

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured pages / Pages de couleur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages damaged / Pages endommagées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages restored and/or laminated / Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/ Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages detached / pages détachées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Showthrough / Transarence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quality of print varies / Qualité inégale de l'impression |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents | <input type="checkbox"/> | Includes supplementary materials Comprend du matériel supplémentaire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Only edition available / Seule édition disponible | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image / Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Opposing pages with varying colouration or discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des colorations variables ou des décolorations sont filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image possible. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées. | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires: | | Various pagings. Pages 501 & 909 are incorrectly numbered pages 510 & 960. |

DEBATES
OF THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS
OF THE
DOMINION OF CANADA.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

BY

T. J. RICHARDSON.

FIRST SESSION—FOURTH PARLIAMENT.

42° VICTORIÆ, 1879.

VOL. VI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1879,
TO THE SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL, 1879.

FIRST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.



OTTAWA :

PRINTED FOR THE PUBLISHER AT THE OFFICE OF THE "CITIZEN" PRINTING AND
PUBLISHING COMPANY.

1879.

ERRATA VOL. VI.

—:—

- Page 51, 1st col., line 44, for "clearly," read "reading."
Page 57, 2nd col., omit line 20—"Motion withdrawn."
Page 78, 2nd col., line 24, for "shells," read "cells."
Page 232, 2nd col., line 42, for "for," read "from."
Page 270, 1st col., line 933, for "there," read "in the colony of Natal."
Page 553, 2nd col., line 9, for "Isaïe Caouette," read "Gatien Lachaine."
Page 765, 1st col., line 35, for "light," read "heavy."
Page 920, 1st col., lines 10 and 18, for "WHEELER," read "KEELER."
Page 947, 1st col., line 5, for "exports," read "imports."
Page 947, 1st col., line 7, for "imports," read "exports."
Page 947, 1st col., line 7, for "£272,000,000," read "£273,000,000."

ADDENDA VOL. VI.

—:—

Page 653, 1st col., after Mr. Connell's motion, add the following :—

"MR. CONNELL said that, a few years since, the New Brunswick Railway Company constructed two bridges over the River St. John with provision for draws, which, however, had not been completed. The River St. John was navigable for steamers of 300 tons and upwards a distance of 74 miles above Woodstock. The York and Carlton Steamboat Company had in course of construction a steamer to ply in the river, which would be finished the coming spring. This company claimed that the draws in the bridges were not of sufficient width, and were not in the proper place to enable steamers to pass through with safety, and they wished the Government to see that proper draws were placed in the bridges, so that they would be able to run their steamer the coming spring, which ought to be done before the opening of navigation, or it would have to be postponed till a later period in the season, and this would be a great damage to the company and an inconvenience to the farmers and others along the river."

Page 654, 1st col., after line 17, add the following :—

"MR. CONNELL said the steamer that was in course of construction was smaller than some of those which had formerly run on the river."

DOMINION OF CANADA.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE MINISTRY

OF THE

HON. ALEXANDER MACKENZIE,

AT THE DISSOLUTION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT, AUGUST 17, 1878.

Minister of Public Works.....Hon. ALEX. MACKENZIE, Prime Minister.
President of the Council.....Vacant.
Minister of Justice and Attorney-General..Hon. R. LAFLAMME, Q. C.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries.....Hon. ALBERT JAMES SMITH, Q. C.
Minister of Finance.....Hon. RICHARD JOHN CARTWRIGHT.
Minister of Agriculture.....Hon. C. A. P. PELLETIER.
Minister of the Interior.....Hon. DAVID MILLS.
Minister of Customs.....Hon. ISAAC BURPEE.
Receiver-General.....Hon. THOMAS COFFIN.
Secretary of State and Registrar-General..Hon. RICHARD WILLIAM SCOTT, Q. C.
Postmaster-General.....Hon. LUCIUS SETH HUNTINGTON, Q. C.
Minister of Inland Revenue.....Hon. WILFRID LAURIER.
Minister of Militia and Defence.....Hon. ALFRED GILPIN JONES.

Speaker of the Senate.....Hon. DAVID CHRISTIE.

Speaker of the House of Commons.....Hon. TIMOTHY WARREN ANGLIN.

Clerk.....ALFRED PATRICK.

First Clerk-Assistant.....EUGÈNE URGÈLE PICHÉ, Q. C.

Second Clerk-Assistant.....JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT.

DOMINION OF CANADA.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE MINISTRY

AS FORMED BY THE

RIGHT HON. SIR JOHN ALEXANDER MACDONALD, K.C.B.,

OCTOBER, 1878.

| | |
|---|--|
| Minister of the Interior..... | { Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. K.C.B., Prime Minister. |
| President of the Council..... | Hon. JOHN O'CONNOR, Q.C. |
| Minister of Public Works..... | Hon. C. TUPPER, C.B., M.D. |
| Minister of Justice and Attorney-General..... | Hon. JAMES McDONALD, Q.C. |
| Minister of Marine and Fisheries..... | Hon. J. C. POPE. |
| Minister of Finance..... | Hon. S. L. TILLEY, C.B. |
| Minister of Agriculture..... | Hon. J. H. POPE. |
| Minister of Customs..... | Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL. |
| Receiver-General..... | Hon. ALEX. CAMPBELL. |
| Secretary of State and Registrar-General.. | Hon. J. C. AIKINS. |
| Postmaster-General..... | Hon. L. H. LANGEVIN, C.B. |
| Minister of Inland Revenue..... | Hon. L. F. G. BABY. |
| Minister of Militia and Defence..... | Hon. L. F. R. MASSON. |
| Speaker of the Senate..... | { Hon. ROBERT DUNCAN WILMOT (Without Portfolio). |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Speaker of the House of Commons..... | Hon. JOSEPH GODÉRIC BLANCHET. |
| Clerk..... | ALFRED PATRICK. |
| First Clerk-Assistant..... | JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT. |
| Second Clerk-Assistant..... | JEAN PHILIPPE LEPROHON. |

LIST OF MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE FOURTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

ADDINGTON—John McRory.
ALBERT—Alexander Rogers.
ALGOMA—Simon J. Dawson.
ANNAPOLIS—Avar Longley.
ANTIGONISH—Angus McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.

BAGOT—Joseph Alfred Mousseau.
BEAUCE—Joseph Bolduc.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Achille LaRue.
BERTHIER—E. Octavian Cuthbert.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Théodore Robitaille
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. Riding—Gavin Fleming.
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—William Fitzsimmons.
BROME—Edmund Leavens Chandler.
BRUCE, N. Riding—John Gillies.
BRUCE, S. Riding—Alexander Shaw.

CAPE BRETON— { William McDonald.
 { Hugh McLeod.
CARDWELL—Thomas White.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Geo. Heber Connell.
CARLETON (O.)—John Rochester.
CARIBOO—Joshua Spencer Thompson.
CHAMBLY—Pierre Basile Benoit.
CHAMPLAIN—Hippolyte Montplaisir.
CHARLEVOIX—Joseph Perreault.
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—Hon. Luther Hamilton
 Holton.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Ernest
 Cimon.

COLCHESTER—Thomas McKay.
COMPTON—Hon. John Henry Pope.
CORNWALL—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Charles Tupper, C.B.

DIGBY—John C. Wade.
DORCHESTER—François F. Rouleau.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Olivier
 Désiré Bourbeau.
DUNDAS—John Sylvester Ross.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Arthur T. H.
 Williams.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Harvey William
 Burk.

ELGIN, E. Riding—Thomas Arkell.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX—James Colebrooke Patterson.

FRONTENAC—George Airey Kirkpatrick.

GASPÉ—Pierre Fortin.
GLENGARRY—John McLennan.
GLOUCESTER—Hon. Timothy Warren
 Anglin.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Philip
 Wiser.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—Samuel J. Lane.
GREY, S. Riding—George Jackson.
GUYSBOROUGH—Alfred Ogden.

HALDIMAND—David Thompson.
HALIFAX— { Matthew H. Richey.
 { Malachy Bowes Daly.
HALTON—Hon. William McDougall, C.B.

- HAMILTON** — { Francis Edwin Kilvert.
 Thomas Robertson.
- HANTS**—W. Henry Allison.
- HASTINGS, E. Riding**—John White.
- HASTINGS, N. Riding**—Hon. Mackenzie
 Bowell.
- HASTINGS, W. Riding**—James Brown.
- HOCHELAGA**—Alphonse Desjardins.
- HUNTINGDON**—Julius Scriver.
- HURON, C. Riding**—Hon. Richard John
 Cartwright.
- HURON, N. Riding**—Thomas Farrow.
- HURON, S. Riding**—Malcolm Colin
 Cameron.
- IBERVILLE**—François Béchard.
- INVERNESS**—Samuel MacDonnell.
- JACQUES-CARTIER**—Désiré Girouard.
- JOLIETTE**—Hon. Louis François G. Baby.
- KAMOURASKA**—Joseph Dumont.
- KENT (N.B.)**—Gilbert Anselme Girouard.
- KENT (O.)**—Rufus Stephenson.
- KING'S (N.B.)**—James Domville.
- KING'S (N.S.)**—Frederick W. Borden.
- KING'S (P.E.I.)**— { A. Colin Macdonald.
 Ephraim B. Muttart.
- KINGSTON**—Alexander Gunn.
- LAMBTON**—Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.
- LANARK, N. Riding**—Daniel Galbraith.
- LANARK, S. Riding**—John G. Haggart.
- LAPRAIRIE**—Alfred Pinsonneault.
- L'ASSOMPTION**—Hilaire Hurteau.
- LAVAL**—Joseph Aldéric Ouimet.
- LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. Riding**—
 Charles Frederick Ferguson.
- LEEDS, S. Riding**—David Ford Jones.
- LENNOX**—Edmund Hooper.
- LÉVIS**—Hon. Joseph Godéric Blanchet.
- LINCOLN**—John Charles Rykert.
- LISGAR**—John Christian Schultz.
- L'ISLET**—Phillippe Baby Casgrain.
- LONDON**—Hon. John Carling.
- LOTBINIÈRE**—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
- LUNENBURG**—Charles Edwin Kaulback.
- MARQUETTE**—Joseph Ryan.
- MASKINONGÉ**—Frédéric Houde.
- MEGANTIC**—Louis Ephrem Olivier.
- MIDDLESEX, E. Riding**—Duncan Mac-
 millan.
- MIDDLESEX, N. Riding**—T. Coughlin.
- MIDDLESEX, W. Riding**—Geo. W. Ross.
- MISSISSQUOI**—George Barnard Baker.
- MONCK**—Lachlin McCallum.
- MONTCALM**—Firmin Dugas.
- MONTMAGNY**—Auguste C. P. R. Landry.
- MONTMORENCY**—Pierre Vincent Valin.
- MONTREAL Centre**—Michael P. Ryan.
- MONTREAL East**—Chas. Joseph Coursol.
- MONTREAL West**—Matthew H. Gault.
- MUSKOKA**—Alexander Peter Cockburn.
- NAPIERVILLE**—S. Coupal *dit* La Reine.
- NEW WESTMINSTER**—Thomas Robert
 McInnes.
- NIAGARA**—Joseph Burr Plumb.
- NICOLET**—François X. Ovide Méthot.
- NORFOLK, N. Riding**—John Charlton.
- NORFOLK, S. Riding**—William Wallace.
- NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)**—Jabez B.
 Snowball.
- NORTHUMBERLAND (O.), E. Riding**—Joseph
 Keeler.
- NORTHUMBERLAND (O.), W. Riding**—Hon.
 James Cockburn.
- ONTARIO, N. Riding**—George Wheler.
- ONTARIO, S. Riding**—F. Wayland Glen.
- OTTAWA (City)**— { J. Merrill Currier.
 Joseph Tassé.
- OTTAWA (County)**—Alonzo Wright.
- OXFORD, N. Riding**—Thomas Oliver.
- OXFORD, S. Riding**—James A. Skinner.
- PEEL**—William Elliott.
- PERTH, N. Riding**—Samuel R. Hesson.
- PERTH, S. Riding**—James Trow.
- PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding**—J. Burnham.
- PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding**—George
 Hilliard.
- PICTOU**— { Hon. James McDonald.
 Robert Doull.
- PONTIAC**—John Poupore.
- PORTNEUF**—Roche Pamphile Vallée.
- PRESCOTT**—Félix Routhier.
- PRINCE (P.E.I.)**— { Edward Hackett.
 James Yeo.

PRINCE EDWARD—J. Simeon McCuaig.

PROVENCHE—Joseph Dubuc.

QUEBEC Centre—Jacques Malouin.

QUEBEC East—Hon. Wilfrid Laurier.

QUEBEC West—Hon. Thomas McGreevy.

QUEBEC (County)—Phillippe Adolphe Caron.

QUEEN'S (N.B.)—George Gerald King.

QUEEN'S (N.S.)—Silas T. R. Bill.

QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)—
 { Hon. Jas. C. Pope.
 Frederick de Saint
 Croix Brecken.

RENFREW, N. Riding—Peter White.

RENFREW, S. Riding—Wm. Bannerman.

RESTIGOUCHE—George Haddow.

RICHELIEU—Louis Huet Massue.

RICHMOND (N.S.)—Edmund P. Flynn.

RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—William Bullock Ives.

RIMOUSKI—J. B. Romuald Fiset.

ROUVILLE—George Auguste Gigault.

RUSSELL—Hon. John O'Connor.

ST. HYACINTHE—Louis Tellier.

ST. JOHN (N.B.) City—
 { Hon. I. Burpee.
 Charles Wesley
 Weldon.

ST. JOHN (N.B.) City and County—Hon. Samuel Leonard Tilley, C.B.

ST. JOHN (Q.)—François Bourassa.

ST. MAURICE—Louis Léon L. Desaulniers.

SELKIRK—Donald A. Smith.

SHEFFORD—Hon. Lucius S. Huntington.

SHELBURNE—Thomas Robertson.

SHERBROOKE—Edward Towle Brooks.

SIMCOE, N. Riding—Dalton McCarthy.

SIMCOE, S. Riding—William C. Little.

SOULANGES—Jacques P. Lantier.

STANSTEAD—Charles C. Colby.

STORMONT—Oscar Fulton.

SUNBURY—Charles Burpee.

TÉMISCOUATA—Paul Etienne Grandbois.

TERREBONNE—Hon. Louis F. R. Masson.

THREE RIVERS—Hon. Hector Louis Langevin, C.B.

TORONTO, Centre—Robert Hay.

TORONTO, East—Samuel Platt, Sen.

TORONTO, West—Hon. John Beverley Robinson.

TWO MOUNTAINS—Jean Baptiste Daoust.

VANCOUVER ISLAND—Arthur Bunster.

VAUDREUIL—Jean Baptiste Mongenais.

VERCHÈRES—Hon. Félix Geoffrion.

VICTORIA (B.C.)—
 { Right Hon. Sir John
 A. Macdonald, K.
 C.B.
 Amor DeCosmos.

VICTORIA (N.B.)—John Costigan.

VICTORIA (N.S.)—Duncan McDonald.

VICTORIA (O.), N. Riding—H. Cameron.

VICTORIA (O.), S. Riding—A. McQuade.

WATERLOO, N. Riding—Hugo Kranz.

WATERLOO, S. Riding—Samuel Merner.

WELLAND—Christopher Wm. Bunting.

WELLINGTON, C. Riding—Geo. T. Orton.

WELLINGTON, N. Riding—G. Alex. Drew.

WELLINGTON, S. Riding—Don'd Guthrie.

WENTWORTH, N. Riding—Thomas Bain.

WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Joseph Rymal.

WESTMORELAND—Hon. Sir Albert James Smith, K.C.M.G.

YALE—Edgar Dewdney.

YAMASKA—Charles Gill.

YARMOUTH—Frank Killam.

YORK (N.B.)—John Pickard.

YORK (O), E. Riding—Alfred Boulton.

YORK (O.), N. Riding—Fred. W. Strange.

YORK (O.), W. Riding—Nathaniel C. Wallace.

THE DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF CANADA

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE FOURTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA,
APPOINTED TO MEET FOR THE DESPATCH OF BUSINESS **13** FEBRUARY,
1879, IN THE FORTY-SECOND YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

THE THIRD PARLIAMENT of the Dominion, which had been prorogued from the 10th day of May, 1878, and thence from time to time, was dissolved by Proclamation on the 17th day of August, 1878; and, writs having been issued and returned, a new Parliament was summoned to meet for the Despatch of Business, on Thursday, the 13th day of February, 1879, and did accordingly meet on that day.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 13th Feb., 1879.

On which day, being the first day of the meeting of the first Session of the fourth Parliament, for the despatch of business,—Alfred Patrick, Esquire, Clerk of the House of Commons, Donald William Macdonell, Gustavus William Wicksteed, Henry Hartney, John George Bourinot and Jean Philippe Leprohon, Esquires, Commissioners appointed by *Dedimus Potestatem* for administering the oath to members of the House of Commons, all attending according to their duty;—Richard Pope, Esquire, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, delivered to the said Alfred Patrick a book containing a list of the names of the Members returned to serve in this Parliament.

The aforesaid Commissioners did administer the oath to the Members who were present; which being done, and the Members having subscribed the roll

containing the oath, they repaired to their seats.

A Message was delivered by René Edouard Kimber, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

“Gentlemen,

“The Honourable William Johnstone Ritchie, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Senate Chamber.”

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate, when the Speaker of the Senate said:

“Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate, and

“Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

“The Honourable William Johnstone Ritchie, Deputy Governor, does not see fit to declare the causes of summoning the present Parliament until a Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law, but to-morrow, at three o'clock in the afternoon, the causes of summoning this Parliament will be declared.”

And the House being returned;

ELECTION OF A SPEAKER.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, addressing himself to the Clerk, said: Mr. Patrick, I have the honour to move that the Hon. Joseph Godéric Blanchet, the member representing the electoral district of the county of Lévis do take the Chair of this House as Speaker. To those hon. gentlemen who have been in Parliament for some time, it should not be requisite for me to state the peculiar qualifications and fitness of the gentleman whose name I have just proposed for the office of Speaker. I will say generally that Mr. Blanchet, the hon. member for Lévis, has had great parliamentary experience. From 1861 until the Confederation of the Provinces, he was a member of the Parliament of the late Province of Canada, and those who had the privilege of knowing him during that long period can fully appreciate his good qualities. Since Confederation he has had varied experience, not only in the House of Commons of Canada, but in the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec. His experience has not been merely a parliamentary one, but for eight years he presided as Speaker over the Legislative Assembly of his native Province, where, I am warranted in saying, his conduct received the approbation and general acceptance from both sides of that body. He has shown, Mr. Patrick, as a member of this House, great aptitude in discussing all questions of constitutional law and parliamentary practice; indeed his experience as a Speaker and a member has enabled him to take a position as an authority in the House of Commons, as well as in the Provincial Legislature, on all such questions. I move that he take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

MR. TILLEY: I have the honour Mr. Patrick, of seconding the nomination of the hon. member for Lévis as Speaker.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Patrick, before indicating the course I propose to take in regard to the Speakership, I desire to express my astonishment at the nomination the hon. gentleman has made. We all, who were in the House in 1873, the House elected in 1872, recollect that the hon. gentleman, in proposing the Speaker of the previous House, gave it

as an expression of his opinion that the practice continued in England for many years of electing the previous Speaker until something should withdraw that previous Speaker from public life, by obtaining a peerage or otherwise, should be introduced into this country, and the hon. gentleman, in pursuit of that view which he took, and had a right to take, and which was in itself intelligible enough, proposed Mr. Cockburn, the Speaker of the previous Parliament. I had supposed, as a matter of course, that the hon. gentleman who now leads this House would take the same course now that he had taken in 1873, especially as he himself commended the action of the late Speaker, my hon. friend the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), as being above all suspicion of partizanship. He eulogised that hon. gentleman last year, on the occasion of a somewhat similar motion, as being a very excellent Speaker; one who had discharged the duties which devolved upon him with the greatest impartiality. I expected, therefore, as the natural result of the stand taken by the hon. gentleman, that he would to-day have proposed my hon. friend the member for Gloucester as the Speaker of this Parliament. Hon. gentlemen will see that it is very difficult to understand how the hon. gentleman could have escaped the responsibility of taking this course, and, but for the adroitness which the hon. gentleman exhibits in changing positions with marvellous rapidity in everything political, no doubt we would have had that motion made. As the hon. gentleman has not chosen to do that, under all the circumstances I do not think it will devolve upon me to move any amendment to the motion, and I will only say, therefore, in reference to the motion which the hon. gentleman has made, that it would be difficult for him to name any hon. gentleman on his side of the House who could give greater satisfaction to myself and the members behind me on this side of the House. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who has been proposed as the Speaker will discharge the high and onerous duties devolving upon him with faithfulness and conscientiousness, and that none will have reason to complain of his conduct as presiding officer of the House. It will be my duty, and the duty of those who

surround me, to afford him every support consistent, with a due regard for parliamentary privileges, which we can afford him.

Motion agreed to.

MR. PATRICK : I declare Mr. Blanchet duly chosen to occupy the Chair of this honourable House as its Speaker.

Mr. BLANCHET was then conducted from his place to the Chair by Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD and Mr. TILLEY.

Then Mr. SPEAKER ELECT, standing on the upper step, said: I humbly thank the House for the great honour which they have just conferred on me in electing me unanimously to be their Speaker. I shall endeavour to be worthy of so responsible and important a position. In cases where experience and knowledge of parliamentary usage and law will be required, I will ask the advice and assistance of those members of this House who have been trained in parliamentary practice. And, in presiding over the deliberations of this Assembly, I will act with the strictest impartiality, according to the laws of Parliament, and in conformity with the will of this House.

And then the Mace, which before lay under the table, was laid upon the table.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD then said: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in congratulating you upon your election. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

House adjourned at

Twenty-five minutes after

Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 14th Feb., 1879.

The House met at Three o' clock.

PRAYERS.

The Speaker Elect having taken the Chair,

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:—

“MR. SPEAKER,

“His Excellency the Governor-General desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Senate Chamber.”

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker Elect, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber;

Then the HONOURABLE JOSEPH GODERIC BLANCHET, SPEAKER Elect, said:

“MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

“The House of Commons have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me.

“If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am, and who through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and country, humbly claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to Your Excellency's person at all seasonable times, and that their proceedings may receive from Your Excellency the most favorable consideration.”

The SPEAKER of the SENATE then said:

“MR. SPEAKER,

“I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor-General to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the House of Commons to Her Majesty's person and Government, and, not doubting that their proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temper and prudence, he grants, and upon all occasions will recognize and allow their constitutional privileges.

“I am commanded also to assure you that the Commons shall have ready access to His Excellency upon all seasonable occasions, and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.”

Then His Excellency the Governor-General was pleased to open Parliament by a Speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported that the House had been in the Senate Chamber, and that he had, in their names and on their behalf, made the usual claim of privileges, which His Excellency had been pleased to confirm to them.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House a judgment, bearing date 7th August, 1878, of the Hon. Mr. Justice Plamondon, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, in the matter of the Election Petition for the Electoral District of Drummond and Arthabaska; also a certificate and report from the Hon. Mr. Justice Armour, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Dominion

Controverted Elections Act, 1874, relating to the election for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Hastings; also a certificate and report from the Hon. Mr. Justice Henri T. Taschereau, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, relating to the election for the Electoral District of Kamouraska.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE BILL.—[Bill No. 1.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

FIRST READING.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced a Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.

Bill read the first time.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

MR. SPEAKER reported His Excellency's Speech from the Throne, and read a copy thereof to the House, which is as follows:—

"Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate;

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

"In meeting the Parliament of Canada for the first time, I desire to express the gratification I feel at having been selected by Her Majesty for the high and important office I now fill, and to assure you of the great satisfaction with which I now seek your aid and co-operation.

"In acknowledging with profound gratitude the reception which has been accorded to myself, as Her Majesty's representative, I am also commanded by the Queen to convey, through you, to the people of Canada, Her thanks for the loyal, generous and kindly manner in which they have welcomed Her daughter.

"The contribution of Canadian products and manufactures to the great National Exhibition at Paris, last year, attracted much attention, and, it is believed, will have a beneficial effect on the trade of the Dominion with Europe. I congratulate you on the success which must, in no small degree, be attributable to the kind and unceasing exertions of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, as President of the British section. The report of the Canadian Commissioners will be laid before you when received.

MR. SPEAKER.

"I am pleased to inform you that the amount awarded for the Fishery claims, under the Washington Treaty, has been paid by the United States, and that Her Majesty's Government has arranged with Canada and Newfoundland for their respective shares of the award. The papers on the subject shall be submitted to you.

"The important and rapidly increasing trade between Canada and England in live cattle has been seriously threatened by the appearance, in various parts of the United States, of pleuro-pneumonia. In order to prevent the contagion from spreading to Canada, and the consequent interruption of the trade, I have caused an order to be issued under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1869, prohibiting the importation or introduction into the Dominion of American cattle, for a short period. It is hoped that the disease will be, ere long, extinguished in the United States, and the necessity for continuing the prohibition removed. Your attention will be invited to an amendment of the Act I have just referred to.

"My Government has commenced negotiations, with Her Majesty's sanction, for the development of the trade of Canada with France and Spain, and with their respective colonies. I hope to be able to lay before you the result of these negotiations during the present Session.

"It is the purpose of my Government to press for the most vigorous prosecution of the Canadian Pacific Railway and to meet the reasonable expectations of British Columbia. In carrying out this intention, due regard must be had to the financial position of the country. Communication by rail has been effected between Manitoba and the United States system of railways by the junction, at St. Vincent, of the Pembina branch of our railway with the St. Paul and Pacific Railroad. That portion of the main line which extends from English River to Keewatin is now being placed under contract, and will be energetically pushed to completion in order to secure, as rapidly as is possible, the connection between Lake Superior and the great North-West.

"A Bill for the amendment and consolidation of the Acts relating to Stamps shall be submitted for your consideration, as well as a measure amending the Act relating to Weights and Measures.

"The decennial census must be taken in 1881. I think it expedient that a measure for

the purpose should be passed during the present Session in order to give ample time for the preparation of all the preliminary arrangements and to ensure the census being taken as accurately and inexpensively as possible. In connection with this subject it may be well to consider the propriety of providing some means for the collection and collation of vital, criminal and general statistics.

"A Bill will be laid before you for the re-arrangement of some of the Departments of the Government, and also measures relating to the survey and management of the Dominion Lands, to the Mounted Police, and to the Post Office Department; and also for the amendment, in some particulars, of the laws relating to Indians.

"A measure will also be submitted to you for the vesting in Her Majesty, for the use of the Dominion, of certain ordnance and admiralty lands in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

"The Estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before you at an early day. They have been prepared with as much regard to economy as is compatible with the efficiency of the public service.

"I regret that the receipts into the Treasury from ordinary sources continue to be inadequate to meet the charges against the Consolidated Revenue. You will, I doubt not, agree with me in the opinion that it is not desirable that our finances should longer remain in this condition. By the application of the strictest economy to the public expenditure, and by the readjustment of the tariff with the view of increasing the revenue, and, at the same time, of developing and encouraging the various industries of Canada, you will, I trust, be enabled to restore the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, and to aid in removing the commercial and financial depression which unhappily continues to exist. I have directed that the Public Accounts of the past financial year shall be laid before you.

"Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate ;

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

"Parliament has recognized the importance of providing for the safe deposit of the surplus earnings of the people by arranging for their being placed with the Government at a fair

rate of interest. It may be well for you to consider how far it is practicable to give a like security and encouragement to persons who may desire, by an insurance upon their lives, to make provision for those dependent upon them.

"Your best attention will, I doubt not, be given to the important subjects I have alluded to, and to the general interests of the country."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved,

"That His Excellency's Speech be taken into consideration on Monday next."

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved,

"That Select Standing Committees of this House, for the present Session, be appointed for the following purposes:—1. On Privileges and Elections; 2. On Expiring Laws; 3. On Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines; 4. On Miscellaneous Private Bills; 5. On Standing Orders; 6. On Printing; 7. On Public Accounts; 8. On Banking and Commerce; 9. On Immigration and Colonization,—which said Committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon; with power to send for persons, papers and records."

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

MR. SPEAKER laid before the House the report of the Librarian of Parliament on the state of the Library of Parliament.

House adjourned at
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 17th February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

APPOINTMENTS.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House, that he had appointed John George Bourinot, Esquire, Second Clerk Assistant, to be First Clerk Assistant, and Jean Philippe Leprohon, Esquire, Chief Clerk

of Committees, to be Second Clerk Assistant.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Has any one resigned?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am told that Mr. Piché is not here.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I desire to ask if you have received the resignation of Mr. Piché.

Mr. SPEAKER: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Or if you have dismissed Mr. Piché.

Mr. SPEAKER: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Then I desire to say that there was no other authority under which it was competent to act except one or the other.

REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House, —Account Current of the Accountant of the House of Commons, of the amount disbursed by him for Contingencies from the 1st July, 1877, to the 1st July, 1878; with the Auditor's Report.

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES.

QUESTION.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the hon. the first Minister if he has not any information to give the House upon the matter of the reporting of the debates. I observe from the newspapers, a report, which is further confirmed by the circulation of certain circulars, that the Government, or some parties, have assumed the giving of a contract for the reporting of the debates. There was no authority that I am aware of delegated to the Government by the last Parliament to do this. There was no such authority vested in the commission of Internal Economy for the House of Commons, and I presume, if anything has been done, if the hon. gentleman has ventured upon this proceeding, it was with a view of obtaining indemnification from the House afterwards; but not one moment should be lost in communicating to the House what has been done, and by what authority it was done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government, believing that it would meet with the approbation of this House, took

Mr. SPEAKER.

the responsibility of making a preliminary arrangement for the publication of the debates. They have taken that responsibility, and will throw themselves upon the House for their support. In doing so, we believe we will receive the support of this House. Believing that the country, as well as the House, require an official and impartial report of the debates, we have undertaken this matter upon our own responsibility. Of course, the contract is subject to the approval of the House.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House proceeded to the consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the Session.

Mr. BRECKEN: Before attempting, Sir, to discharge the onerous duty that has devolved upon me—a duty, I will frankly state, I feel totally inadequate to perform—I must throw myself on the kind consideration and indulgence of the members of this House. This is the first time I have had the honour of sitting on the floor of this House; but I understand, Sir, that in former Parliaments, to young members occupying the very high position in which I am now placed, the kindness of this House has always been extended. Now, if I did not feel that that indulgence would be extended to me, I should be very diffident in attempting to discharge this duty. His Excellency, in the first paragraph of his Speech, expresses the gratification he feels in having been selected by Her Gracious Majesty the Queen for the high and important office he now fills. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am but expressing the sincere sentiment, not only of every member of this House, but of the people of the Dominion at large, when I say that we feel profoundly grateful to Her Majesty for having made such a wise and judicious selection. (Hear, hear.) Our illustrious Queen in appointing her noble son-in-law to be Viceroy of the Dominion of Canada, has selected from among the rising statesmen of the Mother Country a very distinguished nobleman. Although, from the age of His Excellency, his political experience has not been of long duration, yet, when we remember the educational advantages that have fallen to his lot, his ex-

perience as a member of the British House of Commons, his known ability, his high artistic taste, his knowledge of the world, and appreciation of the institutions of the neighbouring Republic, we must admit that they combine to render his administration beneficial to the country. I have no doubt, Sir, that when it closes we will find that the material interests of this country have been considerably enhanced, and that the prosperity, unity, and I may say, if that is possible, the loyalty of the people will be greatly increased and sustained. Our gracious Queen in sending in our midst one of her illustrious daughters, Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise, has reposed a confidence in us that I am sure will be hailed by this honourable House, and the people at large, with feelings of pride and satisfaction. Although the sojourn of the Princess has been of very short duration, yet, from her amiable character, affability and sweetness of disposition and manners, she has already won the affection and esteem of the people of Canada. Her high accomplishments, artistic attainments, and the interest she has taken in the benevolent and charitable institutions of the Mother Country, having for the object the amelioration and education of the poorer classes, are an earnest of the benefits that will accrue from the sojourn of Her Royal Highness in this Dominion, and that, like her estimable predecessor the Countess of Dufferin, she will prove herself to be a true friend to every class of this people irrespective of their social position. I believe that when the administration of His Excellency the Governor General will have been brought to a close, it will have proved so beneficial to the best interests of the Dominion that the people of Canada will be called upon to witness that trying spectacle that was witnessed upon the departure of that eminent statesman and true-hearted friend of Canada the late Governor-General, and that the deep regrets at the loss of such a distinguished Governor-General will be as cordially and warmly repeated when His Excellency and his Royal Consort will be called upon to leave our shores and rejoin their illustrious kinsfolk in the Mother Country.

The next paragraph is one, Sir, that is fraught with interest to the people of this Dominion. It expresses satisfaction that the contributions of Canadian products and manufactures to the great International Exhibition at Paris last year had attracted much attention, and, it is believed, it will have a beneficial effect upon the trade and commerce of this country. Sir, it is almost impossible to estimate the real value that flows from contests of this kind with countries met in the peaceful rivalries of trade and commerce. It must be a source of great satisfaction to this House to reflect that this young country, with its sparse population, and with all its drawbacks, should have been able to attain such a proud position among the older competitors at that world's fair. It is also a matter of very great pleasure to the loyal people of Canada to know that that success has been to a certain extent aided by the kindness, energy, and attention which has been devoted to our interests by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. It is a gratifying spectacle to witness the heir to the British Crown mingling with the subjects of his Royal Mother, and, by his energy and example, inciting them to emulation in these peaceful contests and occupying among nations a proud position in trade and commerce. I am sure, when we see a member of the royal family so identifying himself with the true interests of the country, that it will tend, in a very great degree, to increase that feeling of loyal affection and attachment that has ever distinguished British subjects towards their Sovereign. I am sure it must be a matter of satisfaction to this House to know that this long-vexed question affecting the Fishery Claims, under the Washington Treaty, have at last been concluded. I am aware, coming from the Maritime Provinces, from my own personal observation and experience, that this question has been of a very heart-burning character, and it is a very great satisfaction to know that this vexed question has been settled peacefully and amicably by the means of arbitration. I am also aware that, when the award was made known, it did not give entire satisfaction to our Republican neighbours, and that they thought the award was excessive. The award, I believe, has been

paid under protest. But, from the information I have received, I believe I am correct in saying that the character of the evidence that was adduced before the Commissioners in Halifax fully justified the equitable character of that award. Before I leave that clause of the Address, I think I may fairly tender to the right hon. gentleman the First Minister the congratulations that he deserves for the successful result of the long pending question. I am aware that the right hon. gentleman occupied the distinguished position of a British Commissioner to arrange the terms of the Washington Treaty; and I think I am correct in saying that it is the first instance where Her Gracious Majesty has conferred the distinguished honour upon a colonial politician. I have no doubt that his knowledge of the facts of the case and his long experience as a statesman have, to a considerable extent, contributed to this successful result. Different opinions I know prevailed at one time; different opinions, I believe, have been expressed on the floor of this House; but, to use a vulgar phrase, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. We have got an award that is quite to our satisfaction, and I believe we are quite justified in tendering the First Minister our thanks for the valuable services he has rendered in bringing this question to a favourable termination. The next paragraph in the Speech is also one of considerable importance. It has reference to the rapidly increasing trade between Canada and England in live cattle. It appears, Sir, that, owing to the existence of the disease known as pleuro-pneumonia among the cattle of the United States, our trade in cattle with England was in danger of being interrupted. If I understand the question aright, cattle from Canada and the United States were admitted to the English markets. Information was collected, and I believe that great credit is due to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, for the very ready action he has taken in this matter. He, in a very prompt manner, ascertained that this disease existed and was spreading in the United States. When that knowledge reached the Imperial Government, I believe an order was issued interdicting the importation of American cattle into the English market. That order, I believe, for-

Mr. BRECKEN.

tunately did not extend to cattle from Canada. Therefore, Sir, it seems that the only policy that was open to the Government, was to prohibit the importation of cattle from the United States. When we consider the interests at stake, I think great credit is due to the hon. member for the promptness with which he has acted. Promptitude in this case is everything, for the British Government, in self-defence, would have extended the restriction to this country, as well as the United States, had not this step been taken. In the first place, it is a matter of great consequence to prevent the introduction of the disease into this country, and it would be absolutely necessary to pursue this course in order to prevent the British market being shut against us, which would be a state of things most deplorable. Besides, I believe, with the information I have, that this trade in live cattle between Canada and England, is a source of great wealth to the Dominion, and that trade is rapidly increasing. Consequently, both sides of this hon. House will agree with me, in view of the general depression of trade, that it is of great consequence to this country to protect the trade we have. There is another paragraph of the Address of equal importance to this country, affecting that most important question—trade and commerce. It is stated in His Excellency's Speech, that negotiations have been commenced, with Her Majesty's sanction, for the development of the trade of Canada with France and Spain, and their respective colonies. If I understand aright, there is one important branch of trade which, though not here expressly alluded to, must have been prominently in view when this paragraph was framed. When the commercial treaty was entered into between England and France, somewhere about 1860 or 1861, certain concessions were made on both sides, and reductions were made in the duties of certain classes of goods interchanged between those countries. A short time afterwards, I believe, a treaty was entered into between Austria and France, which gave to the former country the privilege of registering her vessels in French ports on payment of a duty of two francs per ton. Under the "favoured nation" clause in the

treaty between Great Britain and France granting to Britain the most favourable terms conceded to any other country, English built ships were admitted into the French market upon payment of a duty of a like amount as Austrian vessels. I am aware that this question engaged the attention of the late Administration, and that it used every exertion to effect a reduction of the tax at present paid by Canadian-built ships in France. I may state that, when application was made to the French Government to induce them to admit Canadian-built ships on the same terms as English, the French authorities decided that the treaty only extended to English alone and not to colonial vessels. The consequence was that Canadian-built ships have been subjected to the tax of the general French tariff which, in this article, I believe amounts to 40 francs a ton—a duty I believe still in existence. I also believe that such a duty as that practically amounts to the prohibition of this branch of trade. It would, therefore be very desirable, indeed, and I am sure the Government, would receive the hearty thanks of the country if they could see their way, to open negotiations which should result in reducing the tax on Canadian vessels to a point that would render that line of business profitable to Canadian shipbuilders. It would also be a happy result if those negotiations should open up to Canada the trade of the French and Spanish colonies. I suppose, in asking for those concessions—this diminution of foreign tariffs—this country would be called upon to reciprocate in some way. A new trade with those nations and their colonies would widen the circle of our commerce, and give increased employment to the people of the Dominion, extending the inducements we have to offer to men leaving the Mother Country, in which the competition is too keen to allow them to earn a living. We should have all such inducements to present to them as well as those liberal laws and that wise legislation which is calculated to encourage the emigrant to come and settle in Canada instead of the United States. And, when we remember that this country is larger in extent than the Republic—when we look at her inexhaustible resources—her boundless wealth in agriculture, forests, mines and fisheries, and

consider that at present, comparatively speaking, those great inexhaustible sources of wealth are lying dormant for the want of hands to develop them, it will be seen how necessary it is, in the promotion of our interests, for this Administration to lend their best energies, by negotiation and otherwise, to enlarge old and create new industries for the employment of our people and the development of our trade. The next paragraph of the speech has reference to the Pacific Railway. The purpose of the Government is to press for the most vigorous prosecution of this work, to meet the most reasonable expectations of British Columbia. If I understand this question aright, after Confederation, after the various outlying Provinces of the Dominion entered the Union, it was deemed absolutely necessary that some mode of easy communication should be adopted to bind those distant Provinces closer to the older portions of the Dominion. I believe, also, that a work of this kind was advocated and urged by men of all parties. I think, moreover, I recollect seeing, some years ago, in a very influential newspaper, not a supporter of the First Minister of the Crown, an article asking why he delayed the prosecution of that work. I believe differences of opinion exist as to the mode in which this work should be carried on. But one consideration admits of no doubt—that, when British Columbia entered the Confederation it was upon the distinct understanding that a work of this kind should be constructed, and that those outlying Provinces should, as far as possible, enjoy every facility of communication with the east, and easy transportation to the seaboard for the products of those regions. The faith of the Dominion has been pledged to this enterprise, and it is better to be bankrupt in purse than bankrupt in reputation. I understand that, in a short time, 500 miles of this work will be completed, connecting Lake Superior with the great North West. That will be a great advantage, but I believe it is only an instalment of what the inhabitants of British Columbia may sanguinely look forward to. I believe it will be the policy of this and every other Government to prosecute this work consistently with the means at their disposal. It is stated

in the Speech that new communication by rail has been effected between Manitoba and the United States system of railways, by the junction at St. Vincent of the Pembina Branch of our railway with the St. Paul and Pacific Railroad. Whether this is to prove an advantage to our people or not, I am not prepared to say. Whether the effect will be to draw off settlers and traffic to the United States, to the detriment of the Dominion, remains to be seen. But I have no doubt that at present the road is beneficial. A great public writer once said that, if he was to go into a country and seek to judge of its condition and progress, instead of looking at its statesmen, educational or scientific institutions, he would regard the mode of communication existing therein — the means afforded people not only to exchange commodities, but to interchange thought and ideas. If this is correct, I believe it would apply to Canada as well as any other country. We have a large country, and what we want is to know more of each other, and to promote emigration to our country. And how can you expect men who have been obliged to tear themselves from all the endearments that bind them to their homes in the old world, in seeking a home in the new, to prefer a land not affording all these facilities and conveniences that in no small degree tend to lessen the difficulties that emigrants have to encounter in fighting the battle of life? When we have such a country as Canada, with its inexhaustible resources, how necessary is it to try to turn them to proper account and keep pace with our neighbours, to do which it is important to obtain every reasonable communication our means can command. We are promised a Bill for the amendment of the Acts relating to stamps as well as a measure amending the Act relating to weights and measures. I have no doubt those amendments contemplated will prove useful reforms and result in rendering more efficient those branches of the Public Service. It is also the intention of the Government to introduce a measure for the purpose of preparing for the census to be taken in 1881. I have no doubt that it is absolutely necessary for the accurate performance of this public work that the Government should enter upon the pre-

liminary operations in good time. It is very necessary, as we all know, that the census should be as accurate as possible. There is also an assurance given that the Government will consider the propriety of providing some means for the collection and collation of vital, criminal and general statistics. There can be no doubt that accurate vital statistics would be of great consequence to the country. With such you may be greatly aided in the settlement of questions affecting the rights of property, such as when and where a man was born and the like, often occasioning much difficulty. Accurate statistics in the public register would supply all such important information and prove most useful in legislating on sanitary and criminal questions, and in the amendment or amelioration of our criminal code. We are also informed by His Excellency, in the following paragraph that a Bill will be submitted for the re-arrangement of some of the Departments. It is a matter of public notoriety that it is contemplated to abolish the Department of the Receiver-General. I believe the new measure will and should reduce the labours of the Minister of Public Works. I am sure that the hon. the leader of the Opposition will quite agree with me that the labours entailed on the head of that Department are more than ought to be expected from any man. I believe that the railway policy throughout this Dominion will call for the entire energy and attention of a separate Department, and that, as the office of Receiver-General is to be done away with, the cost of the administration will not be increased while the work will be very efficiently advanced. The Estimates of the ensuing year will no doubt be made with a due regard to the state of the revenue at the present time, while also the efficiency of the Public Service will not be lost sight of. I now come to the clause that is considered the most important in the Speech, dealing with a subject which last year was placed by the late Government fairly before the country, which was discussed throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and on which the people have returned a verdict so unanimous as to leave no doubt of their wishes. Of course, a little patience must be exercised, but in a few days the inten-

MR. BRECKEN.

tions of the Government will be made known. It has been a matter of regret that for some years past our expenditure has exceeded our revenue, and, while it is necessary that public works should be constructed for the development of the country, it is equally necessary, for the credit of the country, that the Estimates should be so framed and expenditure so regulated, that our revenue will be sufficient to meet the expenditure. What we want is immigration and manufactories. I admit that statesmen cannot of themselves create prosperity and trade. It would be an unfortunate day for the country, if the farmer, the mechanic or the merchant were to lean entirely upon the arm of the statesman, and trust to legislation alone to make the country wealthy; but, while I state, that I believe it is the imperative duty, and comes within the province, of statesmen, by wise legislation, to open up the avenues of trade, and remove causes of depression—not to attempt to apply any cast-iron rule of fiscal policy, but to suit that policy to the condition and the circumstances of the country. Do you treat a young people in the same way as you would treat an old people? Is there no such thing as helping along youth, whether in the social life or as a colony or community? From the experience we have had, it would be well for us to consider how far statesmen can aid the industries of a country. The suggestion is thrown out as to the propriety of empowering the Government to occupy the position of life assurers. When we look around, to the Mother Country and the neighbouring Republic, and note how often the savings banks, which claim to be safe depositories of the earnings of the labouring classes, have collapsed, and, after a man has paid in his hard earned savings, congratulating himself on having protected himself and family against want, he finds himself again face to face with poverty, and obliged to renew the arduous struggle, the wisdom of the Dominion Government in opening up savings banks under its control comes home to us. If this system of savings institutions has proved a benefit, why should not life assurance under the control of the Government also work beneficially? If one is called for, the other is

more than necessary; for, in the case of savings banks, a man may obtain notice beforehand of its approaching failure, and be enabled to withdraw his deposit, but with life insurance he must continue the risk, no provision being made to enable him to withdraw the amount of his premiums. It would be wise to provide some guarantee for people who have no other means of providing for the future support of their families than through life insurance, their income being fixed, and the demands more than equal to it. I have gone very imperfectly through the various clauses in this address; this is the first time I have occupied a position of this kind. I understand the duty of the mover of the Address is simply to allude casually to the various subjects treated in it. While the outlook at present is not as bright as we might expect, owing to the great commercial depression now prevailing, still, taking a philosophical view of the matter, things are never as bad as they might be. When we look, I say, at this great country, with its great resources, at the nationalities of which our people are composed, surely we may sanguinely hope for a bright future. We have in our people the energy of the Englishman, the chivalry of old France, the dash and ingenuousness of the Irishman, the indomitable perseverance of the Scotchman, the rose, the shamrock and the thistle entwined with the *fleur de lis*, and what better combination could we expect to work out a great and glorious future. All we want is that all men who exercise an influence in this Dominion should adopt this great motto: "Country first; party afterwards." I believe I am not very sanguine when I say that this glorious future is not in the remote distance, but will be realised in a reasonable time. It is a great incentive to a public man to forget, as far as possible, the acerbities of political exigencies, and to devote his time and energy to the best interests of the country. We are a fortunate people. We are the dependency of, I may say, the most liberty-giving country in the world, for there is no country that has a freer constitution, more honourable institutions than that over which Queen Victoria reigns. I thank this House for the very

patient hearing given me, and I have but very briefly expressed the sentiments which actuate me in moving the adoption of the Address.

MR. TASSE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, I am happy to be able to perform that distinguished duty in my native language, the first European language which was spoken upon our country's shores, and the official usage of which is itself an eulogy of the free institutions under which we live. In a speech, as eloquent as it was happily conceived, the hon. member for Queen's has spoken of the importance of the subjects submitted to our consideration by His Excellency, and I am satisfied that there will be but one voice in this House in recognition of the fact that these matters merit our most serious attention, both from the magnitude of the interests which they involve, and from the exceptional circumstances in which they are brought before us. The satisfaction expressed by His Excellency at having been chosen for our Governor cannot certainly exceed the pleasure which we have all felt at his appointment. Belonging to one of the most illustrious families of Great Britain, strong in the experience acquired in the English House of Parliament, he will do honour to the noble name of Argyll in the eminent position to which he has been called. Assuredly, the Imperial authority could not be better represented than by him, who has approached nearer to the British throne than any other subject of our gracious Sovereign. French Canadians hailed his nomination with special rejoicing, and they have not forgotten, nor will they forget, the flattering appreciation which he has shown of the part they have played in the civilization of this continent. "Nowhere," the Marquis of Lorne has said, "is the sentiment of loyalty more real, and more deeply seated, than among the French Canadians, who enjoy the equality of the laws, the justice and the Government of Great Britain." Yes, we saw by this noble language that we were to have a successor of the Bagots, the Elgins and the Dufferins, three names that will be inscribed in our history in letters of gold, and whose memory will remain engraved in all

Canadian hearts. Mr. Speaker, the arrival in our midst of a daughter of our Queen is a social and political event, whose importance can scarcely be estimated. More than once we have had occasion to offer our homage to members of the reigning house, but now, for the first time in our history, Royalty itself, in the person of a Princess of the Blood, allies its destinies to our own. Inheriting, from her august Mother, the virtues and noble qualities that have shed so much lustre on the Crown, deriving also from her noble father his love of the fine arts, and his lively interest in works of intellect and charity, Her Royal Highness will exercise, without doubt, the most beneficent influence upon our people. She will find here neither titles nor distinctions, nor the splendours of a Court; she will find here a social state very different from that of the old world; but will also find loyal subjects of Her Majesty, and spirited sons of toil. Thus is partially realized the dream of those who, at the time of the establishment of Confederation, believed they were laying the foundations of a kingdom, over which, later on, a noble scion of the House of Brunswick should be called to preside. Thus we have one of those happiest strokes of that wise policy which, under the inspiration of a great statesman, Lord Beaconsfield, has succeeded in strengthening the colonial tie, and in testifying, emphatically, that the preservation and development of the possessions beyond the sea are intimately bound up with the present and future of England. Mr. Speaker, if a celebrated warrior could, in this century, distribute crowns to his family by the sole right of the strongest, or of genius, the Queen of Great Britain might with more justice entrust to her children the duty of representing her in those vast regions on which the sun never sets—regions peopled by two hundred millions of subjects of all colours, races and religions, and where are planted and are rapidly taking root those noble institutions which make the English colonies, to use the expression of Lord Grey, "so many free and happy Englands." His Excellency has spoken to us of the warm welcome given the representatives of Her Majesty by all classes of society; these early orations,

MR. BRECKEN.

I am sure, are the forerunners of demonstrations not less cordial which await them wherever they go, from Charlottetown to Vancouver. Alas, Mr. Speaker, that a sudden and painful bereavement should have plunged the representatives of our Sovereign in affliction so very soon after the brilliant demonstrations which heralded their arrival! Ever cruel, Death spares none, neither rank, youth, nor even goodness itself. The untimely decease of the Princess Alice has produced the most painful emotion among the Canadian subjects of Her Majesty, who had learned to respect her name. They knew how much more that loss would be felt by our gracious Sovereign who, having known great joys in the course of a long and illustrious reign, has also experienced great sorrows. His Excellency, Mr. Speaker, has congratulated us on the successes we obtained at the great International Exposition at Paris; successes which gave other nations a high opinion of our intellectual, industrial, and agricultural advancement. His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, who acted as President of the English section, showed a most lively interest in us, in facilitating the work of our Commissioners, thus acquiring new claims to the gratitude of the Canadian people. That exhibition, so suitable for making known the importance of our resources, should assist the measures taken by the Government for the establishment of more satisfactory commercial relations with France, Spain, and their respective colonies. France, observing here more than a million of her children, cannot forget that Canada was formerly New-France, and that she has left on our soil impressions and memories which time cannot obliterate. We must open new channels for our commerce and industries, and every step that His Excellency can take in the direction of a result so desirable, will receive from us the most favourable consideration. We have been glad to learn, Mr. Speaker, that our claims against the United States for the use of our fisheries have finally been settled in a satisfactory manner. No one acquainted with the value of our fisheries in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence, and on our maritime coasts, will pretend for a moment that the sum of five million dollars is

excessive compensation for the privileges granted. The measures vigorously taken by the Government to prohibit temporarily the importation of live cattle from the United States, are entitled to the thanks and congratulations of this honourable House. The effect has been to increase the confidence that exists in England, in our determination to protect the country against the introduction of those destructive epidemics which have ravaged the herds of Europe. His Excellency informs us that a law will be introduced relative to the census, and providing for the collection of special statistics, also for the modification of existing laws regulating certain Departments of the Public Administration. I would mention specially the amendment of the Acts respecting stamps, the improvement of the Weights and Measures Act, the creation of a national system of life insurance, changes in the management of the Federal lands, the Mounted Police, and Indian affairs. All these reforms deserve comment, did I not prefer to pay particular attention to other portions of the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, the House is happy to learn that energetic steps will be taken to push on the work of our transcontinental railway. Already, the Intercolonial is in full operation, and has created an extensive trade between the Maritime Provinces and the rest of the country. It has absorbed many millions, and to-day everybody recognizes the immense advantages which will result therefrom. Only a few days ago the first train of the North Shore Railway traversed the Ottawa region, effecting an entire revolution in the facilities for transport in the Province of Quebec, and constituting an important link in our great national route. The Pacific Railway enterprise, which is to unite all our lines of communication in a vast uninterrupted network, extending from ocean to ocean, cannot be accomplished without enormous expense; but we have reason to hope that the statesmen who contributed to establish Confederation—aided by those who, trained in their school, preserve its tradition—who have constructed the Intercolonial, built the Victoria Bridge—one of the wonders of the world—enlarged our canals, executed almost all our admirable system of public improvements, will be able to con-

duct to a successful completion the gigantic work without imposing on our population too heavy burdens, "The future is in the west," exclaimed Jefferson in the United States in 1818. That prophecy must have encountered unbelievers, but it has been realised in an astonishing manner. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that more than one honourable member of this House will probably see the day when Manitoba, Keewatin, British Columbia, and the other Provinces which are to be carved out of the solitary regions of our great West—the famous "uppercountry" of our pioneers—will challenge our preponderance in the Union. Already an important part of our population is setting out to take possession of the fertile prairies of the Red River, and, before long, of the Saskatchewan. We see in operation here the same economic phenomena which in the United States depopulates New England for the benefit of the West. Manitoba has already begun to export her cereals, and her incomparable wheat will be found hereafter in all the markets of the world. The commercial and agricultural progress and growth of our young Province will be considerably hastened by the recent construction of the Pembina Railway, giving a rapid communication with the civilized world. But the Government have understood the necessity of binding at the earliest moment our North-West and Lake Superior, so that that region may directly pour its products into Canadian territory, and the country will learn, with profound satisfaction, that this branch will soon be in full course of construction. The Pacific Railway, Mr. Speaker, will be the best engine of colonisation in these immense solitudes, by drawing in its train, as by magic, thousands of emigrants, and the day is not distant when the hunting grounds of the buffalo and antelopes will become vast cultivated fields supporting innumerable herds of domestic animals. On the shores of our great lakes, real inland seas, will arise great cities rivalling St. Paul, Milwaukee and Chicago; and these watery wastes which have hitherto borne only the frail bark canoe of the Indian, will be furrowed by thousands of vessels freighted with the products of that inexhaustible region.

MR. TASSÉ.

Then, when borne on the wings of steam, the locomotive will climb the Rocky Mountains, and make its powerful voice heard for the first time in the pine forests of British Columbia,—among the distant electors represented by the right honourable the leader of the Government. We shall then be able to congratulate ourselves upon having established Confederation upon a solid basis, secured its commercial independence, and executed the most gigantic work that a people of our numbers ever had the boldness to conceive and still more the good fortune to accomplish. We shall then have completed an enterprise whose effects upon the commerce of the world it is difficult to foresee, for we shall have constructed the shortest route between Europe and Asia; we shall then have realised the dream of Christopher Columbus, of Jacques Cartier, and many other discoverers, and, pursuing their idea, we shall have reached, marching always towards the West, that ancient Orient whose riches, ever coveted by Europeans, constitute so large a portion of the wealth and power of England. Yes, this road has an importance not confined to Canada, but extending to the commercial interests of the Mother Country, who cannot well refuse to aid us in its execution. More than thirty years ago, Lord Bury exclaimed, in the English Parliament: "Our commerce in the Pacific Ocean with China, Japan and India, must eventually pass through our North American Provinces. In any case," he added, "we shall have lost our commercial supremacy the day when we neglect this important consideration; and, if we fail to cultivate the physical advantages which that country offers us, we shall deserve our fate." Mr. Speaker, if, turning our eyes from these encouraging prospects, we come to regard the actual condition of the country, the picture which presents itself to our view is far from satisfactory. The Speech from the Throne, so lately but the echo of our prosperity, announces a considerable deficit in our public revenue. Our commerce is paralysed, our industries are languishing, our labouring classes are without work, property has fallen enormously in value, in fact everybody is suffering from an unexampled depression in intensity and duration. It is important, then, to re-

establish the equilibrium in our budget, to practice the most rigid economy consistent with the efficiency of the Public Service, to create a healthier revenue to meet our obligations, and to employ all the means afforded by a wise and judicious legislation and administration to restore, at the earliest moment, the comfort and prosperity of former days. A remodelling of the tariff has become necessary, and His Excellency announces that it will be done in a way to protect our youthful industries. To encourage us in this path we have the example of the advantageous results of the tariff of 1859; we have the example of almost all communities who believe that of all policies the best is that which before all things else protects the national interests; we have the example of Germany adopting the system which saved France after her recent disasters; and we shall soon, perhaps, have the example of England abandoning the application of an economical system by which she has profited, but which appears, even for her, to have had its time. Mr. Speaker, the country expects that this remodelling will be done in a protective sense. Our agricultural and industrial classes, understanding the solidarity of their interests, have pronounced their opinion on this point with an *ensemble* which has surprised everybody. In short, the solemn verdict of the 17th of September last demands, among other things, a policy truly national, broad and enlightened, which will promote and develop the resources of our great Confederation. However discouraging the present situation may be, Mr. Speaker, there is, nevertheless, no reason to despair. The clouds of adversity will pass away, and the dawn of better days cannot be far off. With the new impulse given to our industry, the construction of our railways, the creation of new markets for our commerce, we shall very soon resume the ascendant march of past years. Being one of the most important countries in the extent of our territory; possessing an imposing merchant marine, possessing the finest natural communications, possessing fisheries unrivalled in the world—whose importance my honourable colleague the member for Gaspé knows so well how to describe,—possessing a fertile soil, covered with magnificent forests,

and containing great and varied mineral wealth, we have nothing to envy in those countries most favoured by nature. Let me quote the words upon this subject of an American statesman, Mr. Seward: "I see in British America a region vast enough to contain an empire. Its immense wheat fields in the west, its enormous chains of mountains, its inexhaustible forests—the richest of the North—its precious fisheries, its mineral deposits, still unexplored, all this proves to me the possession of the elements of wealth. I find its inhabitants bold, energetic, and moulded by English liberty." We have also reached a high degree of civilization, and we have only to contemplate the number of our steeples, of our churches, of our educational institutions, and of our asylums for all classes of the unfortunate, to understand that we do not measure real progress by the number of our factories, and that we believe in the intervention of Providence in the affairs of men. We appreciate, in the highest degree, the advantages of education, and our system of instruction is not surpassed by that of any other country. We are descended, Mr. Speaker, from some of the strongest races in the world; we have preserved intact their finest traditions of glory and of virtue; if the same blood does not course in our veins, we are united by the same sentiments of noble emulation for our national advancement; we are growing and multiplying far removed from the wars and tumults which desolate and overturn so many other countries,—ready, however, to defend with our lives the soil of our ancestors; we live under the protection of the mildest and most just of political systems—sacred palladium of our liberties, of which we shall never permit with impunity the slightest violation; and it depends upon us alone to build up on this portion of the continent a vigorous and flourishing nation if we only know how to profit by the advantages which an allwise Providence has abundantly showered upon us. A great responsibility rests upon us, the representatives whom the country has chosen to direct its affairs, and this responsibility derives additional importance from the exceptional circumstances of the present hour. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstand-

ing the enormous difficulties which beset the situation, I do not doubt that the wisdom and experience of the advisers of His Excellency, and the trustful and enlightened devotion of the leading bodies in the country,—I do not doubt, I say, that this wisdom, this experience, aided by this confidence, will overcome the evils of the present and render the future as prosperous as has been the past.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, apart from all party considerations, gentlemen on both sides of the House ought to be gratified at the accession to the debating talent of the House and, therefore, for this reason, I congratulate the members who moved and seconded the Address. The Address contains comparatively little to invite comment of a controversial character, as, following the usual practice which has prevailed for many years in Canada, and for a long time in England, it appears to be so constructed as not to commit any person to any principle which the Government may desire to have carried into effect by legislation during the Session, and I shall not, therefore, enter upon any controversy regarding any of the subjects which are to be made the objects of legislation during the current Session. With regard to the passage of the Speech on the advent of a new Governor-General and Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise, I cordially agree in the remarks of those gentlemen. I do not however, believe with the mover of the address, that their advent will add to the loyalty and patriotism of the people, because they do not require any stimulant to add to their loyalty and patriotism; but we are glad that Her Majesty has been pleased to have given her personal sanction to such an appointment as has brought amongst us so illustrious a personage as the daughter of the Queen. I am sure that every one in Canada will vie with one another in doing her honour, as well as her illustrious husband the Governor-General, and I am sure that all believe that His Excellency the Governor-General will discharge the high and onerous duties devolving upon him with that perfect impartiality and independence of character which have characterised his family, and which form the proper domain of every Governor-General

who rules over this country. I cannot say more than that on this subject, because it is unnecessary to enlarge upon such a topic, where all agree in devotion to the illustrious Queen of the realm, and in anything that confers additional honour upon us, we will be glad to take a part or a share in accomplishing. I was a little amused that the hon. gentleman who moved the Address should have gone a little out of his way—and I think it is the only point in which he went out of his way—to eulogize the hon. the Premier for his part in negotiating the Washington Treaty. Well, I presume that living in Prince Edward Island he was not aware of the actual facts respecting that treaty. I have no doubt that my hon. friend is quite ignorant of the all but universal condemnation which that treaty met with; of the entire neglect of Canadian interests in connection with that treaty, and that if a proper award has been obtained by the efforts of the late Administration, it is not because of the wisdom of the treaty, but in spite of it. However, Sir, I will join with him in congratulation that the subject of the Speech as regards the fisheries, has been closed in a manner satisfactory to the people of Canada; and I may congratulate the late Administration upon their anxiety that these negotiations should be conducted by Canadians, and not by any English diplomat. It is the first occasion, I believe, upon which any great subject of this kind has been dealt with purely by Canadian hands, and the result shows that Canadians are quite equal to any ordinary emergency in diplomacy, as well as any British statesmen themselves could be. I regret, Sir, in common with the hon. gentleman who has moved the Address, the recent difficulty concerning the cattle trade, but I am not able to congratulate unconditionally the Government upon the recent order; but I am willing to have it believed, and to believe myself, that the order for the prohibition of American cattle coming in Canada was issued in the belief that it was the best thing to be done. It was a cause of some difficulty beyond all doubt, but the prohibition acts in several ways. It may prevent disease coming into the country; but it, at the same time, prevents the importation of cattle which

MR. TASSÉ.

our feeders require for the purpose of preparing for a more extensive exportation. It also deprives two of our great lines of railway of a vast amount of freight which they would otherwise carry to Atlantic ports. I have only to express my hope that the Government will earnestly consider whether any alteration or amelioration of that order can be made such as will at once ensure safety for the trade and for the health of the cattle of Canada, and not injure the interest to which I have referred. It is, undoubtedly, as has been stated, one of the most important branches of our commerce at the present time, and anything tending to check the growth of such a great business must have, under the present circumstances especially, a most injurious effect upon the agricultural prosperity of the country. With regard to the measures taken, or proposed to be taken, or both, I believe—for I observe that a commission has been sent to some parts of Europe, and it is, I presume, proposed to take some further measures—to increase the trade with France and Spain, that is a matter which gave the recent Administration a good deal of anxiety, and which they considered with very great care; and I can only say that, if the present Administration can find any method by which the natural trade of those countries can be diverted to Canada, and Canadian trade to these countries, such measures not only have our concurrence, but our most cordial support. It is one of those matters that require the united action of this Legislature, and as such will, of course, receive all the support we can give it. In that connection I am happy to congratulate my hon. friend who moved the Address upon the change of policy which he has announced with regard to himself. I was delighted to hear that for the future he is to put his country first and his party afterwards. That is such a complete right-about-face on his part, that I am glad he mentioned it, because I am very much pleased in having him as a convert to a doctrine which, on this side of the House, we have always believed in. We have a paragraph, Sir, which I am somewhat at a loss to understand, concerning the construction of the Pacific Railway. There are gentlemen on the opposite side, and when I

come to discuss that question upon its merits, I shall probably refer to the views of several hon. gentlemen; but I will merely say that there are gentlemen there who denounced the late Government for spending so much money upon this railway; and there are gentlemen there who denounced the late Administration for not proceeding faster with that railway; and now, Sir, it seems that they are taking up exactly the line which the late Administration took. I presume that there is no instance on record where so much work was done in constructing a railroad through an unsettled and unknown country as was done during the last four years. There is no instance, I say, on record where so much was done in prosecuting the initial part of such an enterprise. We constructed that line with the particular view that everything was to be subordinated to the one condition, that it was not to increase the existing rate of taxation in the country, and I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen opposite are also to proceed speedily, as they say, but, at the same time, with a due regard to the financial capacities of the country. So far there seems to be no difference of opinion, but we are told here that they shall proceed with the work in such a manner as to meet the reasonable expectations of British Columbia. This is a diplomatic sentence. It may imply that all their expectations are reasonable, or it may mean that, if they are reasonable, their expectations will be realized. Perhaps the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government will tell us which is the interpretation to be put on these words. I am bound to say, Sir, we have not found hitherto that the expectations of our friends from British Columbia were of the most moderate character. Perhaps the hon. member for Victoria knows exactly what is the nature of those expectations.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
There are two of us.

MR. MACKENZIE : Of course, the hon. member for Victoria must know precisely what he and his constituents expect—that is, if he is the member, of which there is some reasonable doubt, I believe. He will at all events know what the reasonable expectations are. I have only to say that I shall await with the greatest pos-

sible anxiety and expectation, the course which the Government have to propose when their policy is brought down; and I trust that within a very few days, if not to-day, we shall have laid before us the tenders which have been received for the construction, and which, of course, cannot be given out to contract without the sanction of this House, according to law. I would like, also, that the hon. gentleman would tell us why it is necessary to pass a Census Act two years in advance? Under a previous Ministry and a very diligent Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Dunkin, it was thought quite sufficient to pass the Act a year previous. Is it possible that hon. gentlemen opposite mean, by passing the Act two years in advance, to commence operations at once, and have a staff of employes engaged for two years in preparing for what ought to be done in a few months? I cannot imagine that this is the case, and I presume, it is by mistake intended to pass an Act and to commence operations a year earlier than usual. As to obtaining vital statistics in connection with this measure, that is a subject so great in its proportions, and one which has occupied the attention of the House so much on previous occasions, that I shall not venture to discuss it now, except by saying that, if the Finance Minister imagines that in a time of stringent accounts, when money is scarce, and the revenue not coming up to our expectations, he is to impose a vast system of collection of statistics upon the country, it must be at a very heavy expense indeed. We know that the Province of Ontario has already a very complete system for collecting criminal statistics. It may be perfected to a greater extent perhaps, but such as it is, it has been in operation for some time, and I am not aware that it has failed to give satisfaction. It is a measure prepared by the late Minister of Justice, Mr. Blake. With regard to the departmental arrangements promised, I shall not enter into any discussion further than to express a different opinion to the hon. gentlemen who moved the Address as to the Department to be divided. That I shall discuss at length when the measure is fairly before us. I shall say nothing about it now. As to emigration and the hon. gentleman's re-

MR. MACKENZIE.

marks upon it, I entirely agree with him, and I am glad to ascertain that he has been put up by the present Administration to express himself as he has done. It has always been our view that immigration to this country should be promoted as much as possible, but for the last three years, when there was a surplus of clerical and artizan labour and the lower classes of labour in the cities and towns, the late Government felt they would not be justified in promoting that particular kind of immigration to Canada; and in 1875, Mr. Jenkins, then acting as Agent-General in London, was so instructed, and circulars were issued at that time to the agents in Europe. We were, nevertheless, accused by hon. gentlemen opposite of having brought people into the country at a time when many of our own people were out of employment. We endeavoured to direct the attention of our immigration agents in Europe to the introduction of the agricultural class, those who might fairly be expected to go on the land and till it, and produce something which would sustain themselves and increase the trade of the country. Any measures which have for their immediate object the immigration of that class into the country will, as a matter of course, receive our cordial support. The hon. gentleman made a very true remark indeed in discussing this subject; he referred to the share that immigration had in creating prosperity, and he remarked besides that it was unreasonable to expect any Government to create prosperity in the country. Well, Sir, the contrary view is the very thing that hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends have been circulating as their opinions for the last two years. They declared that the late Government could have created prosperity by legislation, but I am glad to find that they now find they cannot procure prosperity by legislation. The question of life assurance is one which can only be discussed in a very careful manner. In connection with the immediate object, that is, to obtain money for the Government, that is a question that I admit to be one fairly open to discussion, and I am not at all satisfied, at the present moment, of the wisdom of entering into a general policy of this character, and as it is one, as I

have said, which is fairly open to discussion, it will be discussed by us, I can say, with perfect impartiality, with a view to accomplish the objects best fitted to promote the prosperity of the country; but I doubt very much that the hon. the Minister of Finance will be able to place any great dependence on this as a means of meeting his obligations by borrowing money. I was somewhat interested to-day, and on the day Parliament met, to know to what extent hon. gentlemen opposite would allude in the Speech to the severe depression which has passed over the country. We were told, during the election, and during the last Session, that all that was wanted to check the tide of adversity which had been sweeping over the country for the last four or five years was a change of Administration, and we were gravely told that if there was a change of Administration, in consequence of the general election, the prices of stocks would immediately rise; and I observed, Sir, in a speech made by the hon. gentlemen at the head of the Government some weeks after the election, he referred to this matter, and called upon his audience, which I suppose must have been a very intelligent one, to mark the great increase in the price of bank stocks and shares which had taken place. The hon. gentleman was apparently ignorant that these stocks had shrunk in value by over 25 per cent.; that the shrinkage, from the date of the election down to the time that the hon. gentleman spoke, had swept away from ten to twelve millions of the banking capital of the country, if it had all been realised upon at that time. This was then the condition of affairs, Sir, and, instead of there being a reaction in this way, producing prosperity, a prosperity that we all could have rejoiced in—because, Sir, the late Administration, adopting the wisest measure which they believed they could adopt, in order to meet the existing circumstances, did not succeed in checking that depression. And if, Sir, the advent of a new Administration, and the proclamation of a new policy was to have produced prosperity, of course we would all have participated and rejoiced in that prosperity. But, instead of that, there has been an actual descent from a great to a still greater depression, and, instead

of the hon. gentleman's views announced in a hall in this city being correct, they were most grossly incorrect. For, of course, I must assume, and take it for granted, that the hon. gentleman had never looked at the prices of stocks from the time of the election until that day. I have only further to add now, that I entirely agree with the closing remarks made by the hon. member for Queen's in his expression of opinion that it would be desirable, in conducting our political discussions, to forget all acerbity of feeling and all bitterness of speech. I am delighted to hear the hon. gentleman propound that and several other views to which I have already adverted, and I am sure that he will find an echo amongst his new friends in the west on this his first advent to the Dominion Parliament, in the propagation of several of the views to which he has given utterance to-day. I have only to say, further, Sir, that in discussing all the matters which are referred to in the Speech, we will not have any serious amount of labour. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has, during the last few years, been constantly speaking from the desk which I now occupy, calling the attention of the House to the small bill of fare which was presented. I as frequently stated that my Administration did not propose to make the Queen's Speech, or the Governor-General's Speech, a mere bill to announce what was to be done throughout the Session, but to announce certain measures which should occupy the attention of the House, while most of the business to be done would probably not find a place in the Speech at all. But I must assume that the hon. gentleman thought differently, and I must protect him against himself. He maintained, on this side of the House, that it was necessary that everything should be foreshadowed in the Speech that was intended to be done. He insisted on the full bill of fare, and on having all the articles upon it. And is this all the bill we are to have before us now? A Bill to amend the Stamp Act, a Bill to amend Weights and Measures, a Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act, and another to amend the Mounted Police Act, another Post Office Act, and some

amendments concerning the Indians. And these six measures are positively all, these petty amendments to six existing statutes are positively the entire bill of fare that the hon. gentleman has presented. I do not allude to this for the purpose of exposing the paucity of the measures and their comparative insignificance. I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to his unreasonable expectations, and his unreasonable demands on previous occasions. The measures to be submitted, I have no doubt, are not all here, but we had a right to expect from the manner in which they announced their policy, that new measures of more than ordinary consequence would be mentioned in the Speech. I am sure, Sir, that, considering the hon. gentlemen's promises, considering the hon. gentlemen's speeches during the elections, the measures which, above all, are demanded to fulfil the reasonable expectations of his supporters are not contained in this Speech.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I cannot in any way object to the manner in which the hon. the leader of the Opposition—and allow me to congratulate him on his position in this respect—has criticised the Speech. Indeed, I am very much relieved by it. I have heard it said that that hon. gentleman announced that it was his duty for the next five years to make the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as uncomfortable as possible. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that, from his kindness of heart, his speech did not at all render us uncomfortable on this occasion. I can agree with him in the just compliment he made to the mover and seconder of the resolutions to-day. Whether they belong to the one side or the other, as the hon. gentleman truly said, it is of great importance to the country, of great importance to this House, that the representative men in the House should present as much talent as the country can supply. I would agree with the hon. gentleman in that respect that, from the manner in which the mover and seconder addressed themselves to their duties to-day, this House and the country have reason to be satisfied with the substantial parliamentary ability which they have displayed. But, while the hon. gentleman paid a due

MR. MACKENZIE.

meed of praise to the mover and seconder of these resolutions, he forgot himself for a moment, and without the usual parliamentary courtesy, he charged the hon. gentleman with ignorance, said that the member for Queen's lived in a far off place, somewhere in Prince Edward Island, and added that he could not possibly know anything about the Washington Treaty. I think if there is a population in the whole Dominion interested in the Washington treaty, it is the people of Prince Edward Island, and I believe that island has gained as much as, if not more than any other part of the Dominion by that much maligned treaty. The hon. gentleman said, with respect to that treaty, that the mover was ignorant of the universal condemnation that the Washington Treaty had received from the country. All that I can say is—that that treaty with all its faults was submitted to the Parliament of Canada and to the representatives of the people of Canada in the year 1872, and that it received the support of the representatives of the people by a very large majority, a majority of sixty-six in this House. And the hon. gentleman will be glad to be reminded that, among those who supported that treaty were some of the most prominent members of the party of which he was the head. I was not prepared for the compliment that was paid to me by my hon. friend as being in some respects connected with the formation of that treaty, but I remember perfectly well that when this speciality of the treaty, the fishery question, was before this House, and when the question was discussed as to what pecuniary compensation the Dominion should receive for the fishing privileges given to the Americans, the hon. gentleman said in this House that he viewed with loathing the idea of accepting money for our rights in these fisheries, the Dominion or territorial rights. We all can remember that. But that hon. gentleman, when he changed his place from being a member of the Opposition to being the head of the Government, he very properly took all possible steps to bring that loathed article of the treaty into successful operation, and he succeeded and the award was made, and he has a right to credit for it. The hon. gentleman is exactly in the position of Vespasian,

who levied a base, obscene tax, to which his son Titus objected. "Oh," said Vespasian, "that is nothing; the tax money does not smell; there is nothing wrong about that." The hon. gentleman, although he loathed the very idea of taking money, took every possible step to collect the money, and it has come at a very opportune moment, a moment when, thanks to the financial skill of the gentlemen opposite, the money was very much needed. With respect to the order about cattle, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it operates in some respects disadvantageously. It certainly interferes with the transit trade. But we had the choice of two evils. We were all aware that a panic existed in England, and of the resolve of the Board of Trade in England to put the Animal Contagious Diseases Act into full effect. We were informed of that, and we knew that, if we did not take the step at once, we would have been scheduled—to use a technical expression—as the United States were scheduled; that Canada would have been at once placed side by side with the United States, and all the cattle going from Canada and the United States would be slaughtered at the place of import into England. And, therefore, we would have had to give up that trade, which has grown to be of such importance, even though in its infancy, if we had not taken the steps we did. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is of importance that that prohibition should exist for as short a period as possible. I fancy the panic will soon pass away in England. We know the energy of the American Government in the matter, and I believe their energy is now being displayed in preventing the spread of the disease of pleuro-pneumonia, and in proving that it is limited to a small district of the United States. I believe that the United States Government are taking the most active steps for the purpose of stamping out the disease, and of putting that portion of the country where the disease exists under quarantine, so that ere long the direct trade in live cattle between the United States and England will be revived. So soon as that is done, we will only be too happy, as everyone knows, to repeal the Order in Council, and to restore the transit trade,

which is of so much importance to the country. With respect to the clause about the negotiations with Spain and France for the development of our trade with those countries, the hon. gentleman has spoken as any independent statesman ought to speak on that subject. I have no doubt that he and his Government considered that fully during the period when they were charged with the special responsibility of considering such subjects. We, of course, on assuming the reins of power, took up that subject as well. It is of great importance that this country should find large and increasing avenues for our foreign trade, and I am glad to inform you, Sir, that we have not been altogether unsuccessful. I am glad to inform you, in a general way, that the Government of France have received our overtures in the most gracious and kindly spirit, that they are inclined to reciprocate in every possible way, and that they are inclined to admit our ships and many other articles under the "most favoured nation" clause. If that clause is continued in the commercial treaty between England and France, that will involve our ships being transferred in France on paying a duty of two francs per ton instead of forty francs; in other words, it will restore the shipbuilding trade to its wonted prosperity in a very great degree. The French Government have received our propositions very favourably. Of course corresponding concessions on our part must be given in the way of a reduction of the duties on French wines. That matter is to be submitted by the French Government to the Chamber of Deputies in a few days—I believe to-morrow. Of course it is impossible for us to know, and perhaps for the French Government to say, what change will be made; but, at all events, so far as the Government is concerned, they have met us more than half-way. I may say that Spain has also expressed a desire to develop trade between Canada and the Spanish Colonies, Cuba and Porto-Rico principally, and they have asked themselves that the powers of our Commissioners should be enlarged so as to embrace the consideration of trade with the Mother Country, of Spain as well as with her colonies on this side of the Atlantic. Whether this

project will eventually be successful or not, it is of course impossible to say now. England has been negotiating for a commercial treaty with Spain for more than a year, and hitherto without much success; but I am glad to learn that, principally in consequence of the Canadian Commissioner going to Madrid and opening up the question of trade with Canada, the discussion between England and Spain has been reopened on the main question of trade between those two countries. The hon. gentleman, in alluding to the speech of my hon. friend who moved the Address, said he was very glad to learn that he had made a complete turn-about face, that he had taken up the principle of country first and party afterwards, as if the hon. gentleman had taken it up for the first time. Now we have always understood that that was the banner of the Liberal Conservative Party—by a party, with a party, and for the people; we have always understood that the principle of the gentlemen opposite was—by a party, with a party, and for a party. But it may be that the hon. gentleman thinks that his party and the people are synonymous. The late election proved that and more than proved that. We all remember the meeting of Englishmen that Canning described so humorously, when three tailors met in a back shop in the east part of London, and commenced an address with, "We, the people of Kingston—no, England."

MR. MACKENZIE: We, the people of Victoria.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman said that his Government had been denounced in former days by some gentlemen in the then Opposition, for not going fast enough with the Pacific Railway, and that others had denounced him for going on too fast. Perhaps it may be found that the policy of the present Government and his policy have not been identical; but we must agree that, after the country had been committed so far as to finish two ends of a railway, we must finish the middle. And that is the extent to which this Speech has committed the present Government to the policy of the hon. gentleman opposite. I forget how many miles there are near Red River, and how many near Thunder Bay, but we all know that there are 185

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

miles in the middle altogether untouched. Until that is finished, the two ends are not of the slightest value whatever. The money has been expended, and the interest is going on. One part of the road runs into a swamp, and the other part runs into a wilderness, and, until these two portions are connected, we shall not have any line between the lakes and our great North-West. By completing that portion of the road we shall have every requisite means of communication. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) will assist, as he has promised to assist, the Government in every possible way, in completing that link, and in giving us a road through Canada to our great country of the North-West. The hon. gentleman says there is something very dubious and diplomatic in the phrase "satisfy the reasonable expectations of British Columbia." One thing is clear, the hon. gentleman did not satisfy the expectations of British Columbia, whether reasonable or unreasonable. We sought to meet their reasonable expectations when we were in power before. We did not then find them so very unreasonable. Now that we are back in power, I do not think that we shall find them more unreasonable than before. A portion of the people have shown their rationality by electing myself to represent them. It is charged by a very high authority in the Reform press that I was elected simply by means of certain pledges to build this Pacific Railway, to suit my constituents and British Columbia in general. Well, the extent of my communications with British Columbia was the despatch of three telegrams to three friends, saying—"I have been defeated in Kingston, and I wish you to elect me for a constituency in British Columbia." The answer came over the wires, "It shall be done," and it was done. The same hon. gentleman asked if we were serious in introducing a Bill with regard to the census two or three years before the year of enumeration. True, it was only in 1870 we introduced the Census Bill for 1871; but the shortness of the time for preparation, then, entailed a great deal more expense than necessary in connection with the census. There had

been a rush of work, which prompted the amendment in 1871 of the Act of 1870, in several very important particulars. We desire, at present, to save all the money possible. I believe the last census cost \$500,000. By timely preparations we hope to save a good deal. The Department of Agriculture is charged with this special duty, and will have plenty of opportunity for judicious preparations by means of its own ordinary machinery and with very slight assistance by proceeding smoothly and calmly the coming summer, to make all the requisite provisions for a correct and complete census. It is simply taking time by the forelock, and avoiding the enormous expense caused by the hurry in 1871. Of course the hon. gentleman's remarks respecting the expense of collecting vital statistics deserve every consideration, but, no doubt, the census would be one-sided without general statistics. It is quite true, moreover, that criminal statistics have received a certain degree of attention. Those statistics, under the present law, would, no doubt, prove of very considerable value. It is well to combine all subjects as much as possible in gathering statistical information. With the same machinery we may get information on all branches, without which the circumstances of any country cannot be satisfactorily known. We hope, by certain provisions, to attain these objects inexpensively. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) alluded to the subject of immigration, and to the fact that his Government had warned the people of England against sending out persons and classes not wanted here. That action, perhaps, was well intended, but I think the manner in which the intention was carried out in England was exceedingly unfortunate, because it was so strongly expressed by the renowned Agent-General of Canada at that time. It was stated that Canada was overcrowded, and Australia, New Zealand and the Cape of Good Hope published our Agent's announcements as a means of inducing emigrants to those colonies; they published the fact that Canada had stated she was full to repletion, and wanted no more emigrants, who should, therefore, go to the East and not to the West; yet, at the same time, the expenses of the Emigration Office—of

the London establishment—were most considerably increased. The hon. gentleman said that he quite agreed with my hon. friend the mover of the Address that national prosperity could not be produced or restored by a Ministry. Well, I believe the country has shown that it thought prosperity may be restored by a change of Ministry, and has changed the Ministry accordingly. Whether the country possesses good judgment it is not for me to say. I am bound to believe, however, that it exercised a wise discretion in that regard. The hon. the leader of the Opposition says I announced there would be an immediate rise in the price of everything the moment we returned to power. What I did say was that I believed the late Government had lost the confidence of the country, and the very fact of a change of Ministry would restore confidence, and that the first effect would be seen in a rise of bank and other stocks, and they did rise. They rose from two to four per cent. within a week after the 17th September. At present our policy is in the future. It rests on intentions. Now, intentions are very good, but performance is better. We hope to perform our intentions. We intend to perform our pledges. Nobody more agrees with the hon. member for Lambton than myself, in the statement he made on a celebrated occasion, that the man who, in Opposition, makes a promise and propounds a policy, and fails to act upon it when in the Government, is little better than a demagogue. I will accept the name, if we do not carry out, while in office, the pledges and promises we held out to the country, in Opposition. The hon. gentleman observes that the Speech is a very meagre bill of fare. But I think it a very fair bill. When we deal with the Pacific Railway, the depression in the country, the tariff, the re-adjustment, of the fiscal system of the country, when we propound a policy which is to relieve the depression and establish an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure—to encourage our manufactures and all our industries—I believe we cannot justly be accused of a meagre bill of fare. I believe the hon. gentleman will find it a little too strong for his digestion. But even were we liable to the charge of presenting a too

meagre bill of fare, it might be considered the object was a due regard to the weakness of his digestion. It was necessary to give milk to babes. We will keep the strong meat for the men on this side of the House. I cannot in any way object to the tone and manner of the criticism of the hon. gentleman opposite. I am glad the Opposition have adopted the English modern system—a very proper one—of passing the Address without amendment; and when all the various subjects alluded to in it are dealt with—when the measures promised are laid before the House, they and their details can be criticised with a full knowledge, and satisfactory explanations with regard to the policy of the Government.

Resolutions agreed to, read the second time and referred to a Committee.

The Committee reported the following Address, founded on the said resolutions, which was read the second time, and agreed to.

“To His Excellency the Honourable Sir JOHN DOUGLAS SUTHERLAND CAMPBELL (commonly called the Marquis of Lorne), Knight of the Most Ancient and Most Noble Order of the Thistle, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Governor-General of Canada, and Vice-Admiral of the same, etc.

“MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:—

“We, Her Majesty’s dutiful and loyal subjects the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly thank Your Excellency for your gracious Speech at the opening of the present Session.

“We receive with great pleasure Your Excellency’s gracious declaration that in meeting the Parliament of Canada for the first time, you desire to express the gratification you feel at having been selected by Her Majesty for the high and important office Your Excellency now fills, and to assure us of the great satisfaction with which you now seek our aid and co-operation.

“We are proud to know, that in acknowledging with profound gratitude the reception which has been accorded to yourself as Her Majesty’s representative, Your Excellency is also commanded by the Queen to convey, through us, to the people of Canada, Her thanks

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

for the loyal, generous and kindly manner in which they have welcomed Her daughter.

“We learn with great satisfaction that the contribution of Canadian products and manufactures to the great National Exhibition at Paris, last year, attracted much attention, and that it is believed it will have a beneficial effect on the trade of the Dominion with Europe. We thank Your Excellency for congratulating us on the success which, we are well assured, must, in no small degree, be attributable to the kind and unceasing exertions of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, as President of the British section, and for the promise that the report of the Canadian Commissioners will be laid before us when received.

“We are well pleased to be informed that the amount awarded for the Fishery claims, under the Washington Treaty, has been paid by the United States, and that Her Majesty’s Government has arranged with Canada and Newfoundland for their respective shares of the award; and that we shall receive with pleasure the papers on the subject which Your Excellency informs us will be submitted to us.

“We are aware that the important and rapidly increasing trade between Canada and England, in live cattle, has been seriously threatened by the appearance, in various parts of the United States, of pleuro-pneumonia; and that we are glad to know, that in order to prevent the contagion from spreading to Canada and the consequent interruption of the trade, Your Excellency has caused an Order to be issued under “The Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1869,” prohibiting the importation or introduction into the Dominion of American cattle, for a short period. That we entertain the hope that the disease will be, ere long, extinguished in the United States, and the necessity for continuing the prohibition removed; and that our best attention shall be given to any amendment of the Act just referred to which Your Excellency may cause to be submitted for our consideration.

“We are much gratified by the information that Your Excellency’s Government has commenced negotiations, with Her Majesty’s sanction, for the development of the trade of Canada with France and Spain, and with their respective colonies, and that Your Excellency hopes to be able to lay before us the result of these negotiations during the present Session.

“We thank Your Excellency for the assurance that it is the purpose of your Govern-

ment to press for the most vigorous prosecution of the Canadian Pacific Railway and to meet the reasonable expectations of British Columbia. That we are sensible that, in carrying out this intention, due regard must be had to the financial position of the country, and that we are happy to know that communication by rail has been effected between Manitoba and the United States system of railways, by the junction, at St. Vincent, of the Pembina Branch of our railway, with the St. Paul and Pacific Railroad, and to learn that the portion of the main line which extends from English River to Keewatin is now being placed under contract, and will be energetically pushed to completion in order to secure, as rapidly as is possible, the connection between Lake Superior and the great North-West.

“Any Bill for the amendment and consolidation of the Acts relating to Stamps which may be submitted for our consideration, as well as any measure amending the Act relating to Weights and Measures, shall receive our best attention.

“We are aware that the decennial census must be taken in 1881, and we agree with Your Excellency in thinking it expedient that a measure for the purpose should be passed during the present Session, in order to give ample time for the preparation of all the preliminary arrangements, and to insure the census being taken as accurately and inexpensively as possible, and that in connection with this subject it may be well to consider the propriety of providing some means for the collection and collation of vital, criminal and general statistics.

“We shall not fail respectfully to consider any Bills which Your Excellency may cause to be laid before us for the re-arrangement of some of the Departments of the Government, and also any measures relating to the survey and management of the Dominion Lands, to the Mounted Police, and to the Post Office Department; for the amendment, in some particulars, of the laws relating to Indians, or for the vesting in Her Majesty, for the use of the Dominion, of certain ordnance and admiralty lands in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

“We thank Your Excellency for the assurance that the Estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before us at an early day, and that they have been prepared with as much regard

to economy as is compatible with the efficiency of the public service.

“We share the regret expressed by Your Excellency that the receipts into the Treasury from ordinary sources continue to be inadequate to meet the charges against the Consolidated Revenue; that we agree with Your Excellency in the opinion that it is not desirable that our finances should longer remain in this condition; and that we trust, with Your Excellency, that by the application of the strictest economy to the public expenditure, and by the readjustment of the tariff with the view of increasing the revenue, and, at the same time, of developing and encouraging the various industries of Canada, we shall be enabled to restore the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, and to aid in removing the commercial and financial depression which unhappily continues to exist; and that we thank Your Excellency for having directed that the Public Accounts of the past financial year shall be laid before us.

“We agree with Your Excellency in thinking that as Parliament has recognized the importance of providing for the safe deposit of the surplus earnings of the people, by arranging for their being placed with the Government at a fair rate of interest, it may be well for us to consider how far it is practicable to give a like security and encouragement to persons who may desire, by an insurance upon their lives, to make provision for those dependent upon them.

“Your Excellency may rest assured that our best attention will be given to the important subjects which you have been pleased to allude to, and to the general interests of the country.”

To be *presented* by Privy Councillors.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Resolved, That a Special Committee of seven Members be appointed to prepare and report Lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by this House on the 14th instant; composed of Sir John A. Macdonald, and Messrs. Tilley, Tupper, Masson, Mackenzie, Holton and Laurier.

SUPPLY.

Resolved, That this House will, on Friday next, resolve itself into a Committee, to consider of a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolved, That this House will, on Friday next, resolve itself into a Committee, to con-

sider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

REPORTS.

MR. TILLEY presented,—Public Accounts of Canada, for the fiscal yearended 30th June, 1878.

MR. BOWELL presented,—Tables of Trade and Navigation of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1878.

MR. MASSON presented,—Report on the State of the Militia of the Dominion of Canada, for the year 1878.

MR. TUPPER presented,—Annual Report of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal year, 1st July, 1877, to 30th June, 1878, on the works under his control.

MR. BABY presented,—Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1878; also, Report on Adulteration of Food, being Supplement No. III, to the Report of the Department of Inland Revenue, 1878.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

ROYAL INSTRUCTIONS TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

QUESTION.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if the Government would lay on the table to-morrow, copies of the new Royal Instructions to, and the Commission of, His Excellency the Governor-General

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Perhaps not to-morrow, but immediately.

PACIFIC RAILWAY TENDERS.

QUESTION.

MR. MACKENZIE: Will the tenders received for the Pacific Railway called for last summer be laid on the table—I mean the tenders upon which the Government propose to act?

MR. TUPPER: In a short time they will be laid on the table of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: The sanction of the House must be obtained to the awarding of the contracts. Formerly, as to those contracts, a special return was moved in the House. I brought the lowest tenders down, if the hon. gentleman will recollect, and showed them to himself and leader.

MR. TUPPER: I do not think the practice of the hon. gentleman ever was to present tenders before the Government had decided to whom they were to be awarded. As I understand the law, it requires that contracts shall be subject to the approval of the House, the contracts and tenders having been left on the table. That was the practice, I think, of the hon. gentleman, and the course sanctioned by the law.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is strictly correct as to the requirements of the law. In two cases I had to anticipate, by getting the authorization of the House previously, as action was to be taken when it was not in session. But still, if the House be in session, tenders should be laid on the table in the first place. I do not wish to interfere with the awarding of the contracts.

House adjourned at

Thirty minutes after

Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 18th February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. COURSOL moved for a statement giving a complete list of all the permanent, supernumerary and temporary employes appointed to the Custom House of Montreal since the 1st July, 1877, showing, 1st. The name and age of each employe; 2nd. The date of his appointment; 3rd. The salary of each employe; 4th. The nature of his duties; 5th. The changes which have occurred, whether by death, superannuation or

dismissal, and the causes of such superannuation and dismissal, and the new appointments made during the period from that date up to the 14th February instant.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES.

MOTION FOR TENDERS.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex), moved for a return of the notices asking for tenders for reporting and publishing the Official Debates of this House, together with copies of all tenders received, and of all arrangements or contracts entered into for the reporting and publication of said debates.

Motion agreed to.

REMOVAL OF STEEL RAILS FROM VANCOUVER ISLAND TO FRAZER RIVER.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. BUNSTER moved for copies of all letters of instruction, for the removal of steel rails from Nanaimo and Esquimalt to Frazer River, B.C., and a statement showing the cost of such removal. He said he owed it to his constituents and the Dominion at large, to make this motion. The rails were landed in Nanaimo in good faith to build the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway, making the terminus at Esquimalt, and if the work had been prosecuted in good faith, the road would now be in good running order. When the surveyors appointed had found the route to be a good practical one, and were within a mile of the completion of their survey, they were ordered away because it was reported the Island was hostile to the late Government; and, in order to punish it, these rails were removed from the Island to the mainland. This report was incorrect. All the Island wanted was to support the Government which would build the road in good faith. How sharp they were in moving those rails on the eve of an election, as if they could not stand a few months longer there, after having been there the whole of the previous year, and now an enormous expenditure would have to be incurred to bring them

back. There was no occasion for the removal of these rails. It was not acting in good faith with British Columbia, but trying to get people annoyed and led astray as to where the terminus should be. Esquimalt was the only suitable harbour. It had been recommended by the engineer, and the Admiral, and was the one to which commerce pointed, and hence these rails would have to be brought back, to build the road between Esquimalt and Nanaimo. His motion was a reasonable one, and merited the consideration of the House.

MR. TUPPER said there was no reason why the correspondence asked for should not be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSALS FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) moved for a return showing the names of all persons who have been dismissed or removed from office, or who have been superannuated, and the causes of such dismissal, removal or superannuation, or who have resigned, since the 10th October, 1878; showing the office or position such persons occupied, and whether on the permanent staff or in the temporary employ of the Government or otherwise in the public service, and when such dismissal, removal, superannuation or resignation took place.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he thought the desire the hon. gentleman embodied in these resolutions was a very laudable one; but, at the same time, the interest which the public took in the matter would not, in his opinion, be satisfied without they obtained some further information so as to allow them to draw comparisons between the action of the present occupants of the Treasury benches and those who formerly occupied them. With a desire to get that information, he would move, seconded by Mr. McCarthy, that the following be added to the resolution: "Also for a similar return, showing the names of all persons dismissed, removed, or superannuated, or who resigned between 4th November, 1873, and 1st April, 1874; and, also, the names of all persons ap-

pointed to office between the said dates, stating the office to which they were appointed, and the salary attached thereto."

MR. CAMERON said that, when he prepared his motion, his intention was, in the first place, to cover the ground from January 1st, 1878, down to the present period. He would have covered the ground covered by the amendment, but he understood that all the information moved for by the hon. gentleman had already been brought down. He had no objection to the amendment. In common with his hon. friend and others, he had a curiosity, a laudable curiosity, to know the exact state of the public service during the period referred to. The expense the preparation of these returns entailed had deterred him from moving for the information asked for by his hon. friend. However, the hon. gentleman, perhaps, knew better what the views and intentions of the Government were on questions of this kind, and, if they chose to vote for the expense, he had no objection. And, as he understood there were some twenty or thirty sessional clerks who had nothing to do, perhaps it would be just as well to give them the employment which the amendment of his hon. friend would furnish.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) moved for a return showing the names and former residences of all persons who had been appointed to office since the 10th of October, 1878; showing the office to which each such person had been appointed, the date of such appointment, and whether in the Civil Service or otherwise, or elsewhere, or in any other position in the public service, and whether the appointment has been permanent or temporary.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD proposed that the motion should be amended so as to read: "Showing the names and former residences of all persons who have been appointed or promoted to office, or whose salaries have been raised since the 17th of September, 1878, showing the office to which each such person has been appointed."

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

MR. CAMERON said he had no objection to that, and, perhaps, the hon. gentleman would also add, "also showing the salary of each person now."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: All right.

MR. CARTWRIGHT suggested that it might be convenient to divide the motion into two clauses. The hon. gentleman of course wanted to get the names of the persons appointed from the 17th September to 10th October. His hon. friend wanted to get the information from the 10th October. If two distinct lists were made it would be a convenience, as they would have to divide it themselves afterwards.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he was surprised, after the hint he had given to the hon. gentleman, that his desire for information was, on these subjects, a little larger than his (Mr. Cameron's), that he did not attempt to gratify that desire by enlarging the scope of his motion. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) had written a few words which he thought would meet the suggestion that had been made by the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. It was not open to the same objection that the hon. member for South Huron had raised to the previous amendment, because he said the returns were already before the House. In this case, the country had not yet had full information as to the number of appointments made in the dying hours of the late Administration. He begged to move that the following words be added to the resolution: "Also for a similar return showing the names of all persons appointed or promoted to any office under the Government of Canada, between the 17th September, 1878, and 11th October, 1878, specifying whether any and what increased pay or emolument was given any person or persons so appointed or promoted."

MR. MACDOUGALL suggested the amendment of the motion of the addition of the words "salary or emolument." He thought it desirable, for the information of the House as well as of the country, that they should see in the same return the amount of the burden

laid on the people for those various offices.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that he had no objection to that amendment.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*, as follows:—

Resolved, That an Order of the House do issue to the proper officer, for a return shewing the names and former residences of all persons who have been appointed or promoted to office, or whose salaries have been raised since the 10th Oct., 1878; shewing the office to which each such person has been appointed, the date of such appointment, and whether in the Civil Service or otherwise, or elsewhere, or in any other position in the Public Service, and whether the appointment has been permanent or temporary; also for a similar return showing the names of all persons appointed, or promoted to any office under the Government of Canada, and the salary or emolument of such office between the 17th day of September, and the 11th day of October, 1878; and specifying whether any and what increased pay or emolument was given to the person or persons so appointed or promoted.

DISMISSAL OF OFFICIALS OF THE HOUSE.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. ANGLIN moved that the Clerk do lay on the table of the House copies of all correspondence between the Clerk and the late Speaker of this House respecting appointments to vacancies in the service of the House of Commons since the last Session of Parliament, and copies of any reports respecting such appointments made by any officer of the Department. He said he had felt it his duty to bring the matter involved in this resolution under the consideration of the House of Commons at the earliest possible moment, because he believed that it affected very materially indeed the rights of this Parliament, and its dignity. The Speaker of the House of Commons was elected by this House in theory at all events, if not in fact. He was elected to serve as their Speaker, to perform certain functions, and exercise certain authority in their behalf. He was elected under the present state of things, not merely for the duration of the Parliament over which he presided, but also to act as Speaker during the interim period between the dissolution of one Parliament and the assembling of another, and

the election of another Speaker, so that at no time should the Departments of the House of Commons, or the country, be without a Speaker, unless in case of his death or absence from the country. There might be some doubt as to what the precise authority of the Speaker was during the interim. He (Mr. Anglin) had looked carefully into this question before acting as he had done with regard to the appointments. He felt satisfied then, as now, that it was the right of the Speaker, and, under the circumstances, his duty as Speaker, to make those appointments. He would, at the very outset of this matter, disclaim any intention of making party capital thereby. He did not think there was any question of party involved in it. But he did think the House itself ought to take such measures as it might think necessary to vindicate its own rights and maintain its own dignity. He thought, at all events, that even those who differed from him would be satisfied that something should be done to settle this question in a proper manner, so that hereafter there might be no room to doubt what were the rights and duties of the Speaker in this respect. It would be natural to bring forward English precedents in matters of this kind; but he had found it impossible to discover any, for the reason that, so long ago as the 39th and 40th Geo. III, a Statute was passed regulating the mode of appointments in the British House of Commons, in a manner entirely different from that we had followed. Probably some sections of that Statute embodied the practice of the House for many years previous, at all events; while the higher officers of the House were, as with us, appointed by the Crown, the subordinate officers were appointed, in one section, by the Clerk of the House, and in another, by the Sergeant-at-Arms. Under that Act was created, he believed for the first time, a Commission the powers of which were very clearly defined. In England, the authority of the Commissioners was much more clearly defined than in our Act. They were clothed with more extensive powers than the Canadian Commissioners, for, while the Clerk and Sergeant-at-Arms made appointments, the Commissioners determined the salary in every case. There was no provision similar to that in the Canadian Act regu-

lating the internal economy of the House. Therefore, he found it exceedingly difficult to obtain any assistance in the determination of this question from anything to be found either in the Statutes or books usually referred to in the settlement of matters of this kind. But in England, as with us, the Commissioners of Internal Economy had no power, no actual existence, they could do nothing, without the presence of the Speaker. So, without the Speaker, except in the case of his death or absence from the country, there could be no sitting of the Commissioners, and they could exercise no authority whatever. The Speaker, on the other hand, continued to exist after the dissolution of Parliament. In 1833 there was a discussion on the subject in the Imperial Parliament at the time of the re-election of Mr. Manners-Sutton as Speaker. The question arose incidentally. Objection was made to his re-election by some gentlemen who alleged that he was then actually a pensioner. He had acquired the right to a pension by length of service, and would become a pensioner after he ceased to be Speaker. The contention on the other side was that he had not ceased to be Speaker, but must continue Speaker for certain purposes until a new Parliament had assembled and a new Speaker had been elected; and one of the facts adduced in proof of this view was that in the case of the demise of the Sovereign before the assembling of a new Parliament, or the day appointed for its assembling, the old Parliament must assemble and, with its Speaker, continue to exist for six months. So it could not be held that the Speaker had ceased to be Speaker, even if no such Act as the Internal Economy Act had ever been passed. In Canada, however, they were compelled to argue from their own Statutes, rules and practice as to what was the duty, and what were the rights of the Speaker *ad interim*. The Canadian Statute of 1868 was exceedingly fragmentary. It was passed, probably, with a view to some special circumstances of the time, and not for the purpose of laying down any general broad principle or creating any special system for the management of the internal economy of the House for all time. There were no special provisions for the period between the dissolution of one

Parliament and the assembling of a new House, save this:—

“For the purposes of this Act, the person who shall fill the office of Speaker at the time of any dissolution of Parliament, shall be deemed to be the Speaker until a Speaker shall be chosen by the new Parliament; and in the event of the death, or disability, or absence from Canada of the Speaker, during any dissolution or prorogation of Parliament, any three of the Commissioners may execute any of the purposes of this Act.”

The Speaker might continue to act independently of the Commissioners altogether, but the Commissioners, without the presence of the Speaker, had no power to act, in any matter—had no authority whatever. The whole of the purposes of the Act, it was not very easy to discover. One section provided that an accountant might be appointed by the Speaker. Why it was necessary to make such a provision he had failed to discover. Unquestionably, while the House was in existence, under the Canadian rules and practice, the Speaker had the power to appoint all officers necessary to the proper discharge of the duties of his Department. One portion of the 9th section provided that the Speaker, not merely during the interim, but at any time, might suspend or dismiss any of the clerks or officers of the House appointed by the Speaker, and suspend any of the officers appointed by commission. He was merely required in that case to inform the Governor-General that he had suspended such commissioned officer. He did not require to give any reason for the suspension, and no one but the Speaker had the right to cancel such suspension. Looking for a moment at the Statute mentioned, it seemed clear that the right to dismiss must imply the right to appoint. If this were not so, it was evident that very serious injury to the public service might be the consequence. There were officers in the employment of the House of Commons whose duties it was of the highest importance should be properly discharged. If he had occasion, after the dissolution of the House, to dismiss one of these officers, he would ask if it could be supposed that this office must remain vacant—that the public business must be brought to a stand-still, because no one had authority to appoint another officer to do that work. If the Speaker had no right to fill that office, it could not be filled. That could

not be the intention of the Act, nor could it have been the wish or understanding of Parliament when the Act was passed. Rule 102 of the House afforded material assistance in the interpretation of the Statute. It could not be objected that that rule was framed before the passage of this Act, and, therefore, that the words "the Speaker" in it must be held to mean only the Speaker while he held the position during the existence of Parliament. The word "Speaker" must refer to the Speaker during the interim of Parliament as well as to the Speaker in full possession of all the powers and privileges conferred by his election. Thus there was not the slightest word to show that the authority, which this rule recognised in the Speaker, did not pertain to him after the dissolution of Parliament, and until the assembling of a new one. The rule referred to said :

"Before filling any vacancy in the service of the House by the Speaker, enquiry shall be made touching the necessity for the continuance of such office; and the amount of salary to be attached to the same shall be fixed by the Speaker, subject to the approval of the House."

That, he thought, plainly referred to the Speaker at all times while he was Speaker. The Commissioners of Internal Economy had not the slightest authority to interfere with these appointments. The authority to make appointments was vested in the Speaker alone, and the Commissioners of Internal Economy under our Statute did not enjoy the power held by the Commissioners under the Imperial Statutes. They were only authorised to guard and protect the funds appropriated by Parliament, and to see that these were properly expended. The money was drawn by them from the Treasury, placed to their credit, and payable to their order, and they saw to its proper expenditure. These were the entire duties they had to discharge—the entire extent of the rights, powers and authority conferred on them by the Statute. He had no doubt that, at times since the passing of this Statute, the Speaker had taken the advice of the members of the Commission, who under the Statute must always be members of the Government, more especially when any change he thought necessary was calculated in any

way to add to the public expenditure. During his (Mr. Anglin's) incumbency of the office, he in no one case had added to the public expenditure without consulting the Commissioners. Generally, after each Session, they met for a slight review of the service, and whenever any important change was made it was with their approval and sanction. But he never thought he was required by law to consult those gentlemen in any way. In many instances he acted entirely on his own judgment. He felt that he should not throw upon the Commissioners any responsibility which, under the rules of the House, he was himself expected to bear. To come to the matter which he desired to bring more immediately under the consideration of the House, he would say that, during the recent general elections, two gentlemen in the employment of the House chose to resign their positions, in order, he believed, to become candidates for the representation of some portion of the Dominion in this House. One of those gentlemen was a member of this House, and he thought it must be a matter of pride to the Department to which he belonged, as well as to himself, that that gentleman had already assumed so excellent and distinguished a position in the House. The other gentlemen had failed to gain his election. The resignation of one of these gentlemen, Mr. Tassé, was forwarded to him when he was busy canvassing in his own county. He at once accepted that resignation, as he did not wish to place anything in the way of his (Mr. Tassé's) becoming a candidate. When the elections were over, being in the habit of frequent communication with the Clerk of the House respecting the necessities of the Department, he received from him a communication representing that it was of the very greatest importance to the public service that the places vacated by these gentlemen should be filled. It was the Clerk's opinion, as it was his (Mr. Anglin's) still, that this application was made to the proper authority, and, indeed, the only person competent to make any such appointment. He made further inquiry regarding the matter, and the Clerk forwarded to him, at his request, a report on the whole subject obtained from Mr. Cour-

solles, the gentleman who was at the head of the French Translation Department. That report insisted very strongly upon the very great necessity of filling the vacancy in his branch of the Department, as the work done there was very great, and he had frequently to employ one of the best of the sessional clerks as an extra clerk for six or seven months or more of the recess. He had a great many applications—Mr. Speaker had no doubt learned what that meant by this time—for these two offices. He was quite determined that he would fill these offices with men perfectly competent. He, therefore, took some time for consideration, and came up to Ottawa for the purpose of making further enquiry. In making these appointments he endeavoured to the utmost of his ability to provide for the proper discharge of the duties of the Department. A gentleman was recommended to him by one of the old and experienced members of this House, as one perfectly competent to discharge the duties of a translator. This gentleman was represented to him as a man of marked ability indeed. After talking the matter all over, acting on his own judgment, rather than on that of the Clerk, he tried to arrange for the proper performance of the service. He put in place of Mr. David—believing it to be of very great importance that they should have an experienced translator for the translation of the Votes and Proceedings—Mr. Gingras, who was then senior French translator, immediately after Mr. Coursolles. He knew nothing of the politics of Mr. Gingras. He placed in the position rendered vacant by the promotion of Mr. Gingras, Mr. Brossoit, whom he had never seen, and who had been very highly recommended by one of the oldest and most experienced members of Parliament. Then, to the place rendered vacant by the resignation of Mr. Tassé, he promoted a gentleman immediately next in rank—a gentleman of whose politics he knew absolutely nothing. Immediately after him came two young gentlemen, who had not served a very long time. These he did not promote, but he appointed to the position which remained vacant, Mr. Piton, who had been for several years sessional French translator, and had been

selected, from year to year, by Mr. Coursolles, to fill the position of extra clerk, and French translator during the recess. He (Mr. Anglin) had reason to believe that Mr. Piton was a person entirely competent to discharge the duties of that position, and he accordingly appointed him. In all that he had done, he believed that he had fairly and properly discharged his duties as Speaker. Of course, it was not of the essence of this question under consideration, whether he had, or had not, so discharged his duties. The essence of the question was whether he had a right to make those appointments. He was satisfied then that he had the proper authority to fill the appointments and the Clerk accepted these appointments, and gave effect to them. The gentlemen were put to work and remained at work two or three days when, as the Clerk subsequently informed him, he (the Clerk) received a message from the Premier directing him not to recognise any appointments made by himself since the dissolution of Parliament, or something to that effect. The Clerk at once dismissed those gentlemen. He (Mr. Anglin) felt that it was his duty then, as Speaker of this House, to take very high and strong grounds, for he thought it was one of the first duties of a Speaker to protect the independence of the House of Commons against all assaults and encroachments, and more especially when these were made by the Crown. Gentlemen who had not much experience in Parliamentary life, and who had not much studied the history of the struggles in which parliamentarians were engaged in former times might not attach much importance to the mode in which an officer of the House was appointed or dismissed, but old parliamentarians who had studied this matter, and knew the vast importance of preserving intact the rights and privileges of Parliament would be satisfied that it was the bounden duty of the Speaker not to suffer the slightest intrusion upon those rights and privileges, without the strongest possible protest on his part. It was true that, under the circumstances, he had no power, but he believed he had the authority, and he was sorry to say that he believed authority and power had been severed of late, and that power, for a time at all

MR. ANGLIN.

events, in appearance triumphed over authority. Believing that it was his duty, as far as possible, to vindicate the privileges of the House and maintain its independence, as far as he could, he immediately wrote to the Clerk of the House a very short letter, in which he said, in substance:—"I write immediately to protest, in the strongest possible manner, against the interference of the Executive, or of any member of the Executive, in the affairs of the Department, of which the Speaker of the House is the head; and I call upon you immediately to undo anything you might have done in obedience to an authority which, as I have learned from your letter, Sir John A. Macdonald has usurped; and I insist that henceforth you receive no instructions regarding the affairs of the Department from any other person than the Speaker of the House." In doing that, he thought he was only discharging his duty. He had no wish to quarrel with Sir John A. Macdonald, but he felt it was a duty that he owed to this House and the country to take the position he did. In a private note, he suggested to the Clerk that probably it would be well to furnish the right hon. gentleman with a copy of his letter, and he believed this was done. Some time afterwards, the Clerk of the House of Commons wrote him again, expressing regret at the embarrassing position in which he had put himself (Mr. Anglin) by asking him to make those appointments, and suggesting that he (the Clerk) should appoint provisionally some persons to discharge the duties of those officers, as it was of great importance that action should be at once taken. He (Mr. Anglin) wrote back immediately, peremptorily forbidding the Clerk to appoint any person whatever to discharge the duties of an office to which he had appointed persons quite competent. Some time afterwards, Mr. Thaddeus Patrick, Clerk of the Private Bills Committee, died. He took no action in this case until the Clerk of the House officially informed him of Mr. Patrick's death. Then he felt it his duty, although he received no requisition on the part of the Clerk—for it was scarcely to be expected then that after what had passed the Clerk would call upon him to make any appointments—to reorganise that branch

of the Department. The clerks in that branch were generally busy for some time before the meeting of Parliament, as the rules required that Bills should be deposited there before Parliament met, and it was absolutely necessary in the public interest that, for some weeks, at all events, before the meeting of Parliament, this Department should be properly organised. He did not stop to inquire what the politics of any of the clerks were, but, having heard from time to time very high accounts indeed of the capacity and ability, particularly of Mr. Hartney, the young gentleman who had, for some time past, discharged the onerous duties of Clerk of the Railways, Canals and Telegraphs, and the Banking and Commerce Committees, he (Mr. Anglin) concluded that he would, under the circumstances, be the person, of all others, who should be entrusted with the care of that work, and with the discharge of those duties for which he had already proved himself so entirely competent. Mr. Panet was his immediate superior. He knew that Mr. Panet had been in the office a great many years, and, when he became Speaker, Mr. Panet was an applicant for an increase of salary, on the ground that he had been so long in the public service. He (Mr. Anglin) wrote to the Clerk of the House informing him that he had appointed Mr. Panet permanently to the position of senior clerk of that branch of the Department, giving him rank and precedence, and an increase of salary, from \$1,200 to \$1,300 per year. To Mr. Hartney he assigned the work of those important committees, and because of the great importance of the work and its very onerous character, he directed that his salary should be increased from \$1,200 to \$1,400. And then to Mr. Todd, son of the gentleman who was formerly at the head of the Department,—a very estimable young man, he believed,—he gave a slight increase from a junior clerk's salary of \$800 to \$900. Another young man, whom he had appointed on a former occasion as junior clerk in the room of Capt. Nolan, deceased, he directed to be placed as senior clerk upon the Railway Committee. So it would be seen that, as far as he was concerned personally, he had no object to serve in this matter but the promotion of the public interest. Not

taking into account the salary of the junior clerk who, at all events, ought to have been on the staff, he would have effected a saving by that arrangement of \$1,400 per year. During his whole time in the Chair, he had directed his attention particularly to reducing the number of permanent officers on the staff, rather than to reducing salaries, many of which were quite small enough. Even deducting the salary of the junior clerk there would have been a net saving of \$600, and, in the whole, of \$1,400 per year. Such was the course he had pursued in reference to these appointments. He understood that these appointments had not been recognised, and they had heard in the House the extraordinary statement that Mr. Piché, who was formerly first clerk assistant, and who no longer appeared at their table, had not tendered his resignation, and had not been dismissed, and yet that Mr. Speaker had appointed another in his place and room. He thought it necessary now to supplement that statement by another on his own behalf, namely, that he had never received Mr. Piché's resignation, and had never dismissed him. For all he knew, Mr. Piché was today as well qualified as when he was appointed years ago, to discharge all the duties of Assistant Clerk of this House. What had been done with him, and why it had been done, it was for others to say. But neither Mr. Speaker nor himself had either dismissed Mr. Piché or received his resignation, and they had shared between them all the authority there was to exercise, during the last twelve months, to do one or the other. The mode and manner in which Mr. Piché had been got rid of was something demanding an explanation from some quarter. He believed that he had now placed the matter fully and fairly before the House. He had looked into the whole case as thoroughly as he could, both as to the law and the practice. If he had not had the power of appointing then, no one else had. The Commissioners of Internal Economy, apart from the Speaker, had no power whatever; even combined with the Speaker, they had no power as Commissioners either to make or unmake any such appointments as this. He desired to say, further, that, up to the last moment, up to

MR. ANGLIN.

last Thursday at three o'clock, when he ceased to be the Speaker, he had never received, either directly or indirectly, the slightest intimation that the Commissioners of Internal Economy desired to make any new appointments. He did expect, during the long interval that ensued, that information would be conveyed to him, but not the slightest intimation ever was conveyed him in any way. Some money matters required that he should sign some cheques as Speaker, and that these cheques should furthermore be signed by some of the Commissioners. Before coming to Ottawa, he had sent up some of these cheques leaving the dates blank, supposing the Commissioners, whoever they were, would sign them; and he suggested to the Accountant that he should speak to the Premier or Finance Minister and have something done so as to avoid irregularity. When he came here, he found those cheques lying as they were, and he had to tear them up and prepare others. The subject was one with which the House should deal and, when he put the House in possession of all the facts, and of such matters of law and usage as he had been able to make himself acquainted with, he had fully discharged his duty as the one who, up to last Thursday, held the position of Speaker. It was now incumbent on the House, the guardian of its own rights, liberties, privileges and independence, to determine whether anything should be done in this matter. When the papers came down it would be open to any hon. member to move a resolution respecting this affair. It was of the utmost importance that no difficulty of this kind should arise hereafter. If the Premier thought the Executive or any member of the Executive ought to be clothed with authority to regulate these matters in the interval between the dissolution of one House and the meeting of the next, he ought to introduce a Bill to that effect, defining the duties of the Speaker, so that the head of this House, the agent selected by this House, should not find himself in the humiliating position of not knowing exactly what his duties were. Though he (Mr. Anglin) believed he did know his, and that he had done nothing which he had not the right to do, still there should be no room for

doubt and no chance of collision between the representative of the House and the head of the Government. Such collisions must have a most deplorable effect, resulting in the lowering of the dignity and the infringement of the rights and privileges of this House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he quite agreed with the hon. gentleman that there was no question of politics involved in this matter, and that the Commission on Internal Economy had no right to make appointments to offices in this House. The Commission had certain powers respecting expenditure, the right to sign cheques, but the power of making appointments did not rest with them. He did not agree with the hon. gentleman that there was any question of privilege or the dignity of Parliament in the matter. The Crown did not claim the right to appoint officers, and no member of the Government acting for the Crown claimed the right to make these appointments. They rested with the Speaker, and the only question was, not whether the dignity and independence of Parliament had been affected, but simply the question of law, of statutory construction, as to who was the Speaker that had the right to make appointments, whether it was the present Speaker, after his election to the office, or the Speaker of the defunct Parliament. The hon. gentleman said the present Speaker could not get any assistance from English precedent in his course. No question of this kind could arise in Parliament in England. Mr. Manners Sutton, to whose case the hon. gentleman alluded, was declared Speaker on quite a different principle, and for quite different reasons from the present case. They all knew the Parliament in England died with the demise of the Crown, and England was then without a Parliament. In the old days, when there was a danger of disputed succession, owing to claimants in two families, it was thought a matter of danger that England should be without a Parliament at the time of the demise of the Sovereign. It was, therefore, provided that in such a case the old Parliament should continue to exist and assemble, as if it had still a legal existence, for six months after the demise of the Crown, so that at no

period should there be any danger arising to the peaceful succession of the Crown from the absence of Parliament. The Speaker was elected to preside over the deliberations of the House of Commons, and as a matter of necessity, when the Parliament died, the Speaker died. There was no Speaker until the 2nd of May, 1868. In case of the dissolution or the natural death of the Parliament, there was no Speaker until this Act passed, and it was only by virtue of this Internal Economy Act that there was a Speaker at all after the termination of Parliament. This Act did not make a Speaker for all purposes. It declared that after the termination of Parliament, the late Speaker should continue for all purposes of the Act to be Speaker, but did not give the Speaker the general powers of Speaker. The purposes of the Act were simply to carry on the expenditure and keep the machinery, as it were, in motion. There was no provision that the Speaker for general purposes or other purposes than those defined in the Act was Speaker at all, and the fact that he had the power of appointment in one case shows that clearly. There was a specific provision that the Speaker, under this Act, had the power of appointing an accountant. The main object of this Act was to take care of the funds, to apply the funds necessary to keep up the machinery of Parliament, and for this purpose to have always an accountant, and thus the Speaker was given the power to appoint him. The hon. gentleman said that, under the 9th clause, the Speaker had the power of dismissal, and that that involved the power of appointment. That principle could not be found laid down in any book in the world, but the converse was, that, where any power to create was given for a specified time, the power of dismissal was necessarily involved in it. The Clerk had the power of dismissal, but not the power of appointment. That rested with the Speaker. The hon. gentleman argued as a matter of law, of statutory construction, that by necessary implication the power of dismissal conferred the power of appointment. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) denied that *in toto*. If, then, the hon. gentleman had no right to appoint these officers, these appointments were

void. The hon. gentleman had no power to make those appointments, and as a matter of expediency he ought not to have that power. He had practically ceased to be responsible for the carrying on of the affairs of this House. A new election had taken place. He knew perfectly well from the complexion of the members returned that it was exceedingly unlikely he would be nominated as the new Speaker, and that the responsibility would fall upon his successor, who would be held accountable for all irregularities and for every farthing of expenditure. It was, therefore, highly inexpedient and unwise in the late Speaker to tie the hands of the new Speaker, to fetter him for five years with those appointments made between October and February, filling up every possible crevice and cranny in order to prevent him from exercising his discretion in the choice of his subordinates. It was a very unwise attempt at usurpation, a very unwise attempt to prevent the Speaker from exercising his discretion in the great responsibility of carrying on the affairs of the House. It was also questionable taste to deprive the present Speaker of the patronage to which he was entitled. The hon. gentleman knew his responsibility had ceased and fallen upon other shoulders. Would it not have been wise, or proper, for the hon. gentleman to have left these matters to the present Speaker; to have left it to him to select his agents, subordinates, and assistants? There could, of course, be no objection to this motion. The matter ought to be settled, as the hon. gentleman said, in a manner that would prevent the question arising again, and he would venture to state that, when the House exercised its discretion upon the point, and settled it for ever, it would not be within the power of a defunct officer to make appointments after all essential responsibility must have ceased. It was quite true, as the hon. gentleman had said, that this Act was inadequate for the purposes for which it was passed. He quite agreed that the Act should be amended, and he desired that, either by the action of the Government or by a Committee of the House—it was a matter more connected with the House itself than the Government,—this subject would be fully considered, and the Act amended so as to

secure it beyond all doubt in the future, and prevent any infringement either of the dignity or privilege of Parliament.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said he was very glad they had had announced from the head of the Government a distinct acknowledgement of a principle which should obtain in this House at all times, and that was that in the Speaker's hands was vested the sole appointing power of the officers and servants of the House, and that in him rested the sole responsibility to the House. He was very glad this had been acknowledged so clearly and so well, because they had had reason to fear that the rule which they knew to be a sound rule had been evaded. They had felt, from the rumours that had been passing current, that the appointment of officers of the House was in a measure to be taken out of the Speaker's hands, and that there was to be a pressure brought to bear upon that hon. gentleman to which he (Mr. Cockburn), as an independent member of the House, would regret to see the hon. Speaker yield, because he thought as long as they expected thoroughly efficient officers and servants of the House they must hold the Speaker responsible for such appointments, which should in a great measure be non-political. He was of opinion that the motion of the hon. member for Gloucester had been of use in that respect, and he was glad the question had been brought up. Beyond that he (Mr. Cockburn) declined to accompany the hon. member for Gloucester. He believed the interpretation put upon the Statute by the leader of the Government was the correct one. He thought there was no doubt that, when the Speaker ceased to represent the House by which he was nominated, and knew that a new Parliament had been called into existence, that he was *functus officii* as to the matter of appointments, and that his powers in that respect were unquestionably gone. The Statute was undoubtedly a very vague and defective one. But, if they only looked back at the old cumbersome system that existed years ago, when the Committee on Contingencies managed these matters, and the difficulties it entailed, they would

know at once why the Act was passed. It was passed for the purpose of placing in the hands of the Speaker of the day control of the finances of the House, in order to afford a speedy and prompt payment of the officers and servants. That was the great object of the Internal Economy Act. He quite agreed that, when a Speaker knew that a new Parliament had been called into existence, and that he would in the order of things give way to a successor, he should not perform, or for a moment dream of performing, the so-called duty of appointment to vacancies. The member for Gloucester spoke of the Statute as being a law respecting which they had no precedents, to govern them. He begged to tell the hon. gentleman of a precedent which was made in 1874. Just as there was the other day in September last, there was then a Speaker representing a defunct Parliament. He retained office until his successor was appointed, and, during the interregnum between the two Sessions, he held in his hands opportunities of making appointments to offices of very considerable importance in the House. There was an important vacancy which had occurred at that time. He thought, if he recollected aright, the office was that of Accountant to the House.

AN HON. MEMBER : No.

MR. COCKBURN said at any rate a very important vacancy occurred at that time, and the Speaker was warned by two Ministers of the Crown against making the appointment to the vacant office. The answer given was that he had no thought of appointing to that office; that he felt that his functions of appointment under the Statute had ceased, and that he did not dream of making any further appointments. He presented this precedent to Mr. Speaker, as the other one had been referred to, and he trusted that, when that hon. gentleman was in the sear and yellow of his leaf—and he hoped it would be very green for a long time—he would remember the two precedents and make his choice between them.

MR. MACKENZIE said they were all exceedingly obliged to the

hon. member for Gloucester for his calm, temperate, and able statement of the case. The subject would, of course, come up again when the papers were before them. He rose then merely for the purpose of asking the hon. gentleman opposite for information on one or two points which he had forgotten. The hon. member for Gloucester stated, in the course of his speech, that the Clerk had informed him that he had received an order from the Prime Minister, directing him not to recognize any of these appointments. The hon. gentleman himself said he gave the Clerk an opinion. He (Mr. Mackenzie) desired to know whether it was an order, as stated, or simply an opinion of what he believed to be the correct course in the case. Then the hon. gentleman had failed to inform the House concerning Mr. Piché's case. He had asked the Speaker, two days before, if he had received Mr. Piché's resignation, and he said that he had not. He then asked him if he had dismissed Mr. Piché, and he said he had not. He was unable to elicit any information whatever from the Speaker concerning the resignation, removal, or dismissal of one of their chief officers, and to that hour the House had received no information on that point. Hon. gentlemen opposite must give them that information. The House was entitled to the fullest information concerning the disposal of this matter. They found, whether the interpretation they put upon the Act was correct or not, that there would be very considerable inconvenience were the interpretation of the hon. gentleman correct. Under that interpretation, the Act would be exceedingly inadequate for the fulfilment of the object for which it was framed. The 10th section of the Act directed that immediately after the passing of this Act the Clerk of the House of Commons shall take and subscribe before the Speaker the oath of allegiance, and all other officers, clerks and messengers of the House of Commons shall take and subscribe before the Clerk of the House of Commons the oath of allegiance; and every officer, clerk or messenger who shall hereafter be appointed shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, take and subscribe the same oath; and the Clerk of the House of Commons shall keep a register

of all such oaths." Now, suppose that a number of vacancies occurred during a long interregnum, by decease or resignation, who would have the power of appointment, and before whom were they to take the oath? All these questions naturally came up in connection with this matter, and it was very clear whether or not it was intended to give the power of appointment of other officers than that of the Accountant, which was provided for in one section, that the other section implied that the power of appointment rested somewhere, and that the duty of taking the oath before the Speaker of the day devolved upon all these officers. The hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) referred to a case that occurred in 1874. He thought he could give an explanation of the hon. gentleman's statement. The late Accountant, Mr. Vaux, was superannuated. He had become utterly unable to discharge his duties, and earnestly requested to be placed on the Superannuation List. There could have been nothing more proper than to do this; but the Government of the day conceived it desirable, in the interests of Parliament, that there should be no appointment to the office of Accountant, and that the Deputy Clerk should discharge the duties of Accountant as well as those of his own office. No Accountant was appointed, but the Deputy Clerk of the House, Mr. Hartney, was asked to undertake the charge of the Accountant's office as well as those of Deputy Clerk, and he had discharged them from that time, the House dispensing altogether with the office and salary of the previous Accountant, and the then Speaker was simply informed of the plan. He (Mr. Mackenzie) thought it was tolerably clear that the House had not received a satisfactory assurance that the Government did not interfere directly in the matter over which neither this Act, nor any other Act, gave them any control. But he would wait, before making any argument, or passing any opinion further on the subject, for the statements the hon. the Premier, might make on those three points. First, with regard to the resignation of Mr. Piché; second, whether an order was sent to Mr. Patrick; and third, where the power of appointment lay.

MR. MACKENZIE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the power of appointment rested with the Speaker. The question was who was Speaker; which he could not answer except by giving his own private opinion.

MR. MACKENZIE: The present Speaker said he was not on the occasion in question; that he made no appointment in the case.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that might be; but, so far as he (Sir John A. Macdonald) knew, Mr. Piché was an officer of the House, and would be until it carried out, what he hoped it would, a proposal to provide for him before dispensing with his services. As the House knew, he had suffered so much in past Sessions that he was obliged to absent himself generally from the House in a way to interrupt the business of the House, and it was known it was considered his duties ended with the Session, and it was considered by himself (Sir John A. Macdonald), and those who acted with him, that they would be improving the efficiency of the staff of the House if his services were dispensed with on the provision of a gratuity to him. Till that was done by the House, he was still an officer.

MR. MACKENZIE asked whether an order was sent to Mr. Patrick to disregard the appointments made by the late Speaker.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he forgot whether the order was verbal or written, but he had expressed his opinion in very strong terms to the effect that the late Speaker had no right to make this appointment, and that the House would not, and he (Sir John A. Macdonald) would not, recognise the appointment.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was a serious misunderstanding in the matter of Mr. Piché's resignation and the appointment of his successor. The Speaker had informed the House that a vacancy had occurred in the office of Assistant Clerk, and that the Speaker had appointed another person to fill the place. Now they were informed

by the leader of the House, that there was no such vacancy, and, if there was not, there could have been no such appointment. He hoped the matter would be corrected, and the contradiction between the statements of that hon. gentleman and those of the hon. the Speaker reconciled.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was no contradiction. Mr. Piché received an intimation of what was the intention of the Government and acted upon it, he had no doubt, gladly enough.

MR. ANGLIN said if Mr. Piché was still an officer of the House, as the right hon. the Premier had stated, he was still First Assistant Clerk, he held no other office, and yet his hon. friend the Speaker informed the House that he had appointed Mr. Bourinot First Assistant Clerk; he did not say, however, that it was in place of Mr. Piché, so they had the extraordinary spectacle of two First Assistant Clerks, one drawing his full salary, and the other hoping for some provision which the right hon. gentleman had said would be very satisfactory; but, meanwhile, drawing a salary, or at least entitled to it. He (Mr. Anglin) rose chiefly, however, to reply to one or two very extraordinary remarks of the Premier. He (Mr. Anglin) endeavoured to make his statement as mildly and moderately as the circumstances permitted. The right hon. gentleman did not choose to so regard it, for he spoke a little more warmly than the occasion required; but that would not have been of much importance, if he had not made some very extraordinary statements. He said that his (Mr. Anglin's) exercise of an authority which he believed he possessed up to the 13th of February at three o'clock in the afternoon, conflicted with the authority which the present Speaker did not possess till after that hour; that he (Mr. Anglin) endeavoured to render the Speaker's position difficult; that he exercised patronage which, in modesty and propriety, should have been left to the present Speaker. The right hon. gentleman overlooked a very important statement of his that, in the first place, he acted upon the direct information of the Clerk that it was abso-

lutely necessary for the proper performance of the duties of the House, that the vacant office should be filled; and, furthermore, that the duties could not be performed with the office not filled. He (Mr. Anglin) did not think that, when doing what he believed necessary in the interest of the public, he was interfering with the powers which the present Speaker did not then possess. No conflict of authority could thus be considered possible, nor was it fair to assert that he had meddled improperly or unfairly with the Speaker's authority. It would have been quite competent for the Speaker to remove the persons he (Mr. Anglin) had appointed, although this would have been entirely contrary to usage and custom. Nevertheless, he believed, had they been removed for any good reason, the House would probably have approved the act, and he (Mr. Anglin) would not have raised his voice to condemn it. He, however, believed that he had authority for his course. He thought the right hon. gentleman was mistaken with regard to the connection between the right of dismissal and the right of appointment in certain cases. They might search all the Statutes, and find no other which clothed any official merely with the right of dismissal, as the Canadian Act did, and not, at the same time, with the right of appointment. There might be some cases of a contrary character, as the Premier alleged, and, if he produced authorities to show,—as he promised to do—that, while the right of appointment implied the right of dismissal, the power of dismissal did not include the power of appointment, he would be much surprised. *Ex necessitate rei*, the power of appointing in this case must be implied in the power of dismissal, else at some period the public interest must greatly suffer. He (Mr. Anglin), however, was willing to submit to any decision of the House, having no personal interest in the matter. Another of the extraordinary statements of the right hon. gentleman was that the Speaker belonged to a party, or was its mouthpiece, mainly, and not the Speaker of the whole House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I said nothing about party.

Mr. ANGLIN said the right hon. gentleman had stated that, after the elections, he (Mr. Anglin) and the whole country knew how they had gone, and that, because he was aware of the result of the elections, he should be satisfied that he had no longer authority, and that it would have been but moderate and modest on his part to abstain from making appointments. What did that mean, but that the Speaker was only nominally Speaker of the whole House, and that, in reality, he was merely the creature and slave of a party? He (Mr. Anglin) would be sorry so to regard the present Speaker, and he never so regarded himself. Sad, indeed, would be the day when the Speaker of the House should become the mere slave and tool of any party. What! because the elections took a certain course, was the Speaker to be deprived of all his functions and attributes? The idea was perfectly monstrous. He was sorry to hear it cheered by a large number of members. He was satisfied that, when some who had cheered had had more experience, and had devoted their time to the study of Parliamentary history, and had learned the great importance of maintaining the rights and privileges of the House, they would hesitate to cheer such a statement. The hon. member for Northumberland spoke of the action of a former Speaker in a certain case, but his recollection seemed confused on the point. He (Mr. Anglin) did not recollect that any important office was vacant when he was elected Speaker. The office of the Accountant seemed the one referred to. Mr. Vaux applied for superannuation several weeks after his (Mr. Anglin's) election as Speaker, and the application was made through Mr. Speaker, the proper channel, as he believed, for any communication between the officers of the House and the members of the Executive, or the Treasury Board. On that application he was superannuated. That was an essentially different case, as no vacancy there existed, and none could have been created without the concurrent action of those members of the Government who formed the Treasury Board, as he believed; while, in the latter case, the vacancies existed, and he (Mr. Anglin) was informed by the Clerk that it was necessary that they should be filled.

Mr. ANGLIN.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said he regretted that, in the discussion of a question involving the powers and authority of the presiding officer of this House, on both sides of the House there should have been displayed a feeling which was not quite compatible with the dignity and the position which this House ought to occupy before the people of this Dominion. The question as to whether there had been any undue exercise of authority by the late Speaker was one which, when the papers were brought before them, they would be better able to discuss; but he hoped that, in addition to the information which had been asked for in the motion, that the Government would send down, also, such information as they might have as to the exercise of authority or power by the Internal Commissioners, if any such had been appointed, because he took it that, if the Speaker, by virtue of this Act of Parliament, had only a limited power after the dissolution of Parliament, the authority of the Commissioners of the Crown, or the members of the Privy Council appointed before being sworn in as members of the House of Commons in dealing with the officers of this House, was equally open to exception and objection. He did not quite concur with the First Minister in his interpretation of this Act. It seemed to him that the intention was to continue in office, during the period from the dissolution of Parliament to the election of a new Speaker the person who had exercised authority as Speaker in the government of the House. He thought, moreover, the Speaker had power to remove or dismiss officers of the House at his own discretion. Then he thought it followed, as a necessary consequence, that he had the power to appoint—at all events, until a new Speaker was chosen—others to the place of those whom he had removed. He, (Mr. Macdougall) was disposed to construe the Act in that sense. But it had been stated—he did not know with what truth—that certain offices had been vacated and then filled at the suggestion, or by the authority, of the Executive. If this were true, he thought there had been an undue exercise of power. For, though he came into this House disposed to give support to the gentlemen on the Treasury Benches—believing, as he did,

that the policy enunciated by them in the recent election was a good one, or, at all events, that it should have a fair trial—yet, at the same time, he was above all a member of Parliament, and, as such, inclined to oppose at the very outset any attempt on the part of the Government to interfere, or exercise in any degree the powers or authority which they derived from their positions as Commissioners or representatives of the Crown in the management of the internal affairs of this House. Let them, at least, have one place in this country where they should be free to express their opinions and exercise their delegated authority. He took this opportunity to refer to a personal matter. They knew that a number of newspapers had connected his name with the Speakership, and for that reason his attention had been drawn to the position of that officer. But he would say that, neither from the Government, nor any member of the Government, had he received any advances in reference to the Speakership, nor had he sought the position. He confessed that, when he saw a disposition, no matter where, to encroach upon the privileges of Parliament, he was not disposed to assent or acquiesce. It was the duty of every member to resist any improper assumption of authority in this body. It was a question that ought to be discussed with reference to the Statutes and their rules, which, if defective, should be amended. He trusted that would be the result of this discussion. He did not think that the hon. gentleman came up to Ottawa on the eve of the meeting of Parliament to appoint gentlemen to certain positions in this House, against the public interest. He exercised an authority which legally belonged to him, though it might have been an indiscreet exercise of authority. However, all these matters would probably be before them when the papers were sent down, and when probably they would be referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections for consideration.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSIONERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, and it is as follows:—

“LORNE.

“The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute in Council, appointing the Right Honorable Sir John A. Macdonald, Minister of the Interior, the Hon. S. L. Tilley, Minister of Finance, the Hon. C. Tupper, Minister of Public Works, and the Hon. G. Baby, Minister of Inland Revenue, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the Act 31 Victoria, Chapter 27, intitled: ‘An Act respecting the Internal Economy of the House of Commons; and for other purposes.’

“Government House,

“Ottawa, 18th February, 1879.”

REPORT.

Mr. POPE (Queen's P. E. I.) laid before the House,—Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1878.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes to

Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 19th February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EAST ELGIN CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

JUDGE'S REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Vice-Chancellor Blake, one of the Judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, a certificate relating to the election for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Elgin.

BANKRUPTCY BILL.

(*Mr. Colby.*)

FIRST READING.

Mr. COLBY introduced Bill (No. 2) Relating to Bankruptcy. He stated that the Bill contemplated the repeal of the

existing Insolvency Act, and also made provision for the winding up of the estates of insolvent debtors and the distribution of the effects.

Bill read the first time.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S INSTRUCTIONS AND COMMISSION.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

MR. SPEAKER read the Message, and it is as follows :—

“ LOBBE.

“ The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, copies of Letters-Patent passed under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, constituting the office of Governor-General of the Dominion of Canada, and of the Royal Instructions accompanying the same,—also of Her Majesty's Commission appointing him to be Governor-General of the said Dominion.

“ Government House,

“ Ottawa, 19th February, 1879.”

THE CARILLON DAM.

QUESTION.

MR. CHRISTIE enquired, Whether the Government has accepted the tender of any contractor for completing the Carillon Dam and Works; and, if not, whether it is intended to prosecute the work immediately to completion as originally designed.

MR. TUPPER: I would say, in reply to my hon. friend, that Mr. McNamee, who was the lowest tenderer for that work, was notified that his tender would be accepted. The Government subsequently decided to suspend the immediate prosecution of the work, and Mr. McNamee received information to that effect, and the deposit was returned. The matter is still under the anxious consideration of the Government. As to the time they will be enabled to resume the work, no definite determination has been reached upon that point.

MR. COLBY.

PARDON OF LOUIS RIEL.

QUESTION.

MR. FISET enquired, Whether the Government have solicited and recommended the pardon of Mr. Louis Riel. If not, whether they intend doing so, and when.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government cannot well solicit the pardon of Mr. Louis Riel, because I take it the Government has the power of granting it. However, the Government have not solicited, or recommended the pardon of Mr. Louis Riel. In regard to the second part of the question, I may say that they do not propose to make that proposition. If the proposition were made in the House, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman would have an opportunity of voting against it again.

THE CHARLEVOIX ELECTION.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. MOUSSEAU said that, before the Orders of the Day were called, he would beg to raise a question of privilege. On the 13th instant, in the county of Charlevoix, an election was held. On the following day, the authorised agent reported Mr. Perreault elected by a majority of 179. Within the five days following there was no demand for a recount by the Opposition candidate. The returning officer declared Mr. Perreault duly elected as member for the electoral district of Charlevoix. On account of the distance, the report could not reach Ottawa before Saturday or Sunday, and he (Mr. Mousseau) would suggest that Mr. Perreault be admitted to take his seat upon the floor of the House, upon the telegraphed report just received by Mr. Pope, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and which, with the kind permission of that gentleman, he held in his hand. The telegram was as follows :—

“ I certify that the member elected for the electoral district of Charlevoix, in conformity with the writ issued, having received a majority of the votes legally given, is Joseph Stanislaus Perreault, Esquire, advocate.”

He desired the permission of the House to waive the rules of the House so that the hon. gentleman could be conducted

to his seat. It would be a great hardship for him to be deprived of the privilege of taking his seat until the arrival of the return.

MR. MACKENZIE : Who sends the telegraphic certificate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The returning officer.

MR. MACKENZIE : But it must be from the Judge who had the recount.

MR. MOUSSEAU : There was no recount held.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Not demanded.

MR. MOUSSEAU said that at the same time the telegram was received by Mr. Pope, another telegram to the same effect was sent to the member himself.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not suppose any member of the House would desire for a moment to keep any person out of his seat who was legitimately entitled to it ; but the question they had to consider was that the time within which a recount could be demanded only expired the day previous, and was it not possible that a recount might have been demanded ?

MR. MOUSSEAU : No. If a recount had been demanded the proclamation would not have been made.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was some case wherein they declined to accept a telegraphic certificate. He could not remember for the moment what case it was ; probably hon. gentlemen opposite would remember.

MR. KIRKPATRICK : It was in Manitoba.

MR. MACKENZIE said that might be so. He did not remember. He had no personal objection himself whatever to the elected member being introduced into the House, except that they might be going beyond their usual custom of requiring the ordinary certificate of the returning

officer. His impression was that, on a former occasion, the hon. gentleman opposite called the attention of the House to the danger of accepting a telegram which might be sent by any one. That was the only difficulty. They had no absolute certificate identifying the sender of the telegram as the proper party to send such a message.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that was the difficulty, and he thought he remembered having called the attention of the House to that on the occasion of the election of his hon. friend Mr. Langevin. In this case they would take one step further than they were usually in the habit of doing. Usually they had been in the habit of accepting the return of the returning officer, and entering at the same time upon the journals of the House that it should not be made a precedent. This would be going one step farther, and saying that the return could be sent over the wires as well as in an envelope. The reason why his hon. friend made this application was that the gentleman, of whose election there was no doubt, would be subjected to considerable hardship by being excluded from taking his seat until the certificate could arrive, in the due course of a long winter's journey. He thought the hon. gentleman might be allowed to take his seat, and an entry made upon the journals of the House that it should not be made a precedent.

MR. MILLS said there was another difficulty to be regarded. It was necessary for a new member to preserve a duplicate of the certificate to the Clerk of the House for the purpose of identity, before he could be sworn in. He did not think the Clerk could swear the hon. gentleman until he had produced such certificate. He did not think the House could do anything in the matter. There was a difference between recognising the election of a member known to the House, and the recognition of one who was elected for the first time.

MR. MOUSSEAU said he had made a mistake about the time within which a recount could be demanded. It was not five days, it was four days, so that the period had expired on Monday. As to

identity, the hon. member for Quebec knew the hon. gentleman personally, and his identity might be certified to on both sides of the House by personal friends.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think my hon. friend will find it is four days from the date of declaring the election.

MR. MOUSSEAU: No, from the day of voting. It expired on the seventeenth.

MR. ANGLIN said he thought the proposal was an exceedingly dangerous one. He was sure no one would wish to keep the hon. member a moment from his seat; but, if they were to accept a telegram in this case, as sufficient proof of the election of a member of the House, the precedent would be exceedingly dangerous. Telegrams might be sent to any part of the country in anyone's name. The hon. gentleman, by remaining out of his seat, would lose little or nothing. Of course it was a loss that he should be deprived of his seat in the House for a moment longer than was necessary. He thought hon. members would see the great danger of accepting telegrams as conclusive evidence of the return of any one as a member of this House. He, for one, must regard the proposal as objectionable, and he took objection to it, not at all from an hostility to the hon. gentleman, or for any purpose whatever than that of exercising a reasonable amount of discretion on matters of so great importance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought his hon. friend had better not press the matter as far as M. R. Perrault was concerned. He had no doubt it would be found that the hon. gentleman had a perfect right to take his seat, and he was assured the House would, notwithstanding, award him all the privileges to—pecuniary and otherwise—attached to his office.

CARILLON DAM AND WORKS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. CHRISTIE moved for a return, showing all tenders received for the completion of the Carillon Dam and Works, and all correspondence between the Government and the Engineer and others, relating to the prosecution of that work.

MR. MOUSSEAU.

He said that the contract for these works was given out by the Macdonald Government in 1873, for \$600,000, and should have been completed two or three years ago. The contractor prosecuted the work for several years, and somewhere about \$360,000 had been expended upon this work. But during the past eighteen months or two years nothing had been done. During the last summer the late Government took it out of the hands of the contractor, and advertised for tenders for the completion of the work. Tenders were received during the month of August last, and it was fully expected the work would have been pushed to completion. But it appeared, since the present Administration had come into power, nothing further had been done; at all events, the work had not been renewed, and he thought this was a matter very much to be regretted. It was a work of very great importance to the country, and of a special importance to the lumber trade. This was one of the worst parts of the river, and navigation was very seriously impeded there. The slide on the south side of the river was nearly gone, and last year was a cause of great delay and loss in the passing of timber. The slide on the north side has not yet been built, and the result would be, in all probability, most damaging to the lumber trade during the present year. That was not all. It was commonly reported that the work which had been done, and on which so much money had been expended, was now going to ruin, and was in danger of being swept away by the spring floods; the material which had been prepared was deteriorating, the timber was rotting, and would soon become unfit for use. It seemed to him that the present was a favourable time for the prosecution of this work. It was well known there was a great scarcity of employment; wages were lower, farm products were cheaper, and money scarcer than they had been for many years, consequently, the work could be done at a greatly diminished cost, and with a great saving to the country. There could be no doubt, if this work had been prosecuted vigorously, if the money (\$240,000) voted by the House during the last Session had been expended as was intended, the work now would have been far advanced

towards completion, employment would have been furnished to hundreds now out of work, a market afforded for some of our farm products, and the depression which had been felt in that section of the country, as well as in the other parts of the Dominion, would have been relieved. He thought it was desirable that this House and the country should be put in possession of the information for which he had asked, and he thought they should know why a work of such vital importance, upon which so much money had been expended, and which was lying unproductive, should be suspended or abandoned. The endless and unnecessary delays which had taken place in connection with these works had been a cause of great disappointment to many, and of general and wide-spread dissatisfaction.

MR. JONES moved in amendment, that the said resolution be amended by adding the following words:—"And all papers, letters, correspondence and reports, in any way relating to the Carillon works from their inception in 1873, to the present time, as also Messrs. Shanly and Keefer's report on the work, which was submitted to the Government by the contractors."

MR. TUPPER said there was no objection to the motion. The facts stated by the hon. mover were nearly, if not altogether, accurate. The tenders were sent in in 1873, the work to be completed in 1875, but it was not finished. During the past season, it was taken out of the hands of the contractors by the Government, and tenders invited; and, finding that Mr. McNamee's tender was the lowest, his (Mr. Tupper's) decision was to award it to him. But before the contract was entered into, without his altering his mind, or any change in the opinion of the Government taking place as to the importance of the work, the financial position of the country was found to be such as to render it inadvisable to press on a large public expenditure that would admit of postponement. It was entirely in consequence of that state of affairs that the Government informed Mr. McNamee that at present the work would be suspended. It was suspended,

though it was the desire of the Government to proceed with it as soon as they could, consistently with the financial position of the country. He was not able to say whether it would be possible to provide for the prosecution of that work this year; the matter was under consideration, and, when a decision was arrived at, he would inform the hon. gentleman. A large portion of the amendment was unobjectionable, but it was not usual to bring down estimates of the engineers upon which contracts were let. Such papers were considered to be, to a certain extent, confidential, and their production would, he was afraid, establish a bad precedent. If the hon. gentleman struck out the clause on that subject, he (Mr. Tupper) saw no objection to the amendment.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was very glad that the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had decided on the course indicated. It would be extremely inconvenient and prejudicial to the public service if the approximate estimates prepared by the engineers were made public; they should be held as sacred, for the eyes of the Minister alone. It was quite impossible to calculate the injury that might result from their publication.

MR. JONES said he would not oppose the suggestion for amendment made by the Minister of Public Works; but he must say the House should have cognizance of all matters connected with the Public Works of the country—not so much in this matter with regard to what works were now in progress, but with regard to what was past. He did think the House should be informed of all matters connected with the contract for this work, and that the engineers should not be enabled to shield themselves from responsibility for any errors or mistakes they might have made.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said he regretted exceedingly to learn from the Minister of Public Works that it was not the intention of the Government to proceed with the prosecution of that work during the ensuing summer. This matter was brought before the attention of the House on former occasions, in 1877

and 1878; during the former year the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) declared that the old slides were damaged considerably the previous season, and that it had become necessary to take decided action for repairs. Again, last year, that hon. gentleman informed the House that it was the intention of the Government to have the matter in such a state that, when the water reached the lowest stage, the Government would be able to prosecute the work with the utmost possible vigour. He was aware that the construction of those improvements at Carillon was necessary in the interests of the navigation—so that boats carrying lumber might be able to pass during the whole summer; and, in the reports of the Minister of Public Works, it was stated that the works previously constructed had already sustained considerable damage, and that, unless the works of the new canal were completed, it would be necessary to reconstruct the locks of the old canal, which were in a state incapable of being sustained much longer, and great inconvenience would be felt. Much work had been done and public money expended; money which, if he was correctly informed, by the exposure of the works in their unfinished state, would be, to a great extent, a loss to the country. It seemed to him the Government ought to make every effort in their power to bring that work to as speedy a completion as possible.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AND DESTRUCTION OF WEEDS BILL.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. MOUSSEAU moved for copies of all correspondence between the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec and the Secretary of State, in 1877, in relation to a Bill intituled: "An Act to provide for the formation of Joint Stock Companies for the maintenance of roads and the destruction of weeds."

THE LATE GENERAL ELECTIONS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for a return showing the number of votes polled for each candidate in the different electoral

MR. WHITE.

districts during the late General Elections; the total number of votes on the voters' lists of each district; the population in such constituency as shewn by the last census; such return to show the returns of special elections, held up to the date of making the return.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF JOHN B. SMITH.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. RYKERT moved for a return of all correspondence and papers in connection with the dismissal of John B. Smith from the office of Deputy-Superintendent of the Southern Section of the Welland Canal, as also the report of the Superintendent of the Welland Canal in reference to such dismissal. He said the person mentioned in the resolution was dismissed or suspended on January 16th, 1874, upon a personal charge made against him by the late Minister of Public Works. That gentleman had been employed by the Government, and, from what was known in that neighbourhood, had discharged his duties faithfully, and there was no reason for his dismissal. On the 16th January, a few days before the elections for the House of Commons, Mr. Smith was suspended by an order issued from the Public Works Department, by telegraph, as follows:—"Suspend John B. Smith, because there are serious charges made against him." On the 21st January a very largely signed petition was sent to the Government, signed by leading men of both parties, among whom were his (Mr. Rykert's) late opponent in the local election, and other leading Reformers of that constituency, asking that Mr. Smith be restored to his position, in which it was alleged he gave the greatest satisfaction. On February 3rd that petition was sent to the Public Works Department, and Mr. Page endorsed on it the following words:—"Mr. Smith was, I believe, a foreman in the central part of the Welland Canal, but, having no knowledge of the reason for his suspension, I am unable to say whether or not he should be reinstated." On the 20th February, Mr. Smith wrote, demanding an investigation of those charges. That

letter, by some means or other, was not presented to the Department until some time in May. It was sent by Mr. Bodwell, Superintendent of the canal, accompanied by a letter directing the attention of the Department to Mr. Smith's dismissal. On that report and letter of petition, the following words were endorsed:— "Will attend to this when I visit the Canal. Signed, A. M." No doubt those initials referred to the Minister of Public Works. Up to the present, no action had been taken. Immediately after that telegram, a gentleman in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite was appointed to take his place. He had no objection to any Government dismissing a man for proper cause, but objected to any Government dismissing a man for political reasons. He did not believe altogether in the doctrine that to the victor belonged the spoils. No public servant should be dismissed unless for good cause. He believed Mr. Smith was a faithful servant, the best guarantee of which was that a petition had been sent to the Department, signed by the leading gentlemen of his constituency, and the two whom he had defeated the last two years. An investigation was refused Mr. Smith, and he asked the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches to take action to have an investigation made, and, if it were proved that Mr. Smith was dismissed for election purposes, to have him restored to his position.

Motion agreed to.

RIVIERE DU LOUP BRANCH G. T. R.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. Fiset moved for copies of correspondence between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, in the matter of the purchase or lease by the Government of that portion of the Railway between Rivière du Loup and Pointe Lévis.

MR. TUPPER asked the hon. gentleman to withdraw the motion until the correspondence, which was now in progress, was concluded.

Motion, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

EXPENDITURE ON RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved for a return of the total amount expended up to the 1st day of January, 1879, on the enlargement of the Welland Canal; on the Lachine Canal; on the Pacific Railway and the Survey thereof; on the section of the Pacific Railway extending from Thunder Bay to Selkirk; and also a statement of the sums further required from the first January, 1879, to be expended to complete the Welland Canal, the Lachine Canal, and the section of the Pacific Railway extending from Thunder Bay to Selkirk, as estimated by Department of Public Works.

MR. TUPPER said he had no objection to furnishing the information which would be of convenience to members when the discussion came up.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS IN TORONTO.

MOTION FOR NAMES OF PERSONS.

MR. ROBINSON moved for copies of names of all persons appointed in the Inland Revenue, Post Office, and Custom House in the City of Toronto, between 4th November, 1873, and 10th October, 1878; the dates of such appointments; their salaries when appointed and whether increased during the above periods, and, if so, the amount of such increase.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Fifteen minutes after
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 20th February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

REPORT PRESENTED.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD presented the Report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report

lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

"That the House concur in the report in so far as it relates to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders."

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

"That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as Members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library; composed of Sir John A. Macdonald, and Messrs. Anglin, Baby, Brecken, Cameron (South Huron), Cartwright, Colby, Daly, Fortin, Houde, LaRue, Laurier, MacDonnell, Mackenzie, Mills, and Wright; and that a Message be sent to the Senate, to acquaint them therewith."

Motion agreed to.

INSOLVENCY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Bourassa.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. BOURASSA introduced a Bill (No. 2) To amend the Insolvency Act of 1875 and the Acts amending the same.

Bill read the first time.

DEATH OF THE PRINCESS ALICE.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A Message was received from the Senate, with an Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty, of condolence on the death of Her Royal Highness the Princess Alice, Grand Duchess of Hesse, to which the concurrence of this House was desired.

On motion of Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, the said Message and Address were ordered to be taken into consideration to-morrow.

THE INSOLVENT ACT OF 1875.

QUESTION.

MR. GIGAULT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to repeal the existing Insolvency Laws, and, in the case of their repeal, to propose one

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

uniform law for the whole of the Dominion having as its object: 1. Affording means for the liquidation of the property of insolvent traders, in a more just, and equitable, and less expensive way than was practised before the Insolvency Act of 1864; 2. To compel the insolvent trader to make an assignment of his property to a public officer entrusted with the duty of making a division among the creditors.

MR. MACDONALD (Pictou): The subject will be considered when the Bill, notice of which has already been given, is introduced. Indeed, the whole subject is under the consideration of the Government at present.

MR. MACKENZIE: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Ministers have given notice of a Bill on the subject?

MR. MACDONALD (Pictou): No; the Bill is introduced by a private member, and stands for a second reading; the whole subject will come up under that measure.

WIDENING THE CHAMBLY CANAL.

QUESTION.

MR. BENOIT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to widen the Chambly Canal. If it is their intention to do so, when do they propose to begin the work?

MR. TUPPER: It is not, at present, the intention of the Government to propose widening the Chambly Canal.

SHELBURNE HARBOUR LIGHT.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) enquired, Whether the harbour light at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, is to be rebuilt this year; and if so, whether upon Sand Point, the site of the former light, or at Fort Point, on the western side of the harbour.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): The subject is under the consideration of the Government.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS
FUND.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. MCKAY moved for a return in detail of the fund known as the "Intercolonial Railway Employés Insurance Fund," showing,

1st. Amounts collected from railway employés monthly since its inception (October 1st, 1874), to 1st February, 1879.

2nd. Amounts paid by Railway Department to said fund.

3rd. Amounts paid out on account of said fund.

(a) Number and amount of death claims in each class. Name of person, employment and cause of death.

(b) Number of weeks' indemnity paid under each class. Party to whom paid, date and cause of accident.

(c) Amounts, if any, paid to non-subscribers, names, date and reason for such payment.

4th. Statement of amount now at credit of said fund, when and to whose credit deposited.

5th. Statement of railway employés who are exempt from contributing to the fund, and reason for such exemption.

6th. Statement of claims against said fund unpaid, by whom made, and cause of non-payment.

7th. Copies of all correspondence on the subject.

Motion *agreed to*.

QUEBEC LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR
QUESTION.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. MOUSSEAU moved for copies of the petition addressed to the Governor in Council, by the Hon. Messrs. Chapleau, Church and Angers, praying, in view of the reasons therein set forth, for the dismissal of His Honour Luc Letellier, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec; of the answer made to the said petition by the said Lieutenant-Governor, and of the reply made by the said Hon. Messrs. Chapleau, Church and Angers to the said answer, and all correspondence and papers relating to the subject.

MR. McCARTHY suggested that the motion should be amended by adding the following words: "And all correspondence and papers relating to the subject."

MR. MACKENZIE: That means, of course, correspondence between the Government and some officials; it would cover no private correspondence?

MR. MOUSSEAU: It means all the papers connected with the memorial, or petition, the answer to the Lieutenant-Governor, and the reply to that answer.

MR. MACKENZIE: What is meant, I presume, is the correspondence relating to this particular memorial.

MR. McCARTHY: Relating to the whole subject.

MR. MACKENZIE: The subject is a very large one. I think the correspondence should be only such as related to the matters mentioned in the papers called for. I have no objection to that, as it is cognate to the subject; but, if the motion is to be made to include the production of everything, whether relating to this memorial or not, it is a very different matter. I do not object to the motion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), my remarks merely referring to the supplementary part.

MR. MOUSSEAU: My object is to get all the exhibits.

MR. McCARTHY said he wished more than that—any correspondence with regard to this particular motion. Not merely did they wish the memorial, but the correspondence in the early part of last spring.

MR. MACKENZIE: That was brought down by Message last spring. The hon. gentleman will find it in the Votes and Proceedings.

MR. McCARTHY: I do not think any answer of the Executive was brought down.

MR. MACKENZIE: Lieut.-Governor Letellier's answer was brought down.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY ROUTE.

MOTION FOR REPORTS.

MR. MACKENZIE moved for copies of the reports of engineers and others made since the 1st of October last, respecting the route, or construction of any part of the Pacific Railway; the removal of rails from Vancouver Island to Yale; copies of any instructions issued by the Government relating to the same; petitions or letters addressed to the Government, and all correspondence relating thereto. He requested the hon. the Minister of Public Works to bring down the papers as early as possible, with a view to enabling members to acquaint themselves thoroughly with all the facts, previous to discussion.

MR. TUPPER: No time will be lost in complying with the motion.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

MOTION FOR REPORTS.

MR. DAWSON moved for copies of all reports of the arbitrators appointed to enquire into the matter of the boundaries between the northernly and westernly limits of Ontario, and the unorganised territories of the Dominion with all documents bearing thereon, whether produced by the Dominion Government, the said Province of Ontario, or otherwise. He said the returns called for by this motion related to a subject of very great importance, not only to the district which he had the honour to represent, not only to Ontario, but to the Dominion at large. The papers, when brought down, would be found to be of deep interest, as showing on what Ontario had based her claims; on what the Dominion claims were founded, and on what grounds the arbitrators had arrived at their award. The question of these western and northern boundaries had long been a disputed one, and he would not enter into it at any great length on the present occasion. By the award, if it should be approved by Parliament, a very large extent of territory would fall to Ontario, and, as the representative of the district chiefly affected, he could not congratulate Ontario very warmly on the acquisition, not that the territory was not valuable

MR. MACKENZIE.

in itself, but because he was afraid that Ontario was in no position to deal with it. If this award should be accepted as final, the territories of Ontario would extend on the north to Hudson Bay, cover all of the great lakes within British territory, and reach to the verge of the great prairies of the North-West. He believed, however, that the constitution of the Province was not such as to admit of her dealing with territories so far from her centres of population. She could not establish a territorial Government, and it would be a never-ending source of embarrassment to her to administer the affairs of a country so far distant as the Lake of the Woods. He had always been of opinion that it would be of advantage to Ontario, and to the Dominion at large, that a great portion, if not the whole, of Algoma, including the regions of Rainy River and the Lake of the Woods, should be formed into a separate Province. It was with Ontario that the trade of these regions must chiefly be, under any circumstances, and if, by forming them into a Province they would grow faster, and their great natural resources become sooner developed, it would be to the interest of Ontario that they should be made a separate Province. Of course there was expense attendant on the formation of new Provinces, but Manitoba now paid her way; the Customs revenue from that Province already amounted to about \$225,000 annually, and he believed that, if a new Province were formed of the districts he had mentioned, it, also, would soon pay its way. The forests of Rainy River abounded in pine, for which there would be a ready market in the unwooded prairies of the west, and these forests would at once yield a revenue, and there would be a revenue, also, from the sale of lands. He had bestowed some attention on the question of the boundaries, and he could not conceive on what grounds the Commissioners arrived at their award. In all the discussions which ever took place, the boundary chosen by them had never even been suggested as the actual one. He had not seen their instructions; but, if they were left free to establish an arbitrary boundary, of course they did not exceed their powers, if it was with-

in the Constitution to grant them such powers ; but, if, on the other hand, they were instructed to investigate and ascertain where the boundary line between Ontario and the territories of the Dominion really was, they had certainly fallen into error. Ontario had just as good a claim to the plains of the Saskatchewan, as she had to at least a great part of the territory awarded by the arbitrators. They had two very important points to ascertain, and on these two points the whole question hinged. The first was as to the western boundary of the old Province of Quebec, previous to 1783 ; and the next, to say where the southern boundary of the territories of the Merchant Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay was. The Dominion Government claimed that the Quebec Act, that was, the Imperial Act of 1774 (14 George III), established the western boundary of the old Province of Quebec. By that Act, the boundary was described as running northward from the point of junction of the Ohio and Mississippi, and the Dominion Government held that the word "northward," as there used, meant due north. This was also the view which the Judges of the Quebec Courts took in 1818. But Ontario objected to the word "northward" as being indefinite, and claimed that the proper construction to put on that part of the Act was that "northward" meant north-westward along the Mississippi ; and in the Commission of 1774, to Sir Guy Carleton, then Governor of the Province, the western boundary was described as running northward along the east bank of the Mississippi, to the territories of the Merchant Adventurers of England, trading to Hudson Bay. This clearly brought the territories of the Hudson Bay Company to the Mississippi, or, in other words, to about the 47th parallel of north latitude. But, if the Hudson Bay Company's territories came so far south, Ontario would be cut off from the North-West altogether. The writers on the part of Ontario derided the decision of the Quebec Judges, as to the meaning to be attached to the word "northward" in the Act of 1774 ; but, in the Acts, treaties and commissions of those days, northward and westward were sometimes used to designate true north and due

west. In the treaty respecting the Oregon boundary, the expression "westward" along the 49th parallel was used, instead of the words "due west," and in another treaty the words "due western course" were used to designate a due west line. Terms of the same kind occurred in the recent award of the arbitrators, where they used the words, "a true meridional line drawn northerly," so that there did not seem to be anything very unreasonable in construing the word "northward," in the Act of 1774, as meaning due north, more especially in view of other facts bearing on the matter. The writers for Ontario had made good the fact that the Canada of the French extended to the Rocky Mountains, at least ; but they had failed to show that the whole of French Canada was included in the old Province of Quebec as constituted by the Act of 1774 ; and it was reasonable to believe that the western sections were considered rather as dependencies than as parts of the Province. They always referred to a proclamation, issued by General Clark, in 1791, when acting as Governor during Lord Dorchester's absence, in which Upper Canada was described as embracing the whole of the western regions to the utmost extent of the country known as Canada ; but they ignored Governor-General Lord Dorchester's proclamation of a few weeks' previous date, in which the Order in Council, based on the Act of 1791, was cited, and in which Upper Canada was described as extending only to the western limit of the former Province of Quebec. In considering the subject of the western boundaries of Ontario, the Act of 1803 (43 George III) should always be kept in view. It was passed to provide for the maintenance of order in a district which, in the preamble, was described as being in no Province whatever. The disturbed district, for which this Act was specially passed, extended from Fort William and Lake Superior to Lake Winnipeg and Red River. If, therefore, this district was beyond the territories and jurisdiction of Upper Canada in 1803, how could it be within the Province of Ontario now ? The Judges of Quebec, in giving their decision in the De Reinhard case, were, in a great measure, guided by the Act of 1803. The award, he believed, had to be confirmed by Act of

Parliament before it could take effect, and it would be a serious question to consider whether it should be confirmed or not. If the Merchant Adventurers of England trading to Hudson Bay had ever possessed any territory to which their right was undoubted and unsusceptible of dispute, it was to the country about James's Bay, where they had posts and establishments for two hundred years, where their rights were confirmed by treaties, and acknowledged, after the Treaty of Utrecht, by France as well as England; yet this territory was, by the award, decided never to have been theirs. But this was not all. The western extremity of the tract awarded ran into the region covered by the old colony of Assiniboia — a colony recognised by the Imperial Government, inasmuch as the Imperial troops had, on different occasions, been sent there, while in some other respects it was treated in the same manner as a Crown Colony. At all events, it was a colony which should not now be ignored in considering the question of boundaries in the North-West. The question was a very wide one, and he should not longer detain the House; but he could not conclude without referring to the very great ability and the untiring industry with which the case for Ontario had been made up. Ontario had spared no expense in order to make good her claims; she had employed able men in this country, and her emissaries had been sent to England and France to look into the old records of French Canada. Whatever other result might arise from the labours of the gentlemen employed by Ontario, they had, at least, thrown a great deal of light on the early history of the country, and the volumes they had produced would, for all time to come, be of value to the country. It remained to be seen what the Government of the Dominion had done in the same direction.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he thought the hon. gentleman who had proposed this motion would have served the case better had he abstained from entering into a discussion of the merits of the award, and the law and facts connected with the question itself at this stage. It was, as the hon. member had said, a very large and involved question;

MR. DAWSON.

one which demanded extensive historical research in order to arrive at a correct understanding of it, and it could hardly be expected that hon. members of this House could at once, upon statements made in Parliament and under the acoustic difficulties which obstructed their hearing in this chamber, grasp the question as presented, even by the hon. gentleman. When the papers came down, no doubt the Government would feel it to be their duty to present their view, and indicate the course they intended to take, and all would be anxious to know what their view and the course to be adopted would be. He (Mr. Macdougall) had given some attention to the subject for some years, and did not entirely agree with the view of his hon. friend, who had also given it a great deal of attention, and was well qualified to form a correct opinion on the facts such as he had presented them. They had had occasion in another place to discuss this same question, and present the reasons *pro* and *con.* for the conclusions at which his hon. friend had arrived. He entirely agreed with him that the boundary decided upon by the arbitrators was a boundary which they themselves had made. It was not found in any Statute, Order in Council, proclamation or official document in any quarter. The arbitrators had assumed that the boundary on the east ran to Hudson Bay; that was, that the boundary between Ontario and Quebec should be prolonged to Lake Temiscaming to Hudson Bay. He did not think there was any authority for that. It was convenient, looked well upon a map, and they had found, in some communications between the Imperial Government and their officers in this country, the words "to the boundary of Hudson Bay." He (Mr. Macdougall) had taken occasion, when in England, to look into that point to ascertain how this expression came to be used, and became satisfied that it was a mere clerical error in the copies of the original report of the Attorney-General, when the boundary between Upper and Lower Canada was being defined. No one would use that word "boundary," in describing the shores of a bay. It was upon that slight circumstance the Commissioners assumed they had an authority to run the

eastern boundary to Hudson Bay instead of the boundary of the Hudson Bay Territories, and having got there it was necessary to get away from it. They, therefore, proceeded along the shore westward to Albany River, then up the river and across country until they reached the Lake of the Woods, and connected the boundary on the north with the boundary on the west. He thought there was very good law as well as good historical evidence to controvert the view presented by his hon. friend, that the boundary on the west was the line of latitude which cut the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. That really had been the great point in dispute. The difficulty he felt with respect to this arbitration was that it was not a legal arbitration, and bound no one. He trusted the hon. the Minister of Justice would be able to satisfy the House that it was competent for this Parliament and the Local Legislature of any Province, by agreement, to change the original boundaries of that Province. His own impression was, that they had no such authority, that the Imperial Act declared that the Provinces which entered into Confederation had done so according to their legal boundaries at the time of Confederation. He did not think there was any authority in this Parliament, and the Legislature of any of the old Provinces, by agreement or otherwise, to change the boundaries of a Province. He believed the people of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had a legal and constitutional right to preserve the boundaries with which they entered into Confederation. If he were right in his view of the construction of the British North America Act, then they were not capable of delegating their powers to any Board of Arbitration or Commissioners. Their power was legislative by virtue of the authority conveyed by this Imperial Act, and the maxim *delegatus non potest delegare* would apply. So far as this boundary was concerned, it was probably as convenient as any, but he had merely risen for the purpose of reminding the House and the country that there were difficulties connected with this question, and because his hon. friend's speech, which had been pre-

sented to the House with his usual ability, and which, he presumed, would go into the Official Reports, would, perhaps, prepossess the public mind in favour of his view. He would repeat that the question was a difficult one. His hon. friend had long held peculiar views of it, and fixed views in respect to it, but there were other members of the House who did not entirely agree with him.

Mr. MILLS said that, when the matter came up at a subsequent period of the Session, there would, perhaps, be a better opportunity of entering into the discussion of the award made by the arbitrators. He did not think the objection made by the hon. member for Halton would be found to be a valid one. It was quite true this Parliament, under the British North America Act of 1867, could not, by any agreement with any Province alter the boundaries of that Province. He did not know that the arbitrators in this particular matter had undertaken to alter the boundaries. His impression was that in making their award they simply declared where they believed the boundary to be. But, apart from that, if the hon. gentleman would look at the British North America Act of 1871, he would see that the Act expressly provided that the boundaries of any Province might be altered in the manner therein provided; that a Province might be enlarged, or part of its territory might be transferred to the Dominion by arrangement with the Province and the Government of Canada. Consequently, he did not consider that the difficulty suggested existed. He thought, if the hon. gentleman would look at all the correspondence in the reports, and the documents that had been published by the Government of Ontario, he would find that there was a great deal to be said in favour of the boundary that had been established. The hon. member for Halton said there was nothing to show why the boundary between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec should be extended to the Hudson Bay Territory. He (Mr. Mills) was inclined to differ from him on that point. He was of opinion that there was a great deal to be shown in favour of that being done. The hon. gentleman knew right well that in regard to Crown Colonies—

but not as to Proprietary Colonies—it was the prerogative of the Crown to alter or change the boundaries of those colonies as it might see proper. That was decided in reference to the old colonies which now formed a part of the United States. The hon. gentleman would also find that when the Hudson Bay Company was re-vested with its territories, the company was explicitly informed that a portion of these territories, at least, was only transferred to them for the purposes of trade, and not as property. These subjects which were involved in this question of boundary might be very properly discussed when the matter came again before the House, as he had no doubt the Government would find it necessary to bring the matter under the consideration of Parliament.

MR. MACDOUGALL said, with reference to the point as to the British North America Act of 1871, the question was not a new one. That Act never was intended to affect or give authority to alter the boundaries of an old Province. It was intended to apply to the new Provinces they were creating in the North-West. The draft of the Act, the correspondence in respect to it, and the language of the preamble showed it was limited to the new Provinces. It was not explained to the House at the time it was passed that it should apply to the old Provinces. He admitted that, from the loose way in which the Act was drawn, the construction the hon. gentleman contended for was verbally possible, but it certainly was not the intention of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

JORDAN BAY BREAKWATER.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for a return showing all tenders received for the erection of the breakwater at Jordan Bay, in the county of Shelburne; copies of the report of the engineer or inspector, upon the completion of that work; copies of certificates upon which moneys were paid to contractors; return of salary paid inspector, or return of the expenditure of money for the repair of the work in the year 1877 or 1878 by day's labour or

MR. MILLS.

otherwise; copies of all reports upon the recent damages to that work, and letters of instruction to the inspector regarding the same. He said his object in asking for this information was to enable him to lay before the House and his constituents the official statement of the actual cost of this important work.

Motion agreed to.

REVENUE FOR FEBRUARY, 1879.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved for a return shewing the receipts generally during the twenty days from the 1st to the 20th day of February of the present year.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved for a return of the imports and exports into the Dominion of Canada during the six months ending the 1st day of January, 1879, as detailed in the monthly returns to the Department of Customs. He said he was aware that a full return would be of a very voluminous nature, and that, therefore, he wished simply for the information which was supplied to the several Departments.

Motion agreed to.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved for a detailed statement of receipts and expenditure during the seven months ending on the 1st day of February, 1879. He said his reason for asking for this return was that the statement published in the *Official Gazette*, although sufficiently full for general purposes, was not sufficiently full for a Budget discussion.

Motion agreed to.

MONTMAGNY BASIN SURVEY.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. LANDRY moved for a statement showing:—1. The number of engineers and employés engaged in making, in August and September last, an exploration and survey of the basin of Montmagny and of the River St. Lawrence,

opposite St. Thomas, L'Islet and St. Jean Port Joli, with a view to deepening the basin of Montmagny ; 2. The number of days the said survey lasted ; 3. The total cost of the said survey.

Motion agreed to.

THE RUSSIAN PLAGUE—QUARANTINE PRECAUTIONS AGAINST.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS.

MR. CHARLTON moved for an Address to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that, in view of the existence of the plague in Russia, and of its threatened progress westward, and in view also of the probability that emigration will take place from Russia to Canada during the present years to a considerable extent, such quarantine and sanitary regulations against infected countries or districts may be determined upon, and enforced at Canadian seaports and upon the Canadian frontier, as shall furnish, so far as intelligently directed efforts may be able to do so, preventives and safeguards against the introduction and spread of pestilence. He said that probably not a single member of the House was not aware of the fact that at present the Asiatic plague in Russia was spreading rapidly. It was the same terrible disease, which, known as "black death," carried off 25,000,000 of inhabitants of Europe in the fourteenth century. Again, in 1665, it devastated London and various parts of Europe, and, in 1720, carried off one-half of the inhabitants of Marseilles. The existence of this disease in Russia was causing lively apprehensions in Western Europe, and steps were being taken by various nations, and by the United States, to introduce efficient quarantine regulations in order to prevent its spread. The American Government was about to send a medical commission to Russia, to inquire into the nature of the disease, and the proper mode of treating it. It was a disease that was propagated by personal contact, and clothing or articles coming into contact with the parties having the disease. Fortunately, the disease was one which could be controlled by efficient quarantine regulations. He had deemed it proper to bring this subject to the attention of the Government. He was aware they had,

among the Ministers of the Crown at the present time, a very eminent medical man—a gentleman who, he had no doubt, was fully alive to the importance of this matter, and he had no doubt the Government would feel disposed to take such course as was necessary in the public interest.

MR. POPE (Compton) said he did not quite understand the purport or object of his hon. friend's motion ; but he might say that the subject was a very important one, and it was very fortunate for him (Mr. Pope) that he had a gentleman of skill to consult, such as was referred to. The Government were fully alive to the danger of this disease, but they knew, while speaking at this moment, that measures were being taken to prohibit the spread of the disease west of the Sea of Azov or the Black Sea, and therefore we were in no great danger. They knew also that emigrants coming from that section of the country had to pass through Germany, where there was a very strict quarantine, and any individual from whom the slightest danger was apprehended was not permitted to pass. Apart from all that, he would say to his hon. friend that we in this country had very efficient quarantine regulations, and that those regulations were quite sufficient to guard us against diseases of this kind. He presumed that his hon. friend, having brought this matter to the notice of the Government, and there being no papers in particular that bore on the subject, would withdraw his motion.

MR. CASGRAIN said that, at the port of Quebec, the regulations referred to by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture were not so efficiently carried out as he (Mr. Pope) thought, because it was well known that emigrants passed directly up to Quebec without being subject to quarantine at the station at Grosse Isle. The consequence had been that quite lately there had been a case of small-pox brought in one of the vessels to Quebec, and the patient had to be removed to the Marine Hospital, and the vessel reached the port of Montreal with the disease on board, and returned to Quebec with it—whether from that or not, small-pox was prevailing in Quebec since—and that was the very vessel

in which His Excellency Lord Dufferin had afterwards returned to Europe, though notified of the occurrence mentioned. He did not see that there would be much danger if the vessels were visited at Grosse Isle before being allowed to pass up to Quebec. It was true there was a medical officer there, but he thought that, in a case like the one referred to in the motion before the House, the Minister of Agriculture took a great responsibility upon himself if he allowed the regulations to remain as they were, in view of the danger of disease coming from the other side of the ocean.

MR. CHARLTON said he could not see why any objection could be raised by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to the passage of the resolution, and he did not feel warranted in assenting to the request to withdraw it. He considered it a matter of very great importance, and was of opinion that prompt measures should be taken with regard to it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the law, as it now existed, clothed the Government with quite sufficient authority to establish an efficient quarantine, so as to prevent the spread of the disease to this country—so far as a most rigid system could effect that object. That being the case—the law being so—the Government felt that there was no necessity for strengthening their hands by a vote of this House. The law said that quarantine could be established, and it was the duty of the Government to carry the law out, more especially in the presence of a threatened danger of this kind. A motion of this kind was simply a request to the Governor-General to ask the Government to perform their duty, and they did not think there was any necessity for any such action. They knew that the law was sufficient for the purpose. Therefore, he thought the hon. gentleman ought to remain satisfied, and must remain satisfied, with calling the attention of the House to this subject. As his hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture had said, the disease must pass through the countries of Europe before it reached here. England was nearer the post of danger than America, yet it had been announced in the British Parliament that England apprehended no danger from the disease invading the

shores of the British Isles. It must come still further and cross the Atlantic to arrive here. As his hon. friend had pointed out, Germany had established most rigid quarantine between Russia and Russian Poland and her confines, so there was no danger, or as little danger as possible of the disease crossing from Russia and Russian Poland into Germany and through Germany to the ocean. They had, in the first place, all the protection that the quarantine or prohibiting regulations of Germany and the other nations of Europe afforded; they had, in the second place, a vast expansive ocean; and, in the third place, they had their own quarantine laws, which were amply sufficient for the purpose. If the hon. gentleman thought the laws did not give sufficient power to the Government, it was quite within his duty and power to introduce a Bill for the purpose of altering the quarantine regulations. He believed the law was amply sufficient for the purpose. The Government would see that the regulations for the purpose of preventing disease would be carried out to the utmost extent, with the utmost promptness, and with the single object of preventing disease coming into our country. They had also the advantage of the United States taking steps to protect their shores, and the steps so taken to protect the United States were so many steps taken to protect us. Altogether, there was, he believed, little danger of this dreadful disease invading America. But there was a bare possibility of its coming into this country, though he did not think that an Address to the Governor-General was at all required in the matter. He thought, also, that the hon. gentleman ought to rest satisfied with this assurance, and ought not, in continuing this subject, to excite a panic in the country. Some of them were old enough to remember the result of the panic of 1832 and 1834, and that the panic was worse than the disease. When the hon. gentleman knew that they had taken every possible step to prevent the disease coming into this country, he thought he ought rather to accept the assurance than hold out a bug-bear that might affect the people's minds in a most unwholesome manner. His hon. friend from L'Islet spoke about the quarantine regulations not being carried out. It

MR. CASGRAIN.

was quite possible that, when an ordinary state of things existed, the regulations were not strictly enforced, and that a single case of small-pox might be brought in, but he did not think there was any great danger from an occasional case of small-pox getting into Quebec.

MR. CHARLTON asked if that would have the effect of re-appointing one of the medical officers at the port of Quebec, whose services had been dispensed with.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said very likely. If there was the slightest danger of the disease coming here, not only would the gentleman be restored, but many others be appointed.

MR. POPE (Compton) said that, with respect to the case referred to, his hon. friend knew very well that steamships passed Grosse Isle without examination. It was only for the Government to declare that they should be examined. In times of health, when passengers were thoroughly examined only ten or fifteen days before the time of their landing, it was thought unnecessary, and it would cause delay in the delivery of our mails.

MR. CHARLTON said that the assurances of the First Minister were satisfactory to him, and that they would, no doubt, be most reassuring to the country. He begged leave to withdraw the resolution.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

MR. FISET moved for copies of all instructions, written or verbal, giving to Collingwood Schreiber, Esq., C.E., since 10th October, 1878, on the subject of enquiries, inspections and examinations made by him or yet to be made by him, against certain persons employed on the northern division of the Intercolonial Railway; also, for copies of all instructions, written or verbal, given to the said C. Schreiber, Esq., since the said date on the subject of resignations and dismissals of persons employed which have taken place or which are to take place on the same division of the railway; also, for copies of all correspondence which has passed between the Government or any member thereof, or any officer of the Government, and any person whatsoever in connection with the said examinations,

enquiries and resignations of persons employed; together with copies of all complaints, written or verbal, preferred since the 17th September, 1878, against any person employed on the said division of the railway.

MR. TUPPER said there was no objection to the motion passing. No written instructions had been given to Mr. Schreiber any further than whenever any complaint came into the Department, in reference to any matters such as alluded to, Mr. Schreiber had been instructed to report to the Government. When the reports were received he had no objections to lay them on the table, with a statement of any action the Government might be obliged to take.

Motion *withdrawn*.

MR. VALLÉE moved, in amendment, that the said resolution be amended, by adding the following words:—"Also a statement shewing the names and places of residence of all employés on the said railway, discharged or dismissed between the year 1873, and the 17th September, 1878."

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for copies of any Order in Council passed in June, 1876, locating the line of the Canada Pacific Railway between Thunder Bay and a point at or near Fort George, in British Columbia, with all correspondence between the Dominion and Columbia Government, respecting the same; also for a copy of an Order in Council of August or September, 1878, respecting the location of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Yellow Head Pass and Burrard Inlet, with all correspondence between the Dominion and Provincial Governments respecting the same; and also, a copy of any special report, if any, of any engineer recommending the location of the respective lines, and on what the Orders in Council were directly based.

Motion *agreed to*.

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE
DEBATES.

MOTION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL moved that a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time; said Committee to be composed of Messrs. Colby, Desjardins, Stephenson, White (Cardwell), McDonald (Cape Breton), Ross (Middlesex), Oliver, Béchard and Charlton. He said he made this motion in accordance with the practice hitherto followed in the House in reference to the reports of debates, and the supervision of those reports by a Special Committee of the House. As explained in the House by the First Minister, when the Address was under consideration, the Government, believing that the principle of official reporting would be approved by the House, took the responsibility of advertising for tenders, and gave the contract for that work to the gentleman who now held it, subject to the approval of Parliament. The contract, together with the tenders which had been moved for, would be laid before the House at the earliest possible moment. In the meantime, it was thought better that this Committee should be appointed at once, in order to organise and begin the supervision of the reporting and publication of the debates and proceedings of the House. The tenders advertised for were to include the reporting, printing, translation, and binding; and, he thought, when the papers were laid before the House, it would be seen that the tender accepted was the best and cheapest, all things being considered. The report of the debates of last Session, and all connected with it, cost upwards of \$18,000. The appropriation voted by the last Parliament for the same purpose this year was \$15,000. By the contract entered into this Session, the volume was restricted to 1,500 pages, and the expense would amount to a little over \$11,000, being between \$3,000 and \$4,000 less than the sum voted by Parliament for that purpose, and some \$7,000 less than the sum expended last year.

Mr. MILLS said he thought the hon. gentleman ought not to press the motion at the present time, because it was anti-

Mr. DeCosmos.

peating the action of the House on the matter of the contract. It would be only right and proper that the House should first see the tenders and the contract, and ratify what the Government had done, if so disposed, before a Committee was appointed for the purpose indicated, otherwise they would be reversing the natural order of proceeding.

Mr. BOWELL said this course had already suggested itself to him, but he had thought it just as well to have the Committee appointed at once, seeing that an appropriation for the reports had been made by Parliament. However, he had no objection that the matter should stand, and, in the meantime, would endeavour to see that the contract and tenders were laid on the table to-morrow.

Motion *postponed*.

House adjourned at
Ten minutes after
Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 21st February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NORTH YORK CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

JUDGE'S REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House a certificate which he had received from the Hon. Vice-Chancellor Blake, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, in the matter of the election for the electoral district of the North Riding of the County of York.

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE
DEBATES.

RETURN.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that, in obedience to the order of the House of Tuesday last, the Clerk of the House had laid on the table a return of the notices asking for tenders for reporting and publishing the Official Debates

of this House; together with copies of all tenders received, and of all arrangements or contracts entered into, for the reporting and publication of said debates.

MR. ANGLIN said he would like to know how these papers came into the possession of the Clerk. They had never come through his (Mr. Anglin's) hands, nor had he been communicated with in regard to them. If they had come through the Executive, he thought it would be another instance of improper interference on the part of the Executive.

MR. SPEAKER: The paper came to me to be laid before the House. It was put into my hands by the Clerk.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

LISTS CONCURRED IN.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

"That the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House, in so far as relates to the following Committees, viz.:—On Privileges and Elections; on Expiring Laws; on Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines; on Miscellaneous Private Bills; on Printing; on Public Accounts; on Banking and Commerce; and on Immigration and Colonization, be concurred in."

Motion agreed to, and report concurred in.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

MR. STEPHENSON moved:

"That a Message be sent to the Senate, requesting that their Honours will unite with this House in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament; and that the Members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.:—Messrs. Bowell, Bannerman, Béchard, Bunting, Charlton, Costigan, Desjardins, Lanthier, McDonald (Cape Breton), Ross (West Middlesex), Stephenson, Tassé, Thompson (Haldimand), Trow, and Wallace (South Norfolk), will act as Members of the said Joint Committee on Printing."

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL No. 4.]

(Mr. McCarthy.)

FIRST READING.

MR. MCCARTHY introduced a Bill (No. 4) To make better provision for the trial of controverted elections of mem-

bers of the House of Commons, by amending and consolidating the Acts now in force on that subject.

Bill read the first time.

DEATH OF THE PRINCESS ALICE.

ADDRESS OF CONDOLENCE TO THE QUEEN.

Order for consideration of Message from the Senate, acquainting this House that their Honours have passed an Address of condolence to Her Most Gracious Majesty on the death of Her Royal Highness the Princess Alice, Grand Duchess of Hesse, and transmitting the same, and desiring the concurrence of this House therein, read.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am sure that this House will have a melancholy pleasure in joining in this, I may say, most beautifully worded Address sent to us from the Senate, condoling with Her Majesty on her late bereavement. Though that calamity has not been of so very recent a date, and we may therefore hope that the blow is somewhat alleviated, yet it is our duty to take the earliest opportunity of our assembling, to assure Her Majesty that the people of Canada and the representatives of the people in this House heartily sympathize with Her Majesty in her great loss. I feel that I am not called upon to enlarge upon this subject; the Address speaks for itself. It conveys our hearty expression of feeling, and we would fain hope that Her Majesty's loss will be, in some degree, alleviated by the knowledge that her sorrows are our sorrows, her joy and her happiness the source of the greatest gratification and pleasure to us. The feeling in Canada, as in all parts of the Empire, is not lip-loyalty. We owe our duty of loyalty to the Crown, but we also present our respectful and loyal affections to Her Majesty in her personal character. We have personal feelings of affection for the gracious lady who presides over this vast empire. We may hope that such solace as these assurances can give, will have its effect upon Her Majesty. Her grief was intensified by an unhappy coincidence, the death of her beloved child reminding her of the grief of her life, the loss of the Prince Consort. We all know that the Princess Alice deserved all the affection bestowed

on her, and the touching circumstances which occasioned her death hanging over the dying body of her child, increases our sorrow at her loss and our knowledge of the gravity and depth of the feeling which must pervade Her Majesty's breast. I shall say no more, but shall move this Address, seconded by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have a melancholy pleasure in seconding the motion made by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. As a portion of the British Empire, it would be our duty on the occasion of any bereavement in the Royal family, to pass such an Address; but towards Her Majesty we entertain feelings of peculiar respect and veneration. She, above all her predecessors, has established a personal claim to the good will and affection of all her subjects in every part of her wide Dominion. On the occasion of her recent bereavement, we all know that she was deprived of one of her principal domestic supports in the person of the lamented Princess Alice. The devotion of that lady to her duty during the occasion of her father's illness was one which elicited a great deal of touching feeling in the country, and the melancholy occasion of her death revealed fresh traits of the excellent and affectionate disposition of her character, which must have commended itself to every one, even if she had no connection with the Royal family. As one of Her Majesty's daughters, she is peculiarly entitled to be thus spoken of in one of the great assemblies of the nation. Canada never was, nor will ever be, wanting at any time, in the respect and veneration due to Her Majesty in her exalted position as our Sovereign, or her personal excellence; but the Canadian people feel a still deeper interest now than formerly, having another of Her Majesty's daughters presiding at the Canadian Government House in the Dominion, and committed to the care of the Canadian people. I, therefore, second this motion, and should be glad if any words of ours, or in the Address of the joint Parliaments of Canada, could have the effect of conveying a single emotional pleasure to Her Majesty in her sad bereavement.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

MR. MASSON rose to speak to the resolution in French, but, after uttering a few words, the hon. gentleman was attacked with faintness, and was unable to proceed.

Address from the Senate *concurred in.*

THE BUDGET.

QUESTION.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked the hon. the First Minister if he would give them some idea when the Budget speech would be made. He did not presume to ask him when it would be made, but he desired to know whether it would be made on the following Tuesday or not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would have liked the hon. the Minister of Finance to have answered that question. In the hon. gentleman's absence, however, he would say that he did not think there was any reasonable probability of the Budget speech being made on the following Tuesday.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE WALLS OF THE CITY OF QUEBEC.

QUESTION.

MR. VALLÉE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry on vigorously the works connected with the improvement of the walls of the city of Quebec.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In the absence of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who has been called away through the recent illness of my colleague, I would say generally that it is the intention of the Government to carry out vigorously the obligations entered into in this respect by the previous Government.

ABSENCE OF AN OFFICIAL FROM DUTY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. RYKERT moved for a return of the number of days during which one James A. McMahan, a clerk in the Paymaster's office of the Welland Canal, was absent from duty during the years 1877 and 1878, the number of days for which he received pay from the Department of Public Works; also a copy of the letter or letters by which he was

authorized to absent himself from duty during those years, either for the purpose of electioneering or for promoting contracts in the interest of certain Government contractors. He said that, as the subject of dismissals was now occupying the attention of the country, he might, perhaps, be pardoned in making a few observations in respect to it. The interest taken in this matter in the county from which he came was not to be wondered at, when it was remembered that, within four years, seven elections had been held in the county of Lincoln, most of which had been brought about by the unwarrantable interference of officials of the late Government. He spoke advisedly upon the matter, because he knew that it was in his county where the missionary was first found abroad elevating the standard of political purity. It was there also that the celebrated Sunday brigade, by their zealous efforts, succeeded in disqualifying the gentleman who opposed him. As he understood the doctrine laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite some years ago, it was that no official should interfere in an election, and he had in his hand a document, an extract from which he thought clearly defined the doctrine of those gentlemen. It was as follows:—

“That it is highly criminal in any Minister or Ministers, or other servants under the Crown, directly or indirectly, to use their powers of office in the election of Representatives to serve in Parliament, and an attempt at such influence will, at all times, be resented by the House as aimed at its own dignity, honour and independence.”

He also recollected well that in the Ontario Parliament the hon. gentleman opposite promulgated the same view in reference to interference in elections, and placed on record a resolution declaring it was inexpedient for officials to take part in elections. In 1873 a discussion took place in this House respecting Mr. Griffin, one of the Post Office Inspectors in western Canada. In the course of that discussion, the hon. the leader of the Opposition moved a resolution clearly defining the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. This was followed by a speech from the hon. gentleman in which he said:

“He was surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite should for a moment defend this

action, and he pointed out that if they did so they were doing what could not but result in the American system.”

He (Mr. Rykert) was entirely opposed to the American system of removing all officials except for just cause. It was the duty of the Government to see that officials kept their places and did not interfere in elections. The facts in the case in point were simply these: Mr. McMahon was imported into the Paymaster's office of the Welland Canal, at a time when, beyond all question, his services were not required. The moment he put his foot in the county of Lincoln, that moment it was discovered the missionary was abroad and at his work. At every parliamentary election his handiwork was to be seen in his interference with the elections; and as he had under his immediate supervision no less than three or four hundred employees, his influence was necessarily very great. The hon. member for Welland, as well as himself, had felt Mr. McMahon's influence, and it was about time this interference was put a stop to. Not only did he interfere in elections, but he ran about the country manipulating contracts. In 1877, when the late member Capt. Norris was contesting the county with Mr. Miller, this Mr. McMahon took a very active part in the election, and appeared on a public platform, and used language exceedingly unbecoming a Government official. He was, however, very gracious not to take his pay during the eight days of the election; but it was found that he was subsequently recouped for his loss in the month of November. Last year he was absent, running about the country at the elections, for two or three months to his (Mr. Rykert's) certain knowledge. He was in Quebec and elsewhere, one place electioneering, in another manipulating contracts. He also understood that that gentleman was interested in a contract on the Welland Canal, by means of which he was drawing a large amount of money, and, at the same time, held his office. He hoped that when those facts were brought to the notice of the Government, they would see the necessity of taking action in this matter, and of preventing Government officials from taking any part in the elections. These gentlemen had a right to exercise their franchise, but the

moment they stepped beyond that, that moment the Government was bound to interfere. The people of Canada were desirous of having this matter fully investigated, and of knowing whether this interference at elections met with the concurrence of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said he never heard a word of complaint concerning this officer's conduct, and he never heard until that moment that he was interested in any contract, or he would not occupy a position as clerk. He entirely agreed in the demand for an investigation. That gentleman never had any control given him whatever, good, bad, or indifferent, in connection with any contract, and was never connected in any way with any contract. These contracts were either given out by the Department, or minor ones for supplies, chiefly by Mr. Page, or one of his assistants. Mr. McMahon was simply an extra clerk in that office, until somewhere about a year ago, when he was appointed permanently an officer of the Government. He knew nothing about the leave of absence, and was utterly ignorant of any of the charges, none of which had been made to the late Government by any person.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was only sorry his hon. friend had not made the motion more general, in order that they might have brought before the House, or some committee, many other charges that existed, such as conveying gentlemen on the Intercolonial Railroad for the purpose of voting for certain members of the House. Gentlemen holding important positions in the Government coerced the employés under them to vote for Government candidates, and had, in some instances, voted an open ballot; and he would have been able to show from telegrams and other papers, that a great deal of pressure had been brought to bear by the Government during the last election.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, in the absence of his hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, he would merely state that he knew nothing about this matter till he saw it on the paper. Of course there could be no objection, after the statement of the hon. gentleman, to the return being brought

MR. RYKERT.

down. He did not agree with the hon. member for King's that the resolution should be widened. If any gentleman had a complaint to lay before Parliament, he thought it should be made separately and specifically, so that each case could be judged according to its merits or demerits. He would oppose anything like a roving commission or committee appointed to make inquiries into such matters. Wherever a real wrong had been done, that wrong should be investigated, and the charge should be distinctly and specifically stated with all the certainty which an hon. member making his motion was able to submit to the House.

MR. ROCHESTER said he hoped the motion would be amended and enlarged, as he and a great many others had great reason to complain. He thought he would be able to show that Ministers of the Crown worked and used their influence during the last election.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear; I should think so.

MR. ROCHESTER said he thought he would be able to show that his hon. friend sent for employés of the Government, telling them how to vote, and that a candidate for the county of Carleton, who pretended to be a Conservative, was furnished with money by a Minister of the Crown, and, if elected, was to support the late Government; and further, that the emigrant agent of this city, Mr. Wills, was acting as treasurer, and paid out money during the election.

Motion agreed to.

SURVEYS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE,

MOTION FOR REPORT.

MR. LANDRY moved for copy of report prepared by a certain party of engineers, on the exploratory survey which they made in Montmagny Basin, and in the River St. Lawrence, off the parishes of St. Thomas, L'Islet, and St. Jean Port Joli. He said that, during the late local election, in the Province of Quebec, the Liberals in his county proclaimed to all who would listen to them, that the Federal Government had promised to deepen the Basin of Montmagny, and that the execution of these works would

put considerable money in circulation in that locality. During his election, in September last, the same rumours were set afloat throughout the county. One fine morning his constituents were somewhat surprised to see the Patton property at St. Thomas studded with several white tents. No one said, "The deepening of the basin of St. Thomas is going to begin;" but, with a common accord, every one exclaimed, "The elections are near at hand." And, indeed, a few days later, a ministerial battery put in its appearance, and in front of the engineers' tents, the hon. member for Quebec East, then Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Laurier), might have been seen bringing his cannon into line and preparing his projectiles. This stratagem did not succeed, and the former Government was beaten. What he wanted now was the report of the exploring party upon the deepening of the basin of Montmagny. He wished to know whether the deepening of this basin was possible, and, if it was, he should be one of the first to ask the Government to execute these works, which would be of so great importance to trade in general, and to his county in particular. He wished to know whether the late Administration was sincere in the action which it took, or whether this explanation was merely a lure, a stratagem of war; ministerial dust, in a word, thrown in the eyes of some of the electors of his county.

Motion agreed to.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL EMPLOYÉS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. BERGERON moved for a statement showing the number of persons employed on the Beauharnois Canal, with their salaries or emoluments; the number of employés dismissed or pensioned since the 5th November, 1873; the names of those appointed since that date, and the increase of salaries.

Motion agreed to.

LOANS TO RAILWAYS BEFORE CONFEDERATION.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. VALLÉE moved for a statement showing the sums of money lent or materials lent or given to the several railway

companies now existing in the Dominion of Canada, prior to and since Confederation, by the Government of Canada; and also a statement of the sums repaid by any such companies. He said he wished to put this House in a position to study an important question. When the founders of the Confederation established, in 1867, the financial basis upon which was to be erected this great national institution, they took a certain amount of the assets of the united Provinces as security for the liabilities that the Federal Government was willing to assume. Among these assets were certain revenues, certain properties, railways, debentures, and these assets were taken at their face value. They were divided into two classes; a part being considered as security for the federal debt, the remainder as provincial receipts for the surplus of the debt for which the Provinces were still responsible. This was a solid and equitable basis. It was highly important that this equilibrium should not be disturbed. Nevertheless, he believed that the policy followed by former Governments on this subject was calculated to destroy the very basis upon which this great social and political edifice reposed. In the British North America Act he saw that, among the assets credited to the Federal Government, there were certain sums of money granted before 1867 by the Provinces to several railway companies. How was it that the debentures of these railway companies were included among the assets of the Dominion of Canada? By referring to the British North America Act, 1867, section 108, they read: "The public works and properties enumerated in the third schedule of this Act shall be the property of Canada." Now, in looking over this third schedule, he saw, by paragraph 6, that railways and railway stocks, mortgages and other debts due by these companies were among the properties that came under section 108. These mortgages due by the railways were taken at their face value. Thus these assets were credited to the Dominion at par; consequently the Provinces had been relieved of certain debts that had been transferred to the general liabilities of the Dominion. In order to come to and facilitate

this arrangement, it was decided to leave to the Province of Ontario and Quebec the surplus of the assets mentioned in schedule 4. The surplus of the assets had in part been divided between Ontario and Quebec after much difficulty, as everyone knew. In the first place, there was an arbitration, from which the Province of Quebec appealed to England, and the Privy Council of Her Majesty had decided in favour of Ontario. His Province had to yield to this decision. On the other hand, the surplus of the debt, over and above sixty-two millions which was to be paid by the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, was, in 1873, transferred to the Federal Treasury. He believed that the action of the Government in 1873 and 1875, in remitting a considerable portion of the liabilities of the Western and Northern Railways was not in harmony with the financial basis established in 1867 by the British North America Act. This was what he grounded his opinion upon. The surplus of the debt of the Provinces served to establish what should be the surplus of the assets of which Ontario and Quebec were to retain possession. The greater part of the assets brought by Ontario to the general credit of the Dominion consisted in railway stocks and debentures. Since then these stocks and debentures or mortgages had been declared to be of little or no value, and what was more, in the cases above alluded to, the Government had, in 1873 and 1875, given up its rights. Thus the Province of Ontario had been credited twice with the same amount, which made an error of about three millions of dollars. Consequently the division of the surplus of the assets which had been made between the two Provinces was not fair. The basis of the division of the assets and the liabilities between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, had therefore been changed. He believed it his duty to draw the attention of Parliament to this fact, in order that this error, if error there were, should be rectified, and that justice should be rendered, not only to the Province of Quebec, but to all the Provinces of the Dominion. By enquiring what were the sums of money that had been lent or given to railway companies since and before Confederation, he thought that, with the help of

this statement, he should be able to establish what he had just laid down. Later on, when these documents were brought down, he would explain more at length his views on this serious and important question.

MR. CIMON said that the Province of Quebec should be grateful to the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée) for having brought this all-important question before the House. There was no doubt that the Province of Quebec had been neglected for some years past by the Federal Government. He had often had occasion in this House to offer some remarks on the subject. The best means for the Federal Government to repair the injustice done to the Province of Quebec would be to purchase the North Shore Railway that the Quebec Legislature had undertaken, and which was now nearly completed. This great road that the Quebec Government had built from Quebec to Hull, was undertaken for the benefit of all the Provinces. This House remembered that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), when he presented himself for the first time before the country as the leader of the Government, stated in his programme that it was the policy of the Federal Government to aid this great enterprise, the North Shore Railway, as it formed part of the Pacific Railway. Upon this declaration the Quebec Government undertook to build this great railway. The Local Government had made great sacrifices in order to open this road to public traffic, and he held that the Federal Government was bound to purchase this road, for it would be a link in the national highway, the Pacific Railway. By this means the Federal Government would render justice to the Province of Quebec. With the price that the Federal Government would pay to the Quebec Government, the latter, mindful of its duty, would construct in the Province of Quebec other railways that would tend to develop colonisation and enhance the prosperity of Quebec. Seeing the manner in which the public moneys had heretofore been distributed by the Federal Government, always to the sole advantage of the other Provinces, it was certain that Lower Canada would not be satisfied unless the Administration of

the Dominion accomplished the act of justice that he had just mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

EXPENSES OF THE GENERAL ELECTIONS

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. OLIVER moved for a return showing all sums paid to defray expenses of the late elections to this House, in the different electoral districts throughout the Dominion; showing the returning officers and deputy returning officers to whom the same were paid, and distinguishing the different services for which the same were allowed.

Motion agreed to.

COST OF STANDARD WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. OLIVER moved for a return showing the total cost of the standard weights and measures purchased for the purposes of the Act relating to Weights and Measures; and also showing the date or dates of said purchases.

Motion agreed to.

REBATE OF DUTIES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. JONES moved for a return of all Orders in Council, Departmental Orders or otherwise, for rebate of duties on merchandise, contractors' plant, or material for contractors use, from the 1st January, 1874, to 1st January, 1879, for each year respectively, with the amount of such rebate or rebates of duties, and the name or names of those to whom such rebates were given. He said he thought it would be found, when the papers were brought down, that a very large amount of material, contractors' plant, and merchandise, had been brought into this country which had not paid any duty. The power of exemption from duty was left in the hands of the Government by Order in Council, but he thought the power ought to be very carefully used. He believed that, during the past five years, many a mechanic and labouring man had lost many a day's work by contractors' materials being brought into this country, which could just as well be supplied in Canada.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS PETITIONS.

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended for ten days, and that Rule 55 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at

Five minutes before

Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 24th February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES COURTS BILL.

(Mr. Mills.)

FIRST READING.

Mr. MILLS introduced a Bill (No. 5) to declare the rule of decision in the Courts of the North-West Territories. He said that, if the leader of the Government had any intention of taking up the subject, he (Mr. Mills) would not think of introducing the Bill. He had introduced a number of measures last year, and he had not known how far it was the intention of the hon. gentleman to deal with the subjects of those Bills. He should be glad to know if the hon. gentleman had given any attention to the matter proposed to be dealt with, and also to the subject of the registration of titles in the North-West Territories, which he (Mr. Mills), has proposed to deal with last year. During the last Session, the hon. gentleman had stated that any subject to which any hon. member had given special attention might be left in his hands if he intended to deal with it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he understood the hon. gentleman had introduced this Bill last Session. He did not now remember its terms, but of course he should be very glad to consider it. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) had no present intention of introducing a measure for the registration of titles in the North-West. Of course, the hon.

gentleman had every right to introduce the Bill, and it would receive every consideration at the hands of the Government.

Bill read the first time.

BRITISH COLUMBIA CHINESE TAX BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. DECOSMOS inquired, Will an Act of the Legislature of British Columbia, intituled: "An Act to provide for the better collection of provincial taxes from Chinese" be disallowed or not?

MR. MACDONALD (Pictou): In answer to the hon. member, I may say that the Act providing for the better collection of provincial taxes from Chinese, and other Acts of the Legislature of British Columbia of last Session, are now under the consideration of the Government. My hon. friend is aware that that Act was declared *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court of British Columbia, or one of the Judges thereof, and that decision is not appealed from.

PARDON OF LOUIS RIEL.

QUESTION.

MR. Fiset inquired, Whether the Government intend to grant a pardon to Mr. Louis Riel, and when.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I thought I had answered that question before. It is not the present intention of the Government to interfere in the matter.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—HALIFAX TERMINUS.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) inquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide for a water-side terminus for the Intercolonial Railway, nearer Halifax, in order to prevent the possibility of ice interfering with winter navigation; and whether it is the intention of the Government to provide for the erection of a grain elevator at Halifax and sufficient storage for other freight until shippers are ready to receive the same.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

MR. TUPPER: That subject is under the consideration of the Government.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) inquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure during the present Session, for the amendment of the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act.

MR. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is probable that during the Session a measure amending, in some respects, the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act will be introduced.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ACTS AMENDMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) inquired, Whether it is the intention of the Ministry to introduce a measure amending the Acts relating to the Intercolonial Railway, in so far as they have prejudicially affected the private property of citizens of Halifax.

MR. TUPPER: It is not the intention of the Government to introduce an Act for that purpose; but, if the hon. gentleman were to introduce an Act of that nature, it would receive the consideration of the Government.

APPEALS FROM PUBLIC WORKS ARBITRATORS.

QUESTION.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) inquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill for the granting of appeals from awards made by the full Board of Arbitrators, in cases of compensation and otherwise, arising under the Public Works Act.

MR. TUPPER: I would say, in reply to the question, that the subject is at present engaging the consideration of the Government, and the decision arrived at will be communicated to the House at an early period.

FOG HORN OR BELL AT RACE ROCKS, B. C.
QUESTION.

MR. DEWDNEY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect a fog horn or bell on Race Rocks, British Columbia.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : It is the intention of the Government, I understand, to erect a bell on Race Rocks.

COST OF BOUNDARY ARBITRATION WITH ONTARIO.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. STEPHENSON moved for returns showing, in detail, the amount of money paid by the Dominion Government on account of the settlement of the boundary line between the North West Territories and Western Ontario, giving the names of the persons employed, for what time employed, and what amount of money paid to each such person so employed.

Motion agreed to.

COST OF REPAIRING THE QUEBEC WALLS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. VALLÉE moved for a statement showing the sums of money expended for repairing the walls of the city of Quebec, between the 1st of August and the 1st of October, 1878 ; 2. The names and places of residence of the contractors for the said works ; 3. The number of workmen employed between the 1st of August and the 10th of the same month, 1878 ; 4. The number of workmen, contractors, foremen or assistant foremen of works, with the pay allowed them, between the 10th of August and the 25th September, 1878.

Motion agreed to.

GROSSE ISLE AND QUEBEC TRANSPORT CONTRACT.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. LANDRY moved for copies of the last contract made between the late Government and Nazaire Bernatchez, Esq., of the city of Montreal, in the matter of the transport from Quebec to Grosse Isle, and from Grosse Isle to

Quebec, of emigrants, mails, provisions, etc. ; and also for the bringing down of the correspondence respecting the said contract and its continuation, in September last, between the then existing Government and the said Nazaire Bernatchez, Esq.

Motion agreed to.

REMITTANCE OF STATUTE LABOUR IN RIMOUSKI.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. LANDRY moved for copies of all Orders in Council, and of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and that of the Province of Quebec, or between any of the members of these Governments, respectively, with all papers and documents respecting the adjustment or remittance of certain statute labour (*droits de corvée*) in the parishes of St. Fabien, St. Simon, St. Mathieu, etc., during the last general elections. He said there were, in the county of Rimouski, certain electors who were at the same time *consitaires* of seigneurs, to whom they owed statute labour. This statute labour had been done away with by paying to the seigneurs an amount of \$16,000. This took place during and after the late general elections, and the whole transaction was worthy of being brought to the knowledge of the public. The money that was thus given constituted part of the general fund to be divided between Ontario and Quebec, and was among the assets of these two Provinces. In order to obtain the payment of this sum to the electors of Rimouski, the consent of both Provinces was absolutely required. The Province of Ontario was willing to comply with this request, provided the Quebec Government likewise gave their consent. During the late local elections, this question excited considerable interest in the county of Rimouski, and was somewhat instrumental in bringing about the tie that closed the election, which was carried by the casting vote of the returning officer. Subsequently, during the Federal election, the question was again brought up, and the electors made application to the Government to have this amount remitted. He believed that the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) took

the interest of his constituents to heart, and that he succeeded, even after the verdict of the country was known, and the late Administration had been repudiated, in obtaining the remittance of this sum in payment of the statute labour that was abolished; and this action was but the realisation of the promises that had been made by his agents. When the correspondence exchanged upon this subject was brought down, it would be seen whether certain rumours were well founded, and whether the late Government had really the right to interfere in this matter, and to settle in such a manner so important a question, after the opinion of the country had been so plainly manifested. There was, moreover, a question of right which seemed to have been entirely ignored, in order to assure the success of a then Ministerial candidate, at the expense of public interests.

MR. Fiset said the hon. member for Montagny did not appear to know a single word about the question that he had brought up. He believed it to be his duty, in the interest of those whom he had the honour to represent, to state the facts as they were. In 1859, under the Union of the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, the Government, as was well known, settled the important seigniorial question of *lots et ventes*. It happened that, in the Province of Quebec, the *consitaires* of the Seigniority called Nicolas Rioux, could not profit by the settlement of this question, and that was how the person appointed to draw up the *cadastré*, instead of putting the days of statute labour (*les journées de corvées*) in the column of casual rights, placed them in the column of annual rents. This put upon the *consitaires*, over and above their annual rents, another annual burden of fifty cents for every lot of an arpent in width. It was true that, during the first two months that followed the drawing up of the *cadastré*, the *consitaires* might have had their rights recognised and the error rectified. But, as, at that time, the greater part of them were new settlers, and did not know better, they did not protest, and since then they had paid to the seigneurs, besides their annual rents, this amount of fifty cents for every lot of an arpent in width.

MR. LANDRY.

Before Confederation, they took some steps in order to have their rights recognised, but without success. It was only in 1872, or at the beginning of 1873, that, through Mr. Chauveau, they applied for the first time to the Federal Government. He (Mr. Fiset) had then asked the Government whether it was their intention to comply with the request of the *consitaires*. The Government made answer that the question was under consideration, and a few months afterwards, the then Minister of Justice (Sir John A. Macdonald), without going into the merits of the question, submitted a report, stating that the *consitaires*, having failed to protest within the appointed time, had lost all their rights. He (Mr. Fiset) did not look upon himself as defeated for all that, and, a change of Government having taken place, he continued to agitate this question so highly important to the *consitaires* of the Seigniority called Nicolas Rioux. In 1875 and 1876, he asked for the production of the papers, and, after having especially and repeatedly drawn the attention of the hon. the Ministers of Justice, Mr. Fournier and Mr. Blake, to this important question, he obtained at length from Mr. Blake a report which, whilst it recognised the legality of Sir John A. Macdonald's decision, recognised also the error that had been committed to the detriment of the *consitaires*. The hon. Minister added that, in his opinion, there was but one mode of relieving them: that was, to obtain from the Quebec and Ontario Legislatures permission to add to the debt of the former Province, assumed by the Federal Government, the amount representing the days of statute labour. This report was transmitted to these Legislatures. The Attorney-General for the Province of Ontario soon gave an answer, but the Attorney-General for the Province of Quebec (Mr. Angers) took a long time to digest this report, so long a time indeed that the Department was obliged to write to him twice before receiving an answer. At last the answer came, and, as he (Mr. Fiset) had expected, the hon. gentleman was hostile to the *consitaires*; he refused to recognise the error committed to their detriment when the *cadastré* had been drawn up, and from which they had been suffering for more

than fifteen years. Happily for the *consistants*, the De Boucherville was replaced by the Joly Government in the month of March, 1878. Not being satisfied with the decision of the Hon. Mr. Angers, he (Mr. Fiset) applied again to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Laflamme. This hon. gentleman made a new report, the conclusions being about the same as those of the Hon. Mr. Blake's report. The question was once more submitted to the Attorney General of the Province of Quebec, Mr. Ross, in the month of April last, during the formation of the Joly Government. It would be remembered that, during the following month, the provincial elections in Quebec took place, and that, almost immediately afterwards, in the month of June, the Session was opened, and continued until the month of July. It was not, therefore, a matter of surprise that Mr. Ross could not answer the memorandum of Mr. Laflamme before the month of August. Happily, the rights of the *consistants* were at length recognised. The Joly Government, not wishing to take advantage of the error committed by the person who had drawn up the *cadastre*, gave their consent to the request that the amount representing the days of statute labour should be added to the debt that the Federal Government had assumed. He had desired to indicate the steps that had been taken to bring about the settlement of this question, and to give dates with the greatest possible exactitude, which he believed would be sufficient to prove to the House that, in the settlement of this important affair, no such act of corruption as the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) pretended to see therein, had occurred. If this motion had been made by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée), or the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Grandbois), it would be less surprising; but what astonished him was to see that this motion had been made by the hon. member for Montmagny, who had only spoken of the affair as an act of electoral corruption. In order to speak so, the hon. gentleman must needs be an angel of purity in matters electoral, or at least above all suspicion. He begged to say, for the hon. gentleman's own information, that he (Mr. Fiset) was qualified to sit in this House; that no one

had dared to contest his election; and that he was not even disqualified to sit in the Quebec Legislature. He proposed, in order to allow the hon. member for Montmagny to go to the bottom of the question, to add to his motion the following words, to which he believed there could be no objection taken:—"And also the correspondence which has passed since 1872 between the Dominion Government and the Legislatures of Quebec and Ontario, and any person whatsoever, on the subject of the statute labour; together with various reports of the hon. the Minister of Justice upon the question."

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a copy of all correspondence in possession of the Government respecting the offer of the Government of British Columbia in 1878, "to grant to the Admiralty, the site, plant and material on hand, and work already done" of the proposed Esquimalt Graving Dock, "subject to the condition that merchant vessels shall be permitted to be docked on payment of expenses, whenever the ships of Her Majesty's Navy do not require its use."

Motion *agreed to*.

BREAKWATER AT SOURIS (P.E.I.)

MOTION FOR TENDERS.

MR. MUTTART moved for copies of all tenders received in connection with the construction of the breakwater at Souris, Prince Edward Island, together with copies of all correspondence between the contractors of that work and the engineer in charge of the same.

Motion *agreed to*.

RAILWAY EXTENSION AT SOURIS.

MOTION FOR TENDERS.

MR. MUTTART moved for copies of all tenders received for the construction of the railway extension and wharf at Souris, and copies of all papers and correspondence relating thereto.

Motion *agreed to*.

MAILS IN DRUMMOND AND ARTHA-
BASKA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BOLDUC, in the absence of Mr. BOURBAU, moved for a return showing the distance traversed, and the amount paid for the carriage of the mails between Drummondville, Wendover and Simpson, up to the 30th December last.

Motion agreed to.

PROVISIONING HARBOURS IN THE ST.
LAWRENCE.

MOTION FOR CONTRACTS.

MR. VALIN moved for copies of all the contracts for provisioning the harbours in the River St. Lawrence; the names of the parties tendering, and the sums specified in their contracts, from the 1st May, 1874, up to 1st January last.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS, GROSSE ISLE.

MOTION FOR CONTRACTS

MR. VALIN moved for copies of all contracts for public works, piers and repairing of buildings on Grosse Isle, between the 15th November, 1873, and 1st of January last; a statement showing the names of the contractors, the amounts of the several contracts, the names of the inspectors of works and the salaries paid to such inspectors; copies of all correspondence in relation to the matters aforesaid.

Motion agreed to.

CAPE SABLE ISLAND CUSTOMS
DISTRICT.

MOTION FOR PETITIONS.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for copies of all petitions and correspondence during the past three years with the Department of Customs, asking that Cape Sable Island, Shelburne County, be erected into a separate and distinct Customs District, together with reports upon the same by officers of that Department.

Motion agreed to.

HALIFAX AS A WINTER PORT.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Public Works and the

MR. MUTTART.

representatives of the various railway lines in connection with the Intercolonial and with steamship companies or their representatives, with a view of obtaining such through freight rates upon grain, etc., from the west to Halifax or European ports as will constitute Halifax the winter shipping port of the Dominion.

Motion agreed to.

EXPENSES OF FORT FRANCES LOCK.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. RYKERT moved for a return of all the expenses in any way incurred in connection with the building of the Fort Frances Lock up to the 1st day of January, 1879, together with the names of all persons to whom any money was paid, and the services for which it was made.

Motion agreed to.

COMPLAINT AGAINST POSTMASTER AT
ST. DONAT.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. Fiset moved for copies of the complaint brought against Mr. Salutre Lévesque, in his quality of postmaster and mail carrier, in and for the parish of St. Donat; and also copies of the proceedings at the enquiry caused by such complaint.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes after

Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 25th February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

REFERRED TO PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
COMMITTEE.

MR. KIRKPATRICK moved that the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1878, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASH WEDNESDAY.

MOTION.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved: "That when this House adjourns, it do stand adjourned to Thursday next."

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

MR. LANGEVIN presented,—Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended 30th June, 1878.

MR. POPE (Compton) presented,—Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada for the calendar year 1878.

INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

QUESTION.

MR. MERNER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any action in reference to the inspectors of weights and measures during the present Session.

MR. BABY: The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

FLOATING LIGHT AT ISLE BLANCHE.

QUESTION.

MR. GRANDBOIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a floating light opposite Isle Blanche (White Island), in the county of Temiscouata.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.): It is not their intention.

THE BUDGET.

QUESTION.

MR. MACKENZIE: I would like to know when it is likely the Finance Minister will make his Budget speech.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In the absence of the Finance Minister, I cannot say.

MR. MACKENZIE: It has been usual, and I think it is proper, to submit the Estimates a few days before.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Certainly.

House adjourned at

Twenty-five minutes before

Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 27th February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

EXTENSION OF TIME.

MR. ROBINSON moved that, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, the time for presenting Private Bills be extended for ten days.

Motion agreed to

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 6) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railroad Company.—(Mr. Schultz.)

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Act incorporating the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 8) To ensure the better qualification of public servants and the greater efficiency and economy of the Public Service.—(Mr. Casey.)

Bill (No. 10) To extend the powers of the Dominion Telegraph Company, and to amend the Act incorporating the said Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

SELKIRK AND SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.

(Mr. Rykert.)

FIRST READING.

MR. RYKERT introduced a Bill (No. 9) To incorporate the Selkirk and South Saskatchewan Railway Company, and moved the suspension of Rule 51, in relation to the said Bill, as recommended by the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

MR. SCHULTZ said that he objected to the introduction of the Bill, because the conditions of the 51st Rule had not been complied with, inasmuch as the first notice in the Canada Gazette was given on the 18th January, and in the local papers on the first and seventh of February.

MR. ROBINSON said that it was laid down by Todd, in his work on Private Bills Practice, that the Committee on Standing Orders should be guided rather by the spirit than by the letter of the rule. A public meeting had been held in the county most interested in this railway, and the Committee on Standing Orders, having no doubt that the inhabitants of the section of country through which the road was to pass had been fully informed as to the nature of the Bill, had come to the conclusion that, notwithstanding the informality of the notice, it would be proper, under the circumstances, to grant the prayer of the petition.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, if this Bill was of a character which necessarily implied a surprise in regard to some important work which would affect the locality seriously, or would prejudicially affect certain private interests, then the rule should be enforced; but, if it was simply an ordinary Bill to charter certain parties to build a railway under certain conditions, then he thought the Committee were right in recommending the suspension of the rule, because the Bill would afterwards be considered by another Committee. The notice was certainly very short; but, unless the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Schultz) could point out some specific objection, he did not think the House would be warranted in rejecting the report of the Committee.

MR. ROBINSON said it was a Bill simply to incorporate this Company.

MR. RYKERT said he was surprised at the course taken by the hon. member for Lisgar, especially as his constituency would be benefited by this railway. If the company asked for a charter over ground already occupied by other persons, he could understand the objection; but everyone west of the Red River was anxious to have a railway service. The notice given by the hon. member for Lisgar showed that he asked the privilege of building a railway from the Red River westward, intending to occupy the whole territory from the boundary line of the United States to the Pacific Railway. The Bill which he (Mr. Rykert) had introduced only

asked that the Railway Committee should decide which territory they should have—the north or the south. The country required more than one railway, and now there was none west of the Red River. The matter had been fully discussed in the section affected, as was shown by the reports in the *Selkirk Inter-Ocean*, which he read. This Bill asked for a charter to build a railway continuously from Selkirk westward. The Bill of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schultz) proposed to build a road from Winnipeg westward, not in a line to any objective point, but spreading over the whole territory from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains. In his (Mr. Rykert's) Bill, the concession lines were pointed out, so that any one could tell what was required, and whether the country would be served or not. The country was not occupied now by any railways, and the Railway Committee could decide which was best.

MR. MACDOUGALL said that the question they had to consider was not so much the merits of this line of railway—for on that subject the House was not yet sufficiently informed—but whether it was convenient, in this the first Session of a new Parliament, to ignore the rules of the House on the mere recommendation of a Committee. In this case, his hon. friend who had just spoken argued plausibly upon the merits of the case, but he told them that both railways started, the one from Winnipeg, and the other from Selkirk, while the direction of both was westward. It was very evident they were to be rival railways, and it might be a question whether it was in the interest of the public in that country for the House to charter rival railroads, running practically over the same ground, or nearly so. They had had some experience in other Provinces of the Dominion, in Ontario especially, and that experience taught them that the chartering of rival lines running very near together was neither advantageous to the public nor the companies. That question, however, could be very properly decided when the case came before the Railway Committee. The question then was whether sufficient notice had been given of this railway scheme. A public meeting had been held, but a

MR. SCHULTZ.

public meeting was not a notice. He was of opinion that it would be highly inexpedient for the House to suspend the rule. If the hon. gentleman waited until the two months required by the rule had expired, he would then have a right to introduce the Bill. If they suspended the rule in this case, he would like to know in what case they could refuse to suspend it.

MR. RYKERT said the notice was published on January 10th for the first time.

MR. SCHULTZ said, according to the Clerk of the Committee, the first notice was given on January 18th.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought the rule had generally been as laid down by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie). The House generally supported the recommendation of the Committee for the suspension of the rule. His hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Macdougall) stated that the hon. gentleman would have a right to introduce the Bill at the expiration of two months. That being so, they might just as well bring it up at once. The right way was for them to concur in the report of the Committee, as the House could not be expected to engage in the discussion of the respective merits of these Bills.

MR. SCHULTZ said that he had no desire to oppose any measure which would benefit any part of Manitoba, but a Bill had already been introduced which covered the same ground, and which provided for the wants of all sections of the Province. The promoters of this Bill had complied with all the conditions imposed by the 51st rule, and the printed Bill was this day received. If it was allowed in this case to accept notice of less than a month, then they could not, in future, refuse to receive any similar defective notices.

Bill read the first time.

NEW MEMBER.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Joseph Stanislas Perrault, Esquire, to represent the Electoral District of Charlevoix.

J. S. PERRAULT, Esquire, member elect for the county of Charlevoix, having taken the oaths, was then introduced by Messrs. POPE (Compton) and LANGEVIN, and took his seat.

WINDSOR BRANCH RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. BORDEN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps, by legislative interference or otherwise, to settle the dispute between the Windsor and Annapolis and Western Counties Railway Companies, with reference to the Windsor Branch Railway.

MR. TUPPER: The Government at present are giving their consideration to that subject, and I expect, in a very few days, to be able to submit the result to the House.

REBATE ON TIN IMPORTED INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

QUESTION.

MR. MCINNES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to alter the existing regulations governing rebate or drawbacks on tin imported into British Columbia and manufactured into cans for preserving fish for exportation into foreign countries.

MR. BOWELL: I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that the question of drawbacks on tin used in the exportation of fish, has been under the consideration of the Government, and I shall only be too glad to hear any suggestion the hon. gentleman may desire to make on this question.

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH, GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to acquire possession of that portion of the railway between Rivière du Loup and Quebec, as forming a continuance of the Intercolonial Railway.

MR. TUPPER: Correspondence is at present going on between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Government on the subject; but I am not in a position to state the result.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND'S SHARE OF
THE FISHERY AWARD.

QUESTION.

MR. YEO enquired, What proportion of the fishery award the Government has set apart for the use and benefit of the people of Prince Edward Island?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No portion of the official award has been set apart by the Government for the benefit of Prince Edward Island or any other portion of Her Majesty's Dominion.

DREDGING OF THE ST. FRANCIS AND
YAMASKA RIVERS.

QUESTION.

MR. GILL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have the Rivers St. Francis and Yamaska dredged this year.

MR. TUPPER: That subject is under the consideration of the Government.

BURLINGTON BAY CANAL PIERS.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in thorough repair the piers at Burlington Bay Canal during the present year.

MR. TUPPER: The Government are at present considering that subject.

DUTIES ON CANADIAN TOBACCO.

QUESTION.

MR. MONGENAIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take off the duties imposed on tobacco grown in Canada.

MR. BABY: I regret that, under the circumstances, the Government cannot give the hon. gentleman a categorical answer.

SURVEY OF THE ESTUARY OF LA
RIVIÈRE À LA GRAISSE.

QUESTION.

MR. MONGENAIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to order a survey of the estuary of La Rivière à la Grasse (Rigaud), in the county

MR. TUPPER.

of Vaudreuil, next spring, and to ask for a grant for the improvement of that harbour.

MR. TUPPER: It is the intention of the Government to make such a survey, and an investigation into the matter.

MILL-WASTE IN NAVIGABLE STREAMS.

QUESTION.

MR. MONGENAIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to repeal the Act 36 Vict., chap. 65, which forbids the owners of saw-mills to throw the mill-waste and rubbish into navigable streams and rivers.

MR. POPE (Queens, P. E. I.): It is not the intention of the Government to deal with the Act referred to.

DRAG-NETS IN THE OTTAWA RIVER.

QUESTION.

MR. MONGENAIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to forbid the use of drag-nets taking fish in the Ottawa River.

MR. POPE (Queens, P. E. I.): This matter is under the consideration of the Government.

HAMILTON CUSTOM HOUSE AND POST
OFFICE BUILDINGS.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) enquired, Whether there are any grounds for the rumour in Hamilton that it is the intention of the Government to purchase additional buildings for the Customs and Inland Revenue and Post Office in the city of Hamilton.

MR. LANGEVIN: I am not aware of any intention on the part of the Government to purchase such buildings.

TRANSPORT OF PASSENGERS AND
FREIGHT TO MANITOBA.

QUESTION.

MR. DUBUC enquired, Whether the Government have made, or intend to make, arrangements with the contractors of the Pembina Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or with the St. Paul and

Pacific Railway Company, to facilitate the transportation of passengers and freight from St. Vincent, Minn., to St. Boniface, Manitoba.

MR. TUPPER: The late Government entered into a contract with parties connected with the St. Paul and Pacific Railway Company, for the purpose of carrying out the objects stated in this question.

POST OFFICE REGULATIONS.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) enquired, Whether it is the intention of Government to amend the Post Office Regulations so as to enable postmasters to return to the sender letters and papers which have not been called for in ten days from the time of their receipt at the office of their destination, in cases where the senders have endorsed on the envelope their address and their request that the same may be done.

MR. LANGEVIN: The regulation of the Department is as follows: "When letters, passing within the Dominion, are sent in covers or envelopes, having printed thereon a request from the sender, that the letter, if not delivered or called for at the office addressed within a certain time specified in the request, may be returned to his address as printed in the said request, such request will be complied with by the postmaster of the office addressed, whose duty it is, at the expiration of the time named by the sender, to write upon the letter the reason for non-delivery, and forward it to the address given. These instructions apply only to request-letters originating within the Dominion, or within the United States; such requests appearing on letters from other countries cannot be complied with." These regulations apply only to the endorsements that are printed. Written endorsements are not noticed by the postmaster, because other parties than the senders or writers of letters might write the endorsements on the envelope, and have the letters, if returned, sent to them. But, when the endorsement is printed, then the writer is supposed to be willing to have that order printed on the envelope.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

RESOLUTION PROPOSED.

MR. CHRISTIE moved :

"That the interests of public morality and the physical well-being of all classes render it necessary that there should be a strict and uniform observance of the Lord's Day in all the Departments of the Public Service, which are under the control of the Dominion Government; that, in the opinion of this House, the regulations in the Post Office Department should be uniform throughout the whole Dominion, and all postmasters be permitted to close their offices during the whole of the Sabbath day."

He said that, in rising to move the resolution which he held in his hand, to secure the better observance of the Sabbath, it was not his intention to occupy the time of the House at any length. The resolution spoke for itself. It would be remembered by some hon. gentlemen present that he moved a somewhat similar resolution during last Session, but he was then aiming specially at the closing of the canals. And he was happy to state that the pledge then given by the late Government had been fully redeemed. An order was issued on the 27th of May to close the canals from twelve o'clock on Saturday night till twelve o'clock on Sunday night, thus securing a whole Sabbath's rest, which was hailed as a precious boon by all the employés, and even by the residents along the line. It had been productive of the most beneficial results, there being less drunkenness, profanity, and public disturbance than formerly; and, so far as he knew, not one of the evil results which had been predicted to follow the closing had been realised. It was to be hoped that the canals had been closed forever on Sunday. He thought that the good results which had followed closing in this case should encourage the Government to go a step farther in the same direction, and to close the post-offices in the Province of Quebec during the whole of the Sabbath day. He found that a great diversity of regulations and practice existed in the Post Office Department, in different sections of the Dominion. In the Maritime Provinces, with one or two exceptions, the post-offices were closed, closing being imperative. In Ontario, postmasters were at liberty to close their offices to the public on Sunday. In Manitoba and

British Columbia, the post-offices, with few exceptions, were closed. But in the Province of Quebec closing was prohibited, and postmasters were required to keep their offices open at least one hour, either before or after divine worship, as might be most convenient to the public. This was a most anomalous and unsatisfactory state of things. Why should closing be imperative in one Province, permissive in a second, and be prohibited in a third? And why should postmasters in the Province of Quebec be denied the enjoyment of their inherent right to a whole Sabbath's rest, when it was accorded to postmasters in every other Province in the Dominion? Many of the postmasters felt it to be a very great hardship to be compelled to open their offices during any portion of the Sabbath day, and they looked to this House for relief, and hoped to be put on the same footing as others, and to be protected in the full enjoyment of their rights in this matter. He believed there was a wide-spread interest felt in this question throughout the country. Petitions had been presented from time to time, praying that there might be a strict and uniform observance of the Lord's day in all Departments of the Public Service. During the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, held a few months ago in the city of Hamilton, this question was considered, and it was unanimously resolved to petition the Dominion Government to close the post-offices in the Province of Quebec during the whole of the Lord's day. The members of that Assembly had approached this House by petition, as Christian patriots impressed with a high sense of the importance of Sabbath observance to secure national prosperity and the general well-being of the Dominion. They had pointed out, in the clearest and most emphatic language, the good results which flowed from Sabbath observance, the inherent right which every man had to the Sabbath's rest, and the duty of the Government to protect all their employes in the full enjoyment of that rest. Now, when they considered the number, the respectability, and the unanimity of that Assembly, and that the evil of which they complained was one of a grave character, they must admit that their representations were well worthy of the consideration of this House.

MR. CHRISTIE.

Although the other religious bodies had not petitioned on the present occasion, he was convinced that most of them were in perfect harmony with the Presbyterian Church on this question. But he regretted to say that, notwithstanding all the petitions which had been presented from time to time, and all the efforts which had been put forth in this House, the evil complained of was still continued. The postmasters were still robbed of that rest which God had given them, and the benign and hallowing influences of the Sabbath were destroyed to a great extent by the opening of the mails, and the scattering of mail matter broadcast over the Province every Sunday. Now it was quite preposterous to suppose that the Sabbath could be observed under such circumstances, so long as the employes of the Government were compelled to open their offices and to break the day, and so long as the cares and anxieties and labour connected with a Sunday mail were thus thrust upon the people. But that was not all. The evil was still increasing. The example of the Dominion Government in the Post Office Department had been followed by the Local Governments in their Railway Departments. Possibly the contractors were responsible; but, ever since the Montreal, Ottawa and Western Railway was built, excursion trains had been run on Sunday during the summer, and all the pleasure-seekers and Sabbath-breakers in the cities had been poured into the country, to the great grief and annoyance of the Sabbath-keeping portion of the community. Even divine worship had been interrupted and disturbed by the passing trains, and by the music and revelry of the excursionists. These glaring acts of Sabbath desecration were under the control of the respective Governments. They were productive of the most disastrous, the most deplorable results, familiarising the public mind with Sunday labour and amusement, destroying all regard and respect for the sacred day, and converting it into a mere holiday for amusement. Many were shocked at these things, and called loudly for reform. He knew that it was urged by some that the present practice in the Post Office Department was necessary, that it was a great convenience to the people to get their papers and

letters when they went to church on Sunday, that it was a saving of time and money, and that occasionally business and social requirements rendered it desirable, if not absolutely necessary, that the post-offices should be opened. But he believed that the plea of necessity was sufficiently answered by the fact that the post-offices had been closed in the Maritime Provinces and in Ontario for many years, and no inconvenience had been experienced. Not a single petition had ever been presented to this House asking for a Sunday mail. Now, no business necessities could exist in the Province of Quebec that did not exist in Ontario or the other Provinces, and if the post-offices had been closed there, and even in the great city of London, with a population nearly equal to that of the whole Dominion, and no inconvenience or detriment to business had been felt, it must be quite evident that the plea of necessity was wholly fallacious and inexcusable. He was convinced that no very serious objection would be raised to the proposed change in the rural districts of the Province of Quebec. Possibly in the cities the objection might be stronger; but even there many of their best and most prosperous merchants refused to take their mail matter on Sunday, and were convinced they had never suffered any loss by doing so. He thought a majority of the respectable people would hail with satisfaction any measure calculated to secure the better observance of the Sabbath, and would gladly submit to any slight inconvenience which the proposed change might occasionally involve. He need not speak of the divine obligation which rested upon them to keep the Sabbath, because he hoped that that was fully recognised and admitted by the House. Neither was it necessary to prove that the Sabbath was made for man's benefit and advancement, both in an economic and religious point of view, and was in perfect harmony with the laws of his being. He believed it was generally admitted by the wisest and best men that the man who strictly observed the day would enjoy better health, live to a greater age, and be able to accomplish more labour than he who ignored the sacred day, and either laboured the whole seven days successively, or

devoted the Sabbath to a round of amusement often more exhausting than labour. And what was true of individuals was equally true of the State; no nation could long continue to prosper that wilfully and unnecessarily violated the sanctity of the Sabbath. He did not ask for the introduction of any new principle into our legislation; but the extension of one that was now recognized and acted upon. He did not ask that any man should be compelled to keep the Sabbath; but simply that the regulations in the Post Office Department should be made uniform; that the same respect should be paid to the Sabbath by the Post Office Department in the Province of Quebec that was paid to it in all the other Provinces of the Dominion, and that the postmasters in that Province should no longer be compelled to open their offices during any portion of the Lord's day. It would be observed that his (Mr. Christie's) motion was permissive; not imperative. It was quite true that he would prefer to go a little further. He thought the regulations should require postmasters to close their offices, and, if the House would go that length, he would be most happy to have his motion amended in that direction, as it would be more in harmony with his convictions. After enquiry he was convinced it could not be carried in that form. He believed it was a question of very great importance, very closely connected with the well-being and prosperity of the Dominion, and he would most respectfully, and, at the same time, most earnestly, ask the Government and every hon. member in the House to give it their serious consideration and support, and to adopt such measures as would secure a strict and uniform observance of the Sabbath, not only in the Post Office Department, but in all Departments of the Public Service.

MR. CHARLTON, in seconding the motion, said it must be apparent to all who gave attention to the movements of social and intellectual forces in this age that there was a growing disposition to desire the abridgment of those restrictions which Christianity had heretofore considered necessary to be imposed for securing the well-being and the moral and religious good of society. It might not

be improper to consider whether those restrictions were arbitrary, and whether they were in accordance with the principles of justice and natural right. The nature of the restraints that might be imposed by a Government, the acts that might be forbidden, the acts and observances that might be required, and the penalties that might be imposed, would necessarily be determined by the principles upon which Government rested. It would not, for instance, be proper for a Mahomedan Government to prohibit polygamy, because it was tolerated in the Koran; perhaps it would not be proper for the United States Government to pass laws requiring the observance of the Sabbath, because that Government had studiously ignored all reference to God in its fundamental law, the Constitution. The Sovereign of this nation was styled the "defender of the faith;" she was said to hold that position "by the grace of God;" and, if, which was unquestionably the case, this was a Christian nation; if, in all its conquests, in all the countries where it had founded colonies and laid the foundations of empires, it had introduced and recognised Christianity, and recognised the law of Christianity, as the higher law, he held it was a Christian nation; if this was the case, then the observance of the Sabbath was a duty which its rulers, so far as was practicable, and their authority extended, were called upon to enforce. The ordinance that one day out of seven should be set apart as a day of rest and religious worship had been recognised throughout all ages of the world. It was the only ordinance, besides marriage, which appeared in the records of the creation. It was a fundamental part of the decalogue. Its binding character had been recognised by the Prophets, and by the Redeemer Himself—the Head of the Christian religion. He (Mr. Charlton) held, further, that that day in seven which had been authoritatively set apart for the day of rest, under the Christian dispensation, was the first day of the week. He did not deem it necessary to go into any discussion of the proof of that assertion, but would content himself with the assertion that the proof was ample and conclusive, and he took it for granted no one would deny that such was the case.

MR. CHARLTON.

By the observance of the Sabbath, God's name was honoured and the visibility of religion was maintained, and any failure to enact laws for its observance fastened the lie upon this or any country which pretended to be a Christian nation. Public recognition of anything whatsoever begat individual respect, and public recognition of the Sabbath, or of any ordinance on the part of the Government, begat individual respect for that ordinance. He did not intend to detain the House by remarks at any length on the subject; but would say that in this age error had assumed most seductive forms. Materialists affirmed that matter existed without a Creator; Pantheists, that matter itself was God; Evolutionists, that that glorious declaration that God made man in His own image was a fable. They referred us to an origin more humble than the tadpole, gravely asserting that our life was evolved from primordial shells which in remotest ages had been vivified by a fortuitous concurrence of atoms, and that, through gradual processes of evolution extending through countless ages, animal life had reached its present stage. By these forms of error, arising from the deductions of science, falsely so called, the truth was sought to be undermined. It was the duty of every Christian nation, people and Government to honour God's laws in all respects; and the motion before the House, calling for a more strict observance of the Sabbath by the employés of the Government, was one which the Government could not disregard, unless they did violence to their professions of being a Christian Government of a Christian nation. Regulations and restrictions, such as laws requiring the observance of the Sabbath, were safeguards which, if maintained, would secure the continuance of civil and religious liberty. It was under them that Britain had attained her greatness, and had placed her impress upon continents, upon races, upon history, and upon time. That same old command: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," given thousands of years ago, was still ringing in their ears, and still binding upon them. They could not claim to be a Christian people if they disregarded it; and he therefore begged to second the resolution of the hon. member for Argenteuil.

MR. HESSON said, before this motion was put, he desired to raise his voice in its favour. It was not necessary to waste the time of this House in a long discussion of the subject. All who felt they were Christians should, so far as their voices and votes went, sustain it. As a new member he would not occupy the time of this House further than to say their vote should be given unanimously, as representatives of a Christian people, in favour of the motion.

MR. LANGEVIN said this was the second time the hon. gentleman had brought this motion before the House; the words, this time, being slightly varied from those of last year, but the motion being substantially the same. The principle of the observance of the Lord's day had been admitted by the whole House last year, and no doubt the same principle would be admitted this year. They all agreed that the Lord's day should be kept as strictly as possible; but the hon. gentleman must be aware that that observance could not be an absolute one. Certain work which could not be avoided had to be done on that day. People had to get up and dress themselves on that day as well as on the others; their meals had to be prepared, and the hon. gentleman did not object that his cook should prepare his meals; that his servants should milk the cows, in order to have milk for his breakfast; that his cattle should be fed and his horses looked after, even on that day. Certain work which could not be avoided had to be done on Sunday. Unless everything stopped—unless life stopped at midnight on Saturday night, and began again exactly twenty-four hours after, certain works must be done on the Lord's day, and therefore the rule which the hon. gentleman wanted to apply could not be applied to other things any more than to the domestic concerns of life. If the hon. gentleman were on his way to Europe, he would not object that on the Sunday the steamer continued her route, that the fireman and the other men worked; but would object decidedly to the steamer being kept twenty-four hours in the midst of the ocean without being allowed to proceed on her course. He had no doubt the hon. gentle-

man had been on a railway even on a Sunday morning or afternoon, and did not object to the men working on it. It was a work necessary to be done. Last year Mr. Macdougall, of Elgin, moved, seconded by Mr. Ross, in amendment to the hon. gentleman's motion, to this effect: "That all the words after 'that,' to the end of the motion be left out, and the words inserted, 'the interest of public morality and the physical well-being of all sections of the community require that the Lord's day be strictly observed by persons engaged in the public works under the control of the Government, as far as practicable; that there should be a cessation of labour on all the canals, railways, and other public works under the control of the Government, as far as, in the opinion of the Government, it would be practicable to do so.'" This amendment was supported by the then Government, and the whole House agreed to it. The hon. gentleman found that in these words should have been included "post-offices." Therefore, this year, he renewed this discussion. He (Mr. Langevin) did not object to the discussion being renewed. He agreed that, as far as possible, the Lord's day should be observed, but complete cessation of labour on that day was impossible, and, no matter how strong a resolution of this kind might be passed, it would be found impossible to carry it into effect. The hon. gentleman must not suppose that he (Mr. Langevin) did not want to respect the Lord's day. He did wish to see it respected as much as did the hon. gentleman himself. But Sunday was the only day on which the population of the country parts in the Province of Quebec went to the post-offices. They lived far apart; they went to church on the Sunday, and after church they got their letters, and posted those they had written during the week; not only the French Roman Catholic portion of the population, but nearly the entire population. The parish in which the hon. gentleman resided might be an exception. If the population of that parish desired that the post-office should be closed there, he would give orders to that effect. No post-office in the Province of Quebec would be opened on Sunday if the people did not go then for their letters; and, if the hon. gentleman and others did not go for their letters on

that day, or send their servants—Roman Catholic servants—or others for them, that post-office would not be used, and the object he desired would be attained. As the hon. gentleman had brought the motion before the House, it would have to be dealt with, unless, after these explanations, he was satisfied to withdraw the motion. Otherwise, he would move that the words after “that” to the end of the question be left out, and the following inserted instead: “The interest of public morality and the physical well-being of all classes of the community require that the Lord's day be strictly observed by all persons engaged in the public Departments, under the control of the Canadian Government, as far as practicable to do so; that, in the opinion of this House, there should be a cessation of labour on the Lord's day on all public works, and in all offices under the control of the Government of Canada, as far as it shall be found, in the opinion of the Government, practicable to do so.”

MR. McLENNAN said he had great sympathy with the prayer of the petition to the House, and he thought that the public servants, as well as all others, should have a day of rest; and, because he sympathised so much with this proposition, he undertook to say a few words about it. He was one of seventy-three new members in the House, and he hoped the seventy-three new members desired to perpetuate the rights and liberties of the people. He was not sure whether the Dominion of Canada stood in the position of defender of the faith—perhaps it was not necessary to discuss that point—but he believed that the law that governed us in that respect should be a law of moral suasion, and written not upon our Statute-books, but in the hearts of the people. At the same time, he was aware that whatever was said in this House upon such a question came before the people, and would be discussed in a variety of forms for which this House could not be responsible, and that mistakes might be made in interpreting the sense of the House. For this reason he would prefer that the mover of the resolution would withdraw it, rather than that others in the same position as himself,

MR. LANGEVIN.

who desired that the prayer of this petition should be carried out in its spirit and essence, should be compelled to vote upon a resolution of this kind.

MR. BÉCHARD said that, although he had much admiration for the Christian feeling which had led his hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) to make this motion, yet he had no sympathy with the purpose of the motion. His hon. friend knew that this question was viewed by different persons from different standpoints. The religious education of three-fourths of the population of Quebec did not make them consider the act of keeping a post-office open on Sunday a violation of that day. They did not consider the writing of a letter, for instance, on that day, any more than the hiring of a horse and buggy to take a ride on that day, as a violation of the Sabbath. In several parishes of the rural districts there were people who lived five or six miles from a post-office, for whom it would be very inconvenient not to be able to get their letters or papers on Sunday when they went to church, as, if compelled to go on any other day, they would have to lose half a day's work. He hoped that no steps would be taken by this House to put a stop to a practice which was a great convenience to the people in districts such as those he had referred to.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said that in the interior of British Columbia a great many people came into the post-towns only on the Sabbath day, and it would be a great inconvenience to them if they could not get their letters and papers. Postmasters, he believed, had the power of closing their offices on the Sabbath, or keeping them open, and he thought it would be going a little too far if the resolution moved by the hon. member for Argenteuil were to be adopted. He agreed with the remarks of the hon. the Postmaster-General, that, while they were willing to preserve the sanctity of the Lord's day to the utmost extent, certain allowances should be made.

MR. SCRIVER said he desired to show that the remarks of the hon. the Postmaster-General were anything but a sufficient reply to what had been said upon the moral aspect of the question, at

all events. They were all agreed as to the importance of the Sabbath day to a Christian community, and to the propriety of its proper observance. They were also fully agreed with the hon. the Postmaster-General, that there were certain labours which, as a necessity of our condition, must be done upon that day. But there was another question which followed, and that was, what were the necessary labours which were the results of the necessity of our condition? To the statement that it was necessary that the post-offices should be kept open in certain localities, he thought a sufficient reply would be found in the fact that in some of the Provinces they were not kept open on that day. With reference to the question as it presented itself to the representatives of the Province of Quebec, he would only say, with the hon. member for Iberville, that a large majority of that Province did not believe that Sunday was violated by keeping the post-offices open before or subsequent to the morning service in the churches. He would not like to force his peculiar views—if they were peculiar—upon the majority of the people of that Province, but he knew that in the English-speaking portion of that Province, or the portion inhabited principally by Protestants, this question was viewed differently from what it was in the parishes inhabited by Roman Catholics; and the majority of these were not only a Christian people in the ordinary sense of the term, but they were members of one or other of the religious bodies which considered it a violation of the Sabbath day that Government officials should be required to work on that day. He believed that the weight of public opinion in that portion of the Province of Quebec inhabited mainly by Protestants was strongly in favour of, at least, a permissive regulation, such as that pointed out by the resolution of the hon. member for Argenteuil. This resolution, if passed, would not make it obligatory, but permissive merely, upon the postmasters of the Province of Quebec to close these offices. He felt assured that, in a community where the general public sentiment was in favour of keeping the post-offices open on Sunday, the postmaster would yield to that public sentiment.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not see why the hon. gentleman should feel at all embarrassed, or think that he would be in a false position, for he voted for the very same motion last Session. He thought that the expression of the House, as far as they could gather it, laid down the true principle that there was a general feeling in Canada, amongst Catholics as well as Protestants, that the Lord's day should be observed as strictly as possible. The hon. gentleman who now led the other side of the House, and led the House last Session, supported the amendment of his hon. friend, as he felt, under the responsibility of his position, the necessity of avoiding an absolute cessation of all work which would be caused by the motion of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie). His hon. friend who had just spoken (Mr. Scriver) said that this resolution would not make it obligatory on the Government.

MR. SCRIVER: I meant to say obligatory upon postmasters.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it would be obligatory upon the Government to order postmasters to cease keeping open their post-offices on Sunday. The resolution was so strong that, if it were adopted, any Government would be compelled by it to order all their employés to close their post offices on Sunday, and not to open them for one second. If that resolution were passed, he would be obliged, in obedience to the command of this House, to order all the employés to close their public departments, except when it was unavoidably necessary; and, of course, as the giving of letters on Sunday in Lower Canada was not a necessity, the post-offices there could not be opened on that day any more than in any other Province. He thought, therefore, that the resolution should be withdrawn. He would prefer that the amendment of his hon. friend (Mr. Langevin) should be carried. The last Parliament solemnly affirmed, by the motion in amendment which was moved by Mr. Macdougall, that the Lord's day should be observed in every way practicable, and he thought that this Parliament should affirm the same principle.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he thought his hon. friend had stated the case too strongly regarding the terms in which the motion was drawn. The motion simply said that all postmasters should be permitted to close their offices during the whole of the Sabbath day. As he understood the question, postmasters in the Province of Quebec, under the terms of the resolution, would be allowed to close their offices where they considered it their duty to do so. He did not wish to enter into a discussion of the question which was so ably put by the mover and seconder of the resolution. He could simply say, so far as the question of convenience was concerned, that he was not aware of any part of the Province of Ontario, where all the post-offices were closed, in which any inconvenience was felt, nor in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where a similar usage prevailed. He quite agreed with the sentiment that, in a mixed community like ours, where there were so many creeds, it was desirable to deal carefully in matters of this kind. He concurred in the statement of his hon. friend (Mr. Scriver) that no line was drawn between what was considered a violation of the Sabbath day and what was a work of necessity. It was said last year, when it was proposed to close the canals, that great inconvenience would be caused thereby; but, since its adoption, no complaints had been made and no petitions presented to this House against that measure. It had proved highly satisfactory. He trusted that the House would support all necessary and proper restrictions.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he did not agree with the conclusion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) had drawn from the terms of the resolution. It appeared to him (Mr. Macdougall) very obvious that, if this House affirmed this resolution in the terms in which it was expressed—in view of the fact that a similar resolution was proposed in the previous Parliament,—the Government would be, of necessity, compelled as obeying the directions of this House, to issue orders to all the postmasters in the country strictly to observe the Sabbath by closing their offices. It would be impossible to draw the line where the hon. gentleman had

suggested it could be drawn, without disobeying an order of this House. He wished to direct the attention of the House to a view of the question which had not yet been presented. Were they here as members of the Dominion Parliament for the purpose of enforcing duties which belong to what legal writers described as the of imperfect obligation? Was that their special function; or were they not, under the Constitution, called upon to deal with a class of questions that did not involve these duties? There were other bodies clothed with the power, and therefore charged with the duty of dealing with the civil rights of the people. It was not the function of this Parliament to regulate educational institutions, religious observances, or matters of police. There were the Local Legislatures and municipal corporations armed with the power of dealing with questions of this character. They represented the people more directly and intimately in all these matters. Consequently, he thought they would be acting wisely, and be keeping within their own jurisdiction, by confining themselves to those matters which had been assigned to them by the Constitutional Act. It was quite true that it was within the power of this House to direct when the post-offices of the Dominion should be kept open and when they should be closed; but, at the same time, he thought it would be an undue exercise of that power if it were put forth on the grounds invoked by the hon. mover and seconder of the resolution. In view of the fact that in this country there were various opinions on this Sabbatarian question, and that a very large religious body, numbering nearly one-half the population, did not regard the keeping of the Sabbath, as it was termed, in the same light, or that it should be done in the same manner as another class of the community, and professing religious opinions of a different kind, would it be fair, and would it result in any good, to impose upon them, by legislation, a strict observance of the Sabbath in a manner which might be repugnant to their habits, and contrary to their convictions? He did not think that our experience in this country, in attempting to legislate upon matters of this kind, had been so satisfactory as

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

to induce us to go any further in the same direction. On another but cognate subject, there had been a great deal of agitation; and Parliament had been called upon to deal with the question of suppressing the use of intoxicating liquors; there had been an attempt to enforce abstinence by legislation in the Province of Ontario, and he thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) would agree with him that our experiment in that direction had not been very successful, for the people were now undoing and repealing, by overwhelming majorities, the attempt to coerce them by law to perform those moral obligations and duties. He was inclined to take the view that we must leave it to the individual consciences of the people, to their own sense of propriety, as to the mode in which they should observe the Sabbath, or as to whether they should abstain from the use of those things which might prove injurious to them. Experience in our own and other countries had taught that legislation of this kind was sure to be ineffective, would aggravate the particular evil, and would injuriously affect the morals of the people. In some of the countries of Europe, he had seen people going to church in the early part of the day, and after the service was over he had seen them with their families in the public gardens and places of recreation and amusement, where they could breathe the fresh air of heaven and admire the beauties of art and nature; and yet these people were, as far as he could see, as religious as any other class of the community. Perhaps their conduct in frequenting these places would shock the hon. mover of this resolution; but, in his (Mr. Macdougall's) judgment, their observance of the Sabbath was perfectly consistent with their religious belief and their duty. In Lower Canada, a large majority of the people did not agree with the hon. gentleman in his view of the mode of keeping the Sabbath. This Parliament, composed of representatives of all the Provinces of the Dominion, with their divergent opinions, was not the proper body to deal with a question of this kind—there were local bodies and other means by which obligations of this nature could be enforced. The resolution proposed in amendment went as far

as it was necessary to go. It went far enough to meet the difficulties of the case. It left it in the discretion of the Government to say that the offices should be closed on the Sabbath in all cases where it could be reasonably and properly done. He would support the amendment, and leave it for the Government to see that its directions were properly carried out wherever public opinion required it.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he thought there was an inconsistency in the terms of the resolution of the hon. gentleman from Argenteuil. The first part declared the necessity for a strict and uniform observance of the Lord's day, and then the second part proposed to leave it to the discretion of postmasters whether to close their offices during the whole of the Sabbath or not. If the word "permit" meant, what his hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) contended it did—individual discretion, how could there be uniformity of practice. Therefore, he thought the true meaning of the resolution was that expressed by the right hon. leader of the Government, who declared that this resolution, more especially in view of the resolution carried last Session, would amount to an injunction upon the Government to insist upon all postmasters closing their offices in every place on the Sabbath day. He would not discuss the question from a Lower Canada point of view, although he entirely endorsed what his hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Macdougall) had just said: that it was improper for this Parliament to impose uniformity in an observance of this kind where there was no uniformity of opinion or sentiment among the people of the different Provinces. As regarded Ontario, he was not prepared to accept the statement of his hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), that everybody was well satisfied with the post-offices being rigorously closed on Sunday, as they were there. As a resident of Toronto, he (Mr. Cameron) was prepared to say that there was great dissatisfaction with the total closing of the post-office on Sunday, and it had often been remarked that the outer door of that office ought to be left open during a portion of the day, and then it could be

left to each man's conscience to go in and get his letters or not. That would be true liberty, leaving every man to do as he thought fit. It would not involve any necessity for Sunday labour in the post-office, as each man having a box could open it himself. It frequently happened that men of business had to leave town on Monday morning before the post-office was open, and it was a great inconvenience to them not to be able to get on Sunday those letters which had arrived and had been assorted on Saturday night. Looking at the question from a broad point of view, he did not know that rigid Protestant views on the Sabbath question were more correct than the more liberal views of their Roman Catholic fellow subjects upon that matter. He did not know that rigid Sabbatarianism was always connected with uprightness of character and conduct. As an illustration of this opinion, he would only mention the case of probably the most guilty of the City of Glasgow Bank Directors, who had just been convicted, and who was so extremely religious that he would not read on Monday a newspaper published on that day, because it was printed on the Sunday night.

MR. CHRISTIE said he wished to remind the House that the resolution he moved last Session specially aimed at the closing of the canals, and it was only after the Government had given a positive assurance that the canals would be closed that he accepted the amendment. It would be remembered also, that he was then censured by the right hon. gentleman the leader of the present Government because he accepted the amendment. The right hon. gentleman would remember that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) accused him (Mr. Christie) of inconsistency and of proving recreant to his convictions because he accepted that amendment. Had the Postmaster-General to-day assured him that all the postmasters in the Province of Quebec would be permitted to close their offices, he (Mr. Christie) would have accepted the amendment proposed by the hon. the Postmaster-General. That hon. gentleman had said that he would allow the postmaster in his (Mr. Christie's) own parish to close his office on Sunday; if he

MR. CAMERON.

would extend that permission to the whole Province, he (Mr. Christie) would be satisfied, otherwise he must adhere to his present position.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR EXPENDITURE.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. McCARTHY moved for a statement showing the amount expended on the survey of, or other work prosecuted at, the harbour of Collingwood during the season of 1878; giving the expenditure in detail, the names of the persons to whom paid, and the services for which it was made.

Motion *agreed to*.

RIVER DU LOUP PIER.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. GRANDBOIS moved for copies of: (1) The instructions given to the engineer and superintendent of works done on River du Loup pier, in the county of Temiscouata, in 1878; (2) A statement of the number of men employed on the said works in the months of August and September last, respectively; (3) The quantity of timber purchased at Quebec, and from whom, and the price; the quantity purchased at River du Loup, and the price; (4) The manner in which the old timber was disposed of, as well as the new timber which was not used.

Motion *agreed to*.

CARRIAGE OF GOVERNMENT SUPPORTERS ON THE INTER-COLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANDRY moved for a statement of moneys due by certain persons, residents of the county of Rimouski, since 1st August, 1878, for the carriage, during the last general elections, on the Intercolonial Railway, of supporters and agents of the candidate in favour of the Administration of the day, together with copies of correspondence on the subject between such persons and the Government, and all orders, receipts and documents relating thereto. He said that, at

the risk of being unpleasant to the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset), he believed it to be his duty to ask for an order of the House for the production of the documents mentioned in his motion; at the risk of bringing upon himself once more the anger of the hon. gentleman, he wished the public to be informed as to the doings of a certain party which had always styled itself the "Party of Purity." A few days since, in answer to some remarks that he (Mr. Landry) had made, while speaking to a motion somewhat of the nature of the one now submitted, the hon. member for Rimouski could not conceal his astonishment, and even his indignation, at seeing him striving to know and to make known to the country what took place in the county of Rimouski during the late general elections. He understood the hon. gentleman's surprise, but the House would admit that he (Mr. Landry) was only following the example given him by the hon. member for Rimouski, and that he did not go as far as he did. Since the opening of the Session the hon. gentleman had twice gone into the territory of Manitoba. He (Mr. Landry) went no further than Rimouski. Now, if the astonishment of the hon. member was in proportion to the distance travelled, this House would conceive how much the hon. member must be surprised at his own excursions in the far off Province of Manitoba. The hon. member had shown some temper in assuring the House that he (Mr. Landry) did not know a single word of the question he had brought up. That might be true, but he wished to know why motions like the one now before the House were made, if it was not to obtain, on certain questions, the information that might be wanting, and over which certain persons might have some reason to throw a veil of mystery and forgetfulness. The question of the conveyance during the late elections, on the Intercolonial, in the county of Rimouski, of a certain number of agents and partisans of the ministerial candidate, at the expense of the public, must have some light thrown upon it. Corruption had been practised in the county of Rimouski on a vast scale. Some days before nomination day, several hundred electors had been called to work on the Intercolonial; contracts had been given out, and all possible influence brought to

ar on the electors. When nomination day came, it became necessary to assemble in an imposing body these workmen who were scrupulously earning the people's money and the right to vote for the candidate of the Government that was paying them so well. The Intercolonial was placed at their disposal, and, without paying a single cent, these happy electors were enabled to go to the *chef lieu* and applaud the words of the ministerial candidate. The Intercolonial was again made use of by them to return to their work, and to go to the polls on voting day. The agents of the railway had, naturally enough, demanded the payment of these fares, but it was an after-thought that came to them when the result of the 17th of September had become known to them, and perhaps, also, to the ministerial candidate. The money, it would seem, had not yet been paid, and delay had been asked for. It was the correspondence exchanged upon this interesting subject that he wanted brought down. This correspondence would make known to the House how the Rimouski election had been carried. The other day the hon. member had endeavoured to be cruel by trying to make the House understand that he was perfectly qualified to set, not only in the House of Commons, but also in the Quebec Parliament. This shaft thrown at him (Mr. Landry) by his hon. friend had been lost on the way, and, before reaching him, had wounded one of the intimate friends of the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset). If the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dumont) would only speak, he would admit that he had been the first to feel the allusion of the hon. member for Rimouski. He might add that the latter was no more qualified than any one else to sit in the Quebec Parliament, for the excellent reason that there was no "Quebec Parliament." Let the hon. gentleman refer to the British North America Act, and he would perceive that what they had in Quebec was not a Parliament but a Legislature. When he (Mr. Landry) came forward as a candidate in Montmagny, he had proclaimed principles that he was not disposed to disown after the lapse of a few weeks as the hon. member for Rimouski had done. In 1872, when the hon. member

first entered public life, he had made public declarations, and, whilst he was canvassing against his now bosom friend, the Hon. Alex. Chauveau, he wrote against his opponent, against the Intercolonial, against the seigneurs, against all those who exercised against him their baneful influence. He had been defeated in 1872, being thus hindered from sitting in what he was pleased to call "The Parliament of Quebec." But, whilst weeping over his defeat, he had kept on writing, and *L'Evenement* of the 17th May, 1872, contained the following words from the hon. member's pen:—

"I admit that, if the principles that I profess were not with me sincere convictions, I could find, in the conduct of these journals and of certain persons, more than one cause to turn my back upon the Conservative party. But my principles are not mere fancies or calculations, nor objects of traffic. Being a sincere Conservative, I know how to distinguish between principles and men, as I distinguish between an honest application of these principles and abuses. This sincerity which still binds me to the Conservative party, my opponents had the courage and the skill to turn against me during the struggle."

Further on, the hon. member added:

"I had many opponents who were unjust and dishonest. I can congratulate myself upon having met with many devoted and generous friends. It is a great pleasure for me now to be able to convey to them publicly my heartfelt thanks. I had not gold, nor the hope of employment, nor the expectation of contracts on the Intercolonial wherewith to entice them. They have stood firm against intrigues and pressure, and it gratifies me to bear testimony to the nobleness of their feelings, and to the firmness of their characters."

That was enough to show that the hon. member for Rimouski should not throw stones at his neighbour's house. The production of the papers that were asked for would prove still more. The hon. member for Rimouski, however, had been well warned. His chief, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), who was now the leader of the Opposition, had said, in 1874, a few days before the general elections, in an address to his electors, which had been spread all over the country and which was published in *L'Evenement* of the 12th January, 1874:

"We will endeavour to raise the standard of public morality that our opponents have spared nothing to lower, and to conduct the business of the country according to principles

that honest people can approve, and in accordance with practices that can brave the light of day."

And, that none of his friends might plead ignorance as an excuse, he gave them, in conclusion, this paternal advice:

"But we must bear in mind that these laws, as all others, will owe their efficacy to the spirit in which they are accepted and applied by the people in general, and I trust that the friends of the Government will, during this election, give the example of a scrupulous observance of the law, and, at the same time, of a firm repression of its violation by others."

If the House granted his motion, hon. members would be in possession of the proof that, in the county of Rimouski, no heed had been given to this solemn warning, and that, if the hon. member for Rimouski now occupied a seat on this floor, it was because he had been spared the application of the law.

Mr. Fiset said that he did not know what object the hon. member (Mr. Landry) had now in view. Let him state precisely his point; let the hon. gentleman accuse him (Mr. Fiset) formally of a single act of corruption and then he could answer him. When the House saw the papers, it would see whether it was he who had been guilty of corrupt practices during the late elections or another candidate. If he had been guilty of corruption, his election ought to have been contested; but no one had dared undertake this task. When the hon. member (Mr. Landry) stated precisely in what he (Mr. Fiset) had been guilty of corruption, he would be able to answer him; but he had nothing to reply to all that the hon. member had just said.

Mr. LANGEVIN said he did not know whether the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) misunderstood, or had not wished to understand, what his hon. friend the member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) had said; but, to the whole House, the affair was quite incomprehensible. The hon. member for Montmagny had shown very plainly, by the motion that he had made, that he wished to obtain certain papers, and by these papers he claimed to be able to establish that, during the late election, friends of the hon. member for Rimouski had been conveyed over the Intercolonial on nomination day at the expense of the public,

MR. LANDRY.

and that the accounts incurred by the hon. member for Rimouski and a member of his committee amounted to three hundred and some odd dollars, and that this sum had not been refunded to the Government.

Mr. GEOFFRION said he thought this motion should have been drawn up so as to specify what persons received money and for what purpose it was received.

Motion agreed to.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR ENGINEERS' REPORTS.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for copies of any reports of engineers and others respecting the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, a location survey of which was made in 1875; with plans and profiles and estimates of cost of said line.

Motion agreed to.

PURCHASE OF REFUSE LUMBER FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. CARON, in the absence of Mr. DOMVILLE, moved for copies of all papers and vouchers in connection with the purchase of deal ends and other refuse lumber in the county of Northumberland, N. B., from 1st January, 1873, to 1st of January, 1879, for the use of the Intercolonial Railway; showing from whom purchased, price paid, to whom paid, for what purpose used, where delivered and used, and when used.

Motion agreed to.

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR.

MOTION FOR ENGINEERS' REPORTS.

Mr. HACKETT moved for copies of engineers' plans, specifications and reports, relating to the improvement of Cascumpec Harbour; together with copies of petitions and all correspondence connected therewith. He said that many propositions had been made for the prosecution of this work, but nothing practical had yet been accomplished. In 1874, a survey was made and a report upon the subject submitted to Parlia-

ment, and it was with a view to get these papers that he made this motion. This harbour was of the highest importance to the people in that section of the country. Owing to the want of proper harbour accommodation, many disasters had resulted during the past two years. Many vessels had been wrecked and many lives lost. Twenty or thirty years ago, the depth of water at the bar was about twenty feet; now, in consequence of the sand filling in, it was not more than twelve feet deep at the bar. This was a serious drawback, and he hoped the Government would do what they could to improve the navigation of the harbour.

Mr. YEO, in seconding the motion, said there was no doubt that the improvement of this harbour, the only one on that side of the land, was greatly needed. Last Session they had a promise from the late Government, and he thought the present Government could not very well avoid giving them a grant. A small grant of from \$20,000 to \$30,000 would be sufficient. Serious losses to shipping and life had resulted on more than one occasion, and a grant by the Government would prove a great boon to that part of the country.

Motion agreed to.

MAIL SERVICE ON VANCOUVER ISLAND.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. BUNSTER moved for copies of all papers relating to a certain mail contract let on the east coast of Vancouver Island, British Columbia, between Comox and Victoria, B. C., once per week, and a service of twice a week between Nanaimo and Victoria, with reasons why the said service was not continued as per contract. He said the performance of this duty devolved upon him, owing to the manner in which this matter was treated by the late Government and the late Postmaster-General. There was a contract entered into for carrying the mails from Nanaimo twice a week. The contract was let to a bogus American contractor who sailed a foreign vessel under our flag at a price that it could not be performed for. The people along the coast, whom he had the honour to represent, suffered from the fraud, as it now took them two weeks to come and get back

from Comox to their farms, and cost them more than the price of a cow, which took them years of care to raise. The expense of carrying the mail once a week would only be something like \$1,000 a year more than the trick perpetrated on the Government of the day, and they felt very much aggrieved at the way in which the contract was afterwards handled. The people now, in place of having a weekly mail from Comox to Victoria, had only a fortnightly service, which was very inconvenient to the farming community. He regarded it as his bounden duty to call for the papers in connection with this matter, so as to show more plainly to the Government the great injustice that had been done to this part of British Columbia in the way of carrying the mails.

Motion agreed to.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

MOTION FOR ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved for returns of copies of all Orders in Council made under and by virtue of the Act 36 Vict., cap 47 (respecting Weights and Measures), and the Act amending the same, between the 1st July, 1873, and the 27th February, 1879, and all correspondence in reference to the working and carrying out of the said Act.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 28th February, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 12) To authorise the Welland Railway Company to convert their six per cent Debenture Bonds, into five per cent. Debenture Stock, and for other purposes.—
(Mr. Drew.)

Bill (No. 14) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.—
(Mr. Langevin.)

MR. BUNSTER.

REPLY TO THE ADDRESS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

MR. SPEAKER read the Message, and it is as follows:—

“LORNE.

“Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

“Accept my thanks for the loyal Address you have voted in answer to the Speech with which I opened the Session, and I receive with satisfaction your assurance that your earnest and careful attention will be given to the important measures which are to be submitted for your consideration.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“OTTAWA, February 28th, 1879.”

MOUNTED POLICE FORCE ACT'S AMENDMENT BILL.

(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

FIRST READING.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced a Bill (No. 13) To amend, and consolidate as amended, the Acts relating to the Mounted Police Force. He said that some of the provisions of the Bill were designed to extend the period of service from three to five years. It had been found, by the experience of the commanding officer, Col. McLeod, that three years was too short, for it took that time for a man to become a thorough cavalry soldier, and two more to make him an efficient policeman. Some offices were to be abolished, including the paymaster's and quartermaster's. There was no reason why they should not leave to the several officers the duty of the payment of their men. The Bill also contained a provision empowering the Government, in cases of pressing exigency, to increase the force to 500 men, which would be done only in consequence of an exceptional state of affairs in the North-West, such as a chance of disturbance among the aborigines, either from the intrusion of a foreign element, or some other element of disturbance. The force could be reduced to the original 300 the moment the exigency was passed; and it was desirable to be able to exercise such power without the calling of Parliament. There were other amendments which ex-

perience showed to be necessary in the working of the Bill, one intended to encourage the several detachments to raise their own forage and subsistence from the land, by cultivation, at the different stations. The force was to be kept always full up to 300, and there were to be supernumeraries, not exceeding ten. The experience of the American force showed the importance of a certain number of half-breeds or Indians, accustomed to the ways and manners of the different Indian tribes, acquainted with their language and movements, to act as scouts and deal with the Indians. The Government desired the aid of such a force which, moving among the different tribes, could learn their feelings, prejudices and complaints. A small fire, by being early dealt with, could be easily extinguished. One clause provided for the application of the fund, obtained by fines imposed upon offending members of the force, to the formation of libraries and recreation grounds. There were several other useful clauses in the Bill, which was a consolidation of the two Acts affecting the force.

Bill read the first time.

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES.

MOTION TO RATIFY CONTRACT.

MR. BOWELL moved :

"That this House do approve of the contract for the reporting, printing, binding and translation of the debates of this House during the present Session, which has been laid upon the table of this House."

He said the notice asking for tenders, together with the contract entered into for the reporting, translating, binding and printing of the debates, for the present Session, were laid on the table of the House some days ago; the members, therefore, had had time to thoroughly examine them. It would be remembered that, at the last Session of Parliament, \$15,000 was included in the Estimates for this service, and was passed by the House without opposition, thereby affirming the principle of continuing the official report of the debates in Parliament. Believing it to be the wish and desire of the House to continue those reports, the Government had taken upon itself the responsibility of

asking for tenders for the work this Session, and entered into a contract, subject to the approval of the House. Tenders were sent in for the whole work, as follows :—

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| W. Gibbens..... | \$11,128 73 |
| J. C. Boyce..... | 13,425 00 |
| T. J. Richardson..... | 11,841 40 |
| A. & G. C. Holland..... | 13,346 40 |
| L. Belanger & Co..... | 13,354 40 |
| W. Gibbens..... | 13,500 00 |
| Jas. Carruthers..... | 14,200 00 |
| T. J. Richardson..... | 15,000 00 |

Mr. Gibbens, before the contract was awarded, withdrew, by letter, his tender, leaving Mr. T. J. Richardson's the next lowest tender for the whole service, namely \$11,841, being some \$1,500 lower than the next tender. He (Mr. Bowell) might state that, by taking four separate tenders, one for reporting, one for printing, one for translating, and one for binding, respectively, the combined or aggregate amount would have been somewhat lower than that accepted. But, considering the difficulties that arose through having the services performed by three or four different persons, in the past, it was thought best, in the interest of the service and of the House, that the contract should be given to one responsible person, whose tender was much less than the total amount paid for the work during the past Sessions. Under those circumstances the Government decided to award the contract to Mr. Richardson for \$11,841.40, exacting from him, in addition to the 20 per cent. retained of the money earned, sureties to the amount of \$2,000 for the proper performance of the work.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he thought it was due to the House, before any action was taken for the official reporting of the debates, that it should have been consulted. This matter has always been held to be one of purely domestic economy—one in which the Government, as a Government, would in no case interfere — one beyond the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of Internal Economy, with which the House alone was considered competent to deal. His hon. friend (Mr. Bowell) called attention to the fact that, last Session, a certain appropriation was made for the reporting and publishing of the Official

Debates ; but he forgot to tell the House that, although an appropriation was made, it positively refused to expend one dollar for the purpose for which it was voted ; and, if he wished to find, in the procedure of the House, a precedent to direct the action of the Government in this matter, he could have readily done so. In the Session of 1874, in a report made by Mr. Young, then Chairman of the Select Committee on the reporting of the debates, it was agreed they should, in 1875, begin the publication of the official debates ; but in the report of that Committee it was distinctly stipulated that the Commissioners would be authorised to make engagements, during the recess, with proper reporters, who should, under the control of the House, issue reports of its debates. A contract was made with Mr. Burgess, which, at the close of the Session of 1875, was extended by the authority of the House. But, at the close of the Session of 1876, the House failed to authorise the Committee further to extend the contract. Now, in this case, the money was voted ; yet, the House having failed to ratify the extension of the contract, neither the Government nor the Commissioners thought it within their jurisdiction to extend the contract, or enter into a fresh one. He believed that to be the true course of procedure. He thought the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Bowell) had stepped a great way out of his proper jurisdiction in taking into his own hands, or under his own control, a matter of the character that this House always regarded as belonging to its domestic economy. Under the course the Government adopted, tenders were called for in the name of Commissioners that did not exist ; and the plans and specifications were to be approved by them. The House would see, therefore, that the Government violated all law ; that their course was irregular and unprecedented ; otherwise they would not ask the House to approve of it, and condone it or indemnify them for the course adopted. He thought the House in this matter should have been consulted. The acts of the Government were an infringement on the rights of every member. He regarded the reporters on the floor of the House as strangers, not there with authority from

Mr. Ross

the House. The Government had really passed over four lower tenders than that finally accepted. The lowest for the reporting and publishing of the debates was Mr. Bradley's, amounting to \$9,658 ; the next was from Mr. Lumsden, at \$9,758 ; the next came from Mr. Gibbens, \$10,385 ; that from Mr. Boyce, \$10,825 ; Mr. Richardson's was \$11,095, not including paper.

MR. BOWELL: The others did not include paper.

MR. ROSS: No.

MR. BOWELL: Why did the hon. gentleman not say so before ?

MR. ROSS said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) thought he had made a point as to paper, but he (Mr. Ross) had distinctly mentioned "Not including paper." So there was a difference of \$1,400 between the tender accepted and the lowest. The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Bowell) could not claim that Mr. Bradley's was rejected on the ground of incapacity or incompetence, as he belonged to the *Hansard* Staff in the last and previous Sessions. The second lowest, from Mr. Lumsden, who was on the official staff four years, was that of a competent man likewise. He (Mr. Ross) was not objecting to the award on the ground of Mr. Richardson's incompetency. All agreed he was a capable and efficient reporter ; but he (Mr. Ross) had yet failed to find any satisfactory reason why four tenders, lower than his, two of them from parties equally well qualified, should have been passed by in favour of Mr. Richardson's. His hon. friend (Mr. Bowell) stated that Mr. Richardson's contract included everything, the others covering only the reporting. Well, according to the documents laid before the House, that statement was correct, and he agreed, to a certain extent, with the remark of that hon. gentleman that it was more convenient to deal with one than a number of contractors. But it was not shown that the acceptance of the lowest tenders in this case would have inconvenienced the House. MacLean, Roger & Co., whose tender for the printing was lowest, had discharged their duties as public printers with efficiency ; and it was known that Mr. Boyce, who

was, he thought, a binder, was well qualified for his work, and that all the parties who proposed for any part of the work were known to be efficient, and capable for their respective duties. So he (Mr. Ross) failed to see why his hon. friend (Mr. Bowell) who had assumed to act for the whole House, in a matter which it formerly disposed of itself, should ask them to assent to this contract which exhibited such gross irregularities. Here they had action without the consent of the House, such as was considered grossly wrong when hon. gentlemen opposite sat on the left of the Speaker. But another question existed above and beyond the change of action he had referred to, which this House had not been asked to express an opinion upon, namely, whether they should have any official reports of their debates at all or not. He thought, as the hon. the Minister of Public Works said when discussing this matter last Session, and as was said by the leader of the Government on the same occasion, that it was due to the coming Parliament that it should be consulted in regard to this matter. They were in this matter entailing considerable expense upon the country, and evidently, from the policy of the Government, they were desirous of exercising due economy in the management of the country's affairs. The cost of the official debates in 1875 exceeded \$12,000; in 1876, it exceeded \$11,000; in 1877, it amounted to \$15,356, and in 1878 the cost was \$18,963, or, in all, nearly \$60,000 had been expended during the past four years on the official reporting of the debates of the House. He thought that, before the Government entered into a contract for reporting the debates, entailing the expenditure of so large an amount of money, the approval of the House should be secured. The matter could have been very easily arranged in precisely the same way as it was disposed of by the late Government in the Session of 1877, and they would not now have to face the irregularities of having their approval of a contract asked after it had been entered into by a new Government acting for a Committee of the House, and of passing over the lowest tender. He merely called the attention of the House to these facts, that they might distinctly understand on what basis the official re-

ports of the House were going to be continued, whether in the event of a discontinuance of the contract, at the close of the Session, the Government was going to assume to continue that contract another Session of their own option, or whether the contracts were to be laid systematically before the House, or the House asked to approve of them after they had been made. These were points upon which they had a right to an expression of opinion, not only from the House, but from the Government. While he was not insisting on a discontinuance of the official reports, he would insist on the matter being regularly proceeded with, on the lowest tender being accepted if the party so tendering was competent, and he must insist on the matter being left, as heretofore, entirely in the hands and in the management of the House.

MR. HOLTON said an important point in respect to this matter was the vote of the House last Session, which in effect declared the expediency of discontinuing the system of official reports altogether. His hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell) had referred to the fact that an appropriation had been made for this purpose. There was no doubt of that. It was brought down by the late Government in their Estimates, and passed by the House before the consideration of the question of the continuance of these reports had been brought formally before the House, as was done in the report of the Committee to supervise the debates. The House objected to that report by a majority of 18—51 to 69,—leaving it to the new House to determine upon the policy of continuing the system of official reports. He thought, therefore, without prejudging the question as to the views of the present House on the subject generally, that they might fairly urge that that question ought to have been submitted to the House before any contracts were entered into, under the authority of the vote of supply which the subsequent action of the House superseded by declaring that, in their opinion, it was inexpedient to continue these reports.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was quite true that this matter was under the control of the House. If they

did not desire to have their speeches reported, all hon. members had to do was to say so, and their speeches would not be reported at the public expense. Speaking for himself and for his colleagues, he would say they were a unit on this matter. They believed it in the interest of the country, of the Government, and of the Opposition, that the debates should be fully reported, and that everything that was transacted in Parliament should be open as the day. They were of opinion that the reporting of their debates should not be left to partisan newspapers, to publish such portions of the reports as they thought expedient, *in extenso* or in part. They knew, looking at the past, what had been the result of leaving this matter to partisan newspapers. Each partisan paper published in full, and in a most flattering way, the speeches of those gentlemen who were of the same political opinions as that particular newspaper, and they slurred over the statements, arguments and debates on the other side of the question. Consequently, people throughout the country, in order to know what actually was proceeding in Parliament, were obliged to take not only papers of the same political stripe as themselves, but to subscribe to, and keep up opposition newspapers. He did not think that was satisfactory to the country. In England, although *Hansard* there had been started by voluntary subscription, the matter was at present before the British Parliament, and he thought that the result of their action would be that there would be a contribution to keep up the official report of the debates. They knew that the newspapers in England formerly gave the debates in Parliament *in extenso*, but of late years they had found that it did not pay. They found it was more profitable to give telegraphic and other information rather than Parliamentary reports, and the debates now published in the *Times* were infinitely more perfunctory, and not so full or so accurate as they were fifty years ago. He thought the people of the country should have an opportunity of reading the debates in full, and it was for the House to say whether they agreed with that opinion or not. If they did not agree, all they had to do was to reject the motion of his hon. friend (Mr.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Bowell). The reason the four members of the Government who assisted the Speaker as a Committee of Internal Management took upon themselves the responsibility of making this provisional contract—and it was not a contract until it was sanctioned by the House—was because, as every one knew, a reporting staff could not be got together in one day. It was a matter that had to be carefully prepared. Had it been left to the House, half the Session would have expired before the necessary arrangements could have been completed, and an efficient staff selected. If the Government had erred, it was for the purpose of enabling this Parliament to have its debates reported without any delay. He believed the House would sanction the course the Government had taken. With respect to the point raised by the hon. gentleman from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) about the tenders, he would leave that in the hands of the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell), who understood the question much better than he (Sir John A. Macdonald) did, and would be able to give full explanations to the satisfaction of even his hon. friend from West Middlesex.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had not answered the point raised by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), namely, that the last expression of Parliament, ten days before the prorogation, was hostile to this action, and that the hon. gentleman had chosen to invite tenders and make a selection in the face of the parliamentary declaration that it was not advisable that that should be done. Some years ago, a temporary provision was made and submitted to Parliament the very first day it met, in anticipation of the House adopting the report of the Committee. That could have been done this time, and then it would have been left in the hands of Parliament.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was told that the vote in question was taken at the end of the Session, in the absence of 85 members of the House. The hon. gentleman said that there was a vote of Parliament. There was an expression of an expiring Parliament, that they did not want the debates of a future Parliament reported, and this he did not

think should carry with it any extraordinary degree of weight. The contract had not been made. It was merely a provisional contract, and would not be a contract until it was confirmed by the House. The Government took the responsibility, and, in doing so, he did not think they offered a very great insult to the House, or committed so very violent a breach of the privileges of the House. He supposed the individual members of the Government would pay Mr. Richardson out of their own pockets, or appeal to their faithful friends to aid them in doing so, if Parliament should refuse the vote. It was quite true that, at the fag end of a moribund Parliament—to use the favourite expression of his hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton);—there was a vote saying that there should be an exclusion of light for the future; but he thought the country, which had very substantially changed the complexion of Parliament, and had sent other men to represent it who were not afraid of the light, was desirous of having the speeches made in Parliament spread before them, and the conduct of their representatives scrutinised.

Mr. HOLTON said he admitted that the vote of the last House did not bind this House; but what he contended was that the sense of this new House, fresh from the people, should have been taken before the Government took the initiative. The hon. gentlemen, when they entered into this contract, had not become members of the House—they had not made their appearance in the Chamber, nor had they taken the oath of office. They did it in their capacity as members of the Executive Government. He had no doubt that the hon. gentlemen would be supported by the House in this matter, but they were not in a position to assume the initiative.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD asked if there was not a vote of a sum of money for this purpose by the late Government.

Mr. HOLTON: Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Supply Bill was adopted and passed after the discussion in the House in reference to the report. The last act of Parliament was the sanction by both Houses

of the vote for this purpose, and that after the expression against the continuance of the official reports.

Mr. HOLTON said that the vote against the expediency of continuing these reports was brought up after the vote of supply had been taken. Nobody thought of amending the Supply Bill, and he maintained that, in view of the last expression of opinion on the part of the House, no contract should have been made until the sense of the new House had been taken.

Mr. MILLS said the hon. the leader of the Government (Sir John A. Macdonald) had not so high a regard for a moribund Parliament as he had at one time, or as his colleague the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tupper) had on a very recent occasion. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that the acts of a moribund Parliament were not as binding on the Government as the acts of a Parliament newly from the people; but, when he carried through the scheme of Confederation, he took an entirely different view of the subject. The people were not consulted, and care was taken that they should not be left in a position that they could repudiate what had been done by a moribund Legislature. The hon. gentleman attached importance to this principle in inverse ratio to the importance of the subject-matter in the public estimation. He (Mr. Mills) had changed his opinion on this subject. When it was first proposed to Parliament, he supported it, because he considered that the representatives of the people in Parliament ought not to be dependent upon the goodwill of the various newspapers in the country for reports of the debates. He felt then that there was a great deal of force in the views which the hon. gentleman had to-day repeated with regard to newspaper reports, that newspapers friendly to a particular party reported what members of that party said on the subjects which came before this House very fully, while the members of the opposite party were not reported at all, or, if at all, very briefly or inaccurately reported. Further, that the newspapers away from the Capital received their reports mostly by telegraph, for publication the next morning. The later in the evening the

discussion took place, the more were the reports abridged, and, as the evening advanced, very important discussions were scarcely reported at all. These were the mischiefs which he had hoped to see overcome. They had had three or four years' trial of parliamentary reporting, and, in his opinion, it had proved very unsatisfactory. Scarcely two pages of the official reports could be examined in which gross mistakes would not be found. He had hoped, when the proposition was first made, that those reports would reach the public at an early date; that, when a debate took place, the official report would appear on the morrow, to be available to the various newspapers in the country. That expectation had not been realised—they were still dependent upon the reports of the metropolitan dailies. The official reports appeared two or three weeks after the debates took place; and so far as being available for newspaper purposes was concerned, they had been an entire failure. The Premier had stated it was necessary to have a report free from partisan bias. He (Mr. Mills) had been told that certain newspapers had made arrangements with the official reporters of the House to be furnished with the official reports of the debates. He asked was it not obvious that the reports, to some extent, would have to be suited to the exigencies of the journals requiring the official reports? Either reports should be furnished indiscriminately to all the newspapers, or to none at all. The official reporters, who were, or were about to become, the paid officers of this House,—the parties who entered into a contract, under the sanction of this House, for the purpose of reporting and publishing the debates,—had no right to enter into a contract for the purpose of selling the fruits of their labours to the various newspapers in the country. That had been done, and it was, therefore, not likely that the official reports would be free from partisan bias. The duties of the reporters to the House and to the newspapers were incompatible. Past experience proved that these reports were not to be relied upon. Sometimes the reporter failed to hear or to correctly apprehend the speaker. Some parties were reported in the first, and some in the third person. In some cases, every extract, whether important or unimportant,

MR. MILLS.

appeared in the report; and in other cases the reports were meagre, and a simple reference to extracts or quotations appeared. The hon. gentleman had said that this contract was not binding on the House; that it could be annulled by the House, if it chose. But the Government had made the contract, and had not left it to a Committee of the House. It was quite clear the House must accept the arrangement as made by the Government, or dispense with the reporting of the debates altogether.

Mr. ANGLIN said there was still a point not alluded to which should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. This matter, as well as all cognate matters, should have been brought under the consideration of the House as soon as possible after it met; immediately after the Address had been disposed of, or, possibly, even before the Address was taken into consideration. Nevertheless, a whole fortnight had been allowed to elapse before this House had been asked to pass judgment on the contract. This showed a very great want of respect to the House, though the majority of its members might approve of what the hon. gentleman had done, might affirm that it was proper on the part of the hon. mover of this resolution to allow it to lie on the paper for days, because he chose to attend to a matter in which the Government felt more interest. The Government having chosen to disregard the distinct declaration of the House at the close of last Session that it was not expedient to make any provision for the official reporting of the debates, should, at least, have submitted their action for the approval of the House at the very earliest moment possible. It would have been almost as well to have waited until the end of the Session, and then asked the House to ratify what had been done, as to wait until more than a fortnight had elapsed.

Mr. TUPPER said he did not think the House would come to the conclusion, after this discussion, that there had been any want of respect to the last or the present House of Commons. He did not at all agree with the hon. member for Bothwell, who said that he had been in favour of having the debates reported, but had changed his opinion. He (Mr. Tupper) had come to a very different con-

clusion. Whatever doubts he might have had as to the advisability of having an official printed report of the debates had certainly been removed by the result of the past. The fact that the Sessions of this Parliament were held in a city where the resources of the press were not so great as in the larger cities of the Dominion rendered it almost indispensable to have an official report of the debates, if the country were to be furnished with a fair and full statement of what took place. The press in the larger cities, in Montreal and Toronto for instance, had to be furnished with reports by telegraph in order that they should be presented promptly to their readers; and it had been found as the result of this, as had been stated by the leader of the Government, that the country had been treated to *ex-parte* reports of the discussions of the House. In view of this fact, a large majority of the members on both sides had come to the conclusion that it was necessary to have an impartial and official report of the debates. All the efforts made by hon. gentlemen who were opposed to having a full, fair and impartial report of the debates against the *Hansard*, made in the presence of a full House, during the late Parliament, had failed, and only at the close of the Session, when the House was denuded of a large body of its members, did their efforts succeed. The system was continued down to the last moment. The Government brought down at the last Session of Parliament, a vote of \$15,000 to provide for the official reports, and obtained the assent of the House to that vote at the last moment, after the discussions had taken place; after this effort had been made on the part of hon. gentlemen at the close of the Session, when eighty-five members had gone to their homes; to undo, in their absence, the policy the entire House had sustained whenever presented. As far as this Government was concerned, it had evidence that the independent sentiment of the large majority of the whole Parliament of this Dominion was in favour of having an official report of the debates. The question then arose, how was that to be carried out? Every one knew it would be utterly impossible to secure an efficient report if it was left to the House to take

up the question, after the gentlemen, whose services might be obtained, were employed elsewhere. The Government, therefore, knowing this system had become a settled policy, made the arrangements to carry it out, in advance. It was not in the interest of any particular political party, but in the interests of the whole country, of all who wished that a sound and healthy sentiment should be brought to bear on the action of this House, that there should be some means taken to which all parties could confidently appeal as showing what had taken place within this Parliament. The question now was whether they should have this official report or not. In the contract made was the condition "subject to the approval of the House." The hon. member for Bothwell had intimated that the reports would be partisan, that the Government had made a contract with parties who were susceptible to political influence, and who had made arrangements to furnish papers with a portion of the debates. The Government had entered into a contract with Mr. Richardson, the gentleman who had been placed at the head of that service by the hon. gentlemen opposite when in power. No other gentleman had ever attempted to impugn the fairness and impartiality with which Mr. Richardson had discharged his duties, and there was no reason to insinuate for a single moment that any attempt had been made to obtain any other than the most fair and impartial report possible. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had done Mr. Richardson the justice to say that he had no reason to doubt the impartiality with which he had discharged his duties, and in saying this had done him but simple justice. He (Mr. Tupper) had never regarded Mr. Richardson as a political friend, but had always considered him as a gentleman who had fulfilled his duties conscientiously and with the utmost courtesy to every member. As to the question of cost, what was the fact? The late Government had brought down an amount of \$15,000, and the expenditure during the past year was \$18,000; yet hon. gentlemen would appear to complain when the contract laid on the table reduced the expenditure to \$11,000, and provided for more efficient and prompt service.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): But the size is limited to 1,500 pages.

MR. TUPPER said a thousand pages could be taken from the last volume without detracting from its value. The statement that there were lower tenders passed over was hardly, he thought, sustained by the fact. The tender accepted was really the lowest one for the whole service, and every person knew—and no one better than the hon. member for Middlesex—the great advantage of having one man responsible instead of two or three; it was better that the House should deal with some person who had the whole work in his hands, and who was responsible to the House, under his contract, for the efficient performance of the duty. He trusted that the contract would receive the support of gentlemen on both sides of the House, as it had always done before. He believed that, whatever difference of opinion might have existed between a large number of gentlemen on both sides of the House, and whatever views might have been entertained on the subject, they all agreed in the importance of their statements in this House being correctly given to the country through the means of an official report of the debates.

MR. HUNTINGTON said that last year he was one of those who thought that there should be some discussion of the question of the continuance of the system of reporting as it existed. He was not quite convinced that a record of the debates of Parliament would be useful to the House. He had come to the conclusion that there were a great many speeches made in the House that might be dispensed with. He had no doubt that it was highly important to Parliament that an intelligent record of the discussion of public affairs should in some way be kept, so that the public should have an opportunity of seeing the motives by which they were influenced; but he did not at all believe in three-hour speeches, and the *Hansard* had encouraged three-hour speeches. He did not say that the man who spoke for three hours was a great orator, and posterity could get on very well if they were not obliged to read these speeches. Owing to the *Hansard*, speech after speech which public interest did not require had

been delivered at a great tedious, and expensive length. Members should have been permitted to discuss this question freely before a Committee; but the Government had forced the House to support them. Did any one mean to say that this was an open question, or that gentlemen sent here to vote for the Government were permitted to give an independent vote? Lengthy speeches, owing to the *Hansard*, had become a nuisance, but the Government had deliberately interfered, and brought down a motion which they knew their friends would sustain, whether these hon. gentlemen believed the action of the Government was right or wrong. The House was now compelled to laboriously listen to speeches which would never be delivered were there no *Hansard*.

MR. CASEY said that he was in favour of official reporting as a general principle. There was need for some official record. The objections raised were not so much to official reporting, as to the manner in which it was conducted. He was prepared to agree that the reporting was in many ways defective, owing, perhaps, in great measure, to the carelessness of the parties interested, who did not take the trouble to revise their speeches. But the question now was not on the desirability of an official report. It had been put most clearly by his hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton). It was not a question as to whether official reporting was desirable, or whether the present system was desirable; but whether the Government had the right to let the contract without submitting it to the House. He thought that the reason given by the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tupper) for the action of the Government, that it was impossible to take up the question after the House had met, was a very peculiar one. He must remember that a few Sessions ago the House found itself in the same position as it did this year. The House met in a new Session, without any definite arrangements having been previously made. Some preliminary arrangements were made, as his hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had stated, before the opening of

MR. TUPPER.

Parliament; but the initiative on that occasion was taken by the hon. gentleman, the then Premier, on the second day of the meeting of the House, by moving for a Committee, and, if he recollects aright, it was only about a week after the opening before the reporting of the debates was in full working order. He believed they had very satisfactory reporting that Session. The hon. the leader of the Government had stated that the Government were anxious to have light, and that the party which had gone out of power were adverse to light. They would imagine, from the zeal he had shown in providing for the diffusion of their light by official reports, that something of immense importance was going to be done as soon as the House met. They would really think that the great National Policy was going to be introduced at once. He thought that they would find, by the experience of the past two weeks, that the country would lose no more by cutting off the reports for the first two weeks of the Session, than by the cutting out of one thousand pages of the *Hansard*, referred to by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tupper). He believed that official reporting could have been organised at an early period of the Session, even if no previous provision had been made for the reporting of the debates; that even if this had been possible the loss to the public would not have been great, and that, even had it been impossible to have official debates at all this Session, the loss would have been less than that caused by the infringement of the privileges of the House which Ministers had committed.

Mr. OUIMET said it was very important that the electors should know what their representatives said in the House, so that they might be able to judge whether they fulfilled their engagements contracted after the elections were over. It was therefore important that speeches delivered here should be correctly reported. But if it was important for the public to know what took place in the House, it must also be borne in mind that there were two large portions of the population, who spoke different languages, but who possessed equal rights. It must be borne in mind that the French-speaking public had the same right to know what occurred in this House, to know it immediately and cor-

rectly, as the English-speaking public. It must be borne in mind that those members of the House who represented at least a third of the population of the Dominion had a right to receive the *Hansard* at a proper and convenient time, in order to take cognisance thereof. But, by referring to the past, it would be seen that the French portion of the population had two great and important complaints to make with regard to the *Hansard*. The first was that the translation of the *Hansard* had always been badly done; so much so that, when a member came to read what he had said or to read in French a speech delivered in that language, he almost always failed to recognise his own words, and it was impossible to understand what had been said. It must not be forgotten either, that heretofore there had been no French reporter in the House, and that the members who thought fit to speak in French, their mother-tongue, would not be reported otherwise than in English. During the preceding Session, the translation of the *Hansard* had never been ready until a fortnight or three weeks after the speeches had been printed and distributed in English. He believed that these complaints were well grounded, and, if he thought that the new Committee, which would be appointed to superintend the printing and translation of the *Hansard*, would not take these complaints into consideration, he would certainly be one of those who would vote against the expenditure of \$10,000 or \$15,000 for a report that would be useless, or nearly so, for a third of the population of the Dominion and for a third of the members of the House. He hoped that this year neither the members of the House nor the public would have occasion to reiterate these complaints. He might add that, being assured that this wrong would be righted, and that justice would be done to himself and to all the French members, and to the French-speaking public, he was in favour of the official reporting of the debates. As to the other question, he believed that the Government was not so very much to blame for having made provision for a report from the beginning of the Session. He believed, on the contrary, that the Government, in doing so, had given a conclusive answer to those opposition papers that claimed that the present Adminis-

tration would not fulfil the promises they had given to the electors. It seemed to him that the Government had shown that they had no objection to having all that was said in Parliament by hon. Ministers placed before the public; and the public would see that the members and the friends of the Government had been sincere in the promises they had given to their constituents. The public would be convinced that these members had acted in good faith, and that they were now disposed to allow the public to compare their former professions made before the elections with the professions they might make in this House when called upon to give their support to Sir John A. Macdonald's Administration.

Mr. LANGEVIN said that he entirely agreed with the hon. member who had just sat down, as to the reporting of the debates in French. Certainly during the last Session, and during the whole of the last Parliament, members had to complain bitterly and often of the manner in which the debates were reported in French, and of the delays that always occurred in transmitting the reports to the House. Members were sometimes more than a month waiting for the report of a discussion. Consequently these reports were merely a book of reference for the future, but could be of no utility during the Session, and the French members could only refer to the English reports. For several of them this was no easy matter. He must however state to his hon. friend the member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) that, in the provisional contract that had been entered into, and that the House was called upon to ratify, it had been provided that the French speeches should be reported by French reporters in the language in which they were delivered. Consequently, the French-speaking members would have the same advantages as the English-speaking members. As to the translation, it had also been provided with the contractor that it should be done by special translators, by capable men acquainted with the political questions of the day, and who would not make hon. members say that which they had not said.

Mr. OUMET asked if the translation would be given from day to day.

MR. OUMET.

Mr. LANGEVIN said that the translation might be delayed a day or two, but the hon. member would himself see that it would not be often behind-hand. Members would certainly have a right to complain if the debates were delayed a fortnight, as they were during the last Session, and he was convinced that the Committee would not fail to see that the contractor was kept strictly to his contract. As to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and some other hon. members who had expressed their opinion as to the necessity of having an official report of the debates of the House, he readily understood that they had changed their mind. They had often had placed before their eyes, during the late election, those two portly volumes that had certainly reduced the number of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and now they would not have this system continued, because it had proved fatal to them. This official report was absolutely necessary, not only in the interest of the people now, but in the interest of future generations. It was well that it should be known what members had said in times gone by. The reports given by the newspapers were neither complete enough nor reliable enough. To-day, when they wished to refer to the debates of former Legislative Assemblies, they had no means of doing so. The utterances of the greatest speakers of that period had not been reported. They had but a shadow, a mere tradition, of what such or such a speaker of former days had said, and one might seek in vain for these speeches in the reports of the newspapers. Nothing was left. By looking into the history of this country, it would be seen that we had but a sample, as it were, of what our great orators had said. The question was not only to know what these men had thought, but also what had been the good and sound reasons for their acting in such or such a manner. With the official report, as they now had it, there was no doubt that they were in a far better position, for the present and for the future; and he would add that the report now published by the contractor seemed to be reliable. He had had occasion, yesterday, to read over some remarks that he had made during the day, and the report

had been placed before him about three hours after the remarks had been made. And he admitted that the report was a very good one, considering how reports were generally made here, especially when members spoke without paying any attention to the reporters, and without even knowing whether they were present. Often, in the midst of a debate, members would forget that there was some one taking down their words, and would, therefore, speak too quickly for the reporters. He trusted that the remarks that he had just made would meet the objections raised by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), and that he would not fail to support the motion which had just been submitted by his hon. friend the Minister of Customs.

MR. SPRULE said he believed that, if an expression of opinion on this question was asked for from the young members of this House, a very large majority of them would be inclined to support the motion of the hon. the Minister of Customs. Every young member in this House had felt the benefits accruing from the *Hausard* reports. Moreover, it was a great advantage to have a reliable and true official report of the debates in this House, since the newspaper reports were too often partial and one-sided. When one considered the contradictions and disputes that arose throughout the country with regard to the course or expression of members in Parliament, the importance of having official reports to fall back upon was very evident. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had said that the experience of the past had not been very satisfactory in respect to the *Hausard*. But this could only apply to the manner in which the report of the debates had been made, and not to the principle itself. He believed that the principle of having official reports was sound, and needed only to be properly carried into practice. If the hon. gentlemen charged last year with securing official reports had not been able to perform that duty satisfactorily, another committee, more conversant with the matter, might succeed much better.

MR. DESJARDINS said that he had been on the Select Committee appointed to superintend the reporting of the debates during the last Parliament, and,

he believed it his duty to say a word in answer to certain remarks made by his friend the member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) upon the French translation of the debates. It would be unjust to allow these remarks to pass without removing the responsibility that would seem to rest upon the French translators of the House for the errors and delays that might have been complained of in the French version. If there had been inaccuracies in the French version, they were due rather to the system itself, which made it necessary for the translators to translate mechanically the English debates that were put into their hands, and deprived them of the means of doing justice to the French version. It would be remembered that French-speaking members of this House had seen their speeches submitted to a short-hand translation, that was to say, their speeches were reported immediately in English, so that the translators had to re-translate from English speeches originally delivered in French. It would be understood that it was impossible for them to do entire justice to speeches reported in such a manner. He could himself bear testimony to the pains these gentlemen had taken in order to do justice to the French-speaking members; and, if delays and inaccuracies had occurred in their work, it was entirely without any fault of theirs. They had done all in their power to do justice to every one. As to the subject which was now occupying the House, it seemed to him to be reduced to a question as to whether the Government had done wrong in adopting the measures they had taken in order to make sure that there should be an official report of the debates of the House from the very opening of the Session. A large majority of the members understood that, having two official languages, it was impossible for a great many members to fully comprehend the discussions which took place in the House, either in English or in French, unless these discussions were reported in the native tongue of each speaker. He looked upon the reporting of the debates in both languages as a mere act of justice to the two nationalities. The French-speaking members had interests that they had every reason to make known to the English-speaking majority; and, on the other hand, those who spoke the English

language were interested in making known to the French population their aspirations, their wants, and their opinions. He thought that the publication of the debates in both languages was the only really practicable means they possessed of arriving at this result. The newspapers could not answer this purpose, for the French press had but a very limited number of English readers, and very few French read the English papers, so that it was quite insufficient to leave the reporting in the hands of the press, as had been suggested. The official report of the debates, as they now had it, was exactly what they required in order to arrive at this full understanding, and to acquire this necessary knowledge of the opinions entertained by English and French-speaking members. For these reasons, he believed that the Government was right in having overlooked the petty spites of some of the members of the Opposition, who could not readily forgive the *Hansard* for what it had done for them during the late elections, and in giving the country the benefit of this official report.

MR. CURRIER said that, now that the contract had been entered into, it must be carried out; but he must say that, if he were at perfect liberty to vote as he liked upon this question, he should be inclined to vote against the expenditure of \$15,000 or \$16,000 for this purpose. He thought that, if the taxpayers of the country could be consulted on the matter, they would be willing to forego the luxury or pleasure of perusing the *Hansard* for the next year, and keep the money which it cost in their pockets; and he thought the reporting of debates might be fairly left to the enterprise of the public journals of the country. If there were no *Hansard*, the newspapers would report the debates at much greater length than they did now. They would put on a larger staff of reporters, and take the trouble to obtain more correct reports.

MR. VALLÉE said he believed it to be his duty to take exception to a remark made by several members of the Opposition who had reproached Conservative members with their want of independence, and had accused the Government of being supported by a servile majority.

MR. DESJARDINS.

Happily the Government was supported by a very large majority in this House, but it was an intelligent majority, composed of members who would be able, when circumstances required it, to express their opinion and cast their vote according to the dictates of their conscience. It was not a majority that would continue to support a Government that was admittedly in the wrong, as the Liberal party had confessed they had done after the late elections. The Conservative party was very strong in the House and in the country; but, if it should unhappily occur that the present Government should fail to recognise just claims, this party would not hesitate to condemn the Government, or oblige them to fulfil their promises. As to the contract entered into for the publication of the debates, he thought that those who had undertaken this task were worthy of confidence, and that the Government had acted wisely.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said there was but one opinion in the House as to the importance of an official record of the debates of Parliament. He thought hon. gentlemen opposite had all admitted that proposition. True, some of them confessed to a change of opinion as to it, but he could not imagine their arguments to justify that change would be accepted by any other hon. members. If, for instance, the reports were unreliable, it was because hon. gentlemen were unwilling to take the trouble to revise them; they had thus only themselves to thank. Every member could correct the reporter's notes of his speech. If members were not to be judged by these official reports, which they all had the opportunity of supervising, they ought not to be called upon to be judged by the reports in the daily press, brief as they necessarily were. He was not a reporter himself; he never had the industry to acquire that wonderful art, but he had, for a quarter of a century, enjoyed very pleasant relations with the gentlemen of the Press Gallery, and could say he believed that, in no department of labour, were there men who worked more conscientiously, more industriously, more perseveringly to perform their whole and simple duty to his House, than the gentlemen engaged in its reporting. But they had great

difficulties to labour under in their efforts to please everyone. A complete report of each day's sittings of the House would require about twenty four columns of the daily press. It was quite clear that no newspaper could give such lengthy reports. The average reports of the largest papers were about eight columns, or about one-third of the whole amount of a full report. Under those circumstances, to depend on the enterprise of the daily press would deprive the House of anything like a full report.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The *Hansard* is not to be a full report either.

Mr. WHITE: It would be fuller than the newspaper reports. Then the reporters in the gallery, who worked industriously and conscientiously, were subject to orders from their offices, probably at eight or nine o'clock, to cut down their reports of debates, owing to pressure of other matter. The subjects at the time being discussed might be those in relation to which they might most desire official, reliable reports; but, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the papers, ample reports could not be expected of them. Considering the difficulties of reporters and newspapers at such times, it was not to be wondered at that the almost unanimous sentiment of the House favoured an official report. They were told Government had interfered with the privileges of Parliament, which was not free to act in this matter; but, what were they doing this afternoon, but discussing the question as a free Parliament—whether those gentlemen on the floor of the House should continue reporting their debates? That charge on the Opposition side was extraordinary. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had complained that the official reporter had undertaken to supply reports to the newspapers. Precisely the same thing was done by Mr. Burgess, the former contractor, under the direction of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), chairman of the Committee at that time, who was a full consenting party to that arrangement. The very same newspapers which received those reports then had made the same arrangement, for the same reason, with the present contractor. He hoped the resolution would pass. He

thought the Government was entitled to thanks for having made a provisional arrangement, and he hoped that the contractor this year would be able to give the House a report somewhat more promptly than during the past year.

Mr. MACDOUGALL said, as an old member of Parliament, who had been sometimes very badly reported, and occasionally misreported, he was in favour of an official report of the debates of this Parliament. One reason, which he had not heard mentioned, was that he thought it important that, this Parliament representing the different Provinces, in which questions sometimes arose specially interesting to them as Provinces, that the Local Governments, the Local Legislatures and the officials of those Provinces, should have an opportunity of observing what their own representatives, as well as those from other parts of the Dominion, might say thereon. They could not really obtain this advantage through the ordinary newspaper reports; because it happened that the leading Ontario and Quebec newspapers naturally desired to furnish the information most interesting to their readers and, therefore, would not take the same pains to report discussions affecting the remote Provinces as were observed in reference to local topics. In matters of great importance to the outlying districts of the Dominion, the newspapers often gave little or no information whatever. It was, therefore, right to afford hon. gentlemen from the smaller and remote Provinces an official report of such debates. But it seemed to him also that there was an enormous amount of matter which, both for the credit of speakers, and the convenience of readers, should be omitted altogether from the official report. Brief reports or summaries should be the rule in particular questions of little consequence. The annual volume might thus be lessened and made more portable and suitable for reference. Many questions and matters of business came up that were sufficiently reported in the journals of the House; they did not require elaborate speeches in such cases. Moreover, a knowledge of the fact that there would be full reports at certain times was embarrassing, and prevented new members from speaking with the freedom they ought

to enjoy. With regard to this class of subjects there should be a means of informing the reporters that their notes need only be written in brief. In the large volumes of past years he saw the most trifling statements—of no concern to anybody outside the House—were spread out in wearisome detail. In this telegraphic age, the bulkiness of such volumes was a great objection to them. Upon the general question, that they should have to preserve an extended official impartial report, he, for one, did not agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He believed the reporters did their duty conscientiously, though they might sometimes unintentionally misrepresent a speaker whom they had not heard distinctly. Some of their difficulties arose from the bad acoustic properties of this building, and some were owing to the indistinctness of speakers themselves. In regard to the question of interference with the privileges of the House by Ministers, he was as determined as hon. gentlemen opposite to preserve their privileges intact against ministerial encroachments. But a certain discretion must be allowed to the Government even in this House,—a certain control in the conduct of business,—which was permitted, under the English parliamentary system. In this matter he could see nothing to censure, so far as they had gone. The agreement for reporting was only conditional; otherwise they would not now be discussing it. He (Mr. Macdougall) expected, and the country expected, hon. gentlemen opposite would have challenged the speech from the Throne, and that they would have had a long discussion upon the programme of the Government, as well as the policy of the Opposition, including the modifications it had received at the hands of the people. Such a debate would have been instructive to new members, and suggestive and advantageous to the Government themselves in the preparation of their measures. But they chose to avoid that discussion, and, therefore, they had been precipitated into the middle of business, probably before it was ready for them. Now, if they had had such a debate, it would have been fortunate that preparation had been made for a full report. The opinion of an expiring Parliament, expressed when

MR. MACDOUGALL.

many members had left, was not binding on them, and could not be binding upon their successors in a new Parliament. It was presumptuous in the late House, at such a time, to deal with this matter, which they might have left to those who had been elected for this very purpose. He hoped the Committee would be composed of the older members of the House, experienced in the matter, and that they would adopt means to shorten the reports of those useless debates which would occasionally take place in Parliament.

MR. BOWELL said he desired to make one or two remarks in reply to the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). He would not further discuss the question of an alleged interference with the rights of Parliament. He remembered distinctly, a few years ago, a point of order having been taken upon the submission of a report of the Reporting Committee by the member for Chateauguay, on which the report was defeated, thus leaving the incoming House the next year in precisely the same position as the action of the House last year left this one.

MR. HOLTON: Not the incoming House, but the same House in a succeeding Session.

MR. BOWELL said that his hon. friend the member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) had, two or three Sessions ago, at the close of the Session, taken advantage of a technicality in order to prevent a report made by a Special Committee, whose duty it was to supervise the reporting of the debates from being adopted. The late Government, believing that the official reporting of the debates should be continued, notwithstanding the fact that the House had not affirmed the principle, made a temporary arrangement with reporters who commenced the work at the commencement of the Session, and the House of Commons afterward confirmed what the Government had done, and appointed a committee to which was relegated the supervision and control of the reports and the publication of the debates in precisely the same manner as the Government at present proposed to do, providing the contract was confirmed by the House. It had been said by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton),

also by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross), and repeated by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), that the negative vote of the House last year upon the motion to adopt the report of the Special Committee was a disapproval of an official report altogether. Such was not the fact. That report was a very short one, and simply asked the House to give power to the Speaker to make provision for the reporting during the present Session of Parliament. To this proposition the House said no.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) : During the opening days of the Session.

MR. BOWELL said that was precisely what the Government had done. The Committee stated that they had not had time to complete a system by which the reporting could be done more perfectly, and asked the House to give the Speaker power to make temporary arrangements until the House could meet, and the House refused to adopt the report. Why they would not place that power in the hands of the Speaker, it was for the House to say, and not him. The argument of the hon. member for Middlesex was, if he might use the expression without being disrespectful, disingenuous. He said Mr. Bradley's tender was for nine thousand odd dollars, and that Mr. Lumsden's was between \$9,000 and \$10,000. The hon. gentleman, having had the tenders in his hands, knew well that Mr. Bradley and Mr. Lumsden only tendered for the reporting; yet, the hon. gentleman left the impression upon the House that these gentlemen's tenders covered the whole work. The hon. gentleman, having been Chairman of the Committee, and having had full control of the management and reporters for the last two or three years, knew that the difficulties which presented themselves, and which caused so much complaint, particularly on the part of the French-speaking gentlemen of the House, were, from the delays which constantly occurred from the system which had been adopted for the translation of the speeches, contrary to his own (Mr. Bowell's) efforts. The translators of the House were employed to do this work, a system he thought highly objectionable and improper, taking them, as it did, to a greater or lesser extent, from their legi-

timate work. When members complained, the contractor was questioned, and he referred the Committee to the printers, and the printers laid the fault at the door of the proof-readers or translators. The blame was thrown from one to the other, like a shuttlecock, until it was almost impossible to fasten the blame on anyone. He admitted that, had they divided the tenders and given the work out to four different persons, it might have been done for from five to six hundred dollars less than the tender of Mr. Richardson; but, having in view the difficulties that had presented themselves in the past, he thought every member of the House, and particularly the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), would approve of the action of the Government in this matter. He did not intend to delay the House with a criticism of the position taken by the different gentlemen who had spoken on the subject. He, too, had changed his mind on this subject, like some of the hon. gentlemen who had preceded him. When the question first came before Parliament, he voted against it, but after watching closely and seeing the way in which hon. gentlemen would explain away opinions to which they had given utterance in the House, he came to the conclusion that it was in the interest of the country that they should have an official report. He had no doubt the present Opposition would find it to their advantage—that was, if the Government committed itself in the same way their predecessors had—when the next election came round, just as the late Opposition found it to their advantage to have an official report at the last election. If there was any one thing more than another that tended to enlighten the people on the policy of the late Government, it was the official report of the sayings and doings in the House. He was of opinion official reporting would prove a check in future to all Governments, and, in addition, enable the people to know precisely what their representatives said in Parliament, thereby enabling them to judge of their utterances and acts. The member for Gloucester stated that the question had been delayed for nine days, on account of his (Mr. Bowell's) absence. The gentleman knew that statement was not in

accordance with fact, he having been absent from the city but one day upon which the House sat, having left on Saturday and returned on Tuesday. He would not retort as he might do, but simply remind him that his (Mr. Bowell's) work was not altogether fruitless, as he would see in a few days when the hon. member elect for East Hastings was introduced.

Motion agreed to, on a division.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bowell, for the appointment of a Select Committee to supervise the official reports of the debates of the House during the present Session, *read*.

Motion agreed to.

WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYEES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR McCALLUM moved for return giving the names of all the permanent employes engaged in the working and management of the old Welland Canal, their ages and date of appointment, the salary paid each, and allowance for house rent and travelling expenses, if any; and positions in which they are employed.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSFER OF RIVER TRENT NAVIGATION WORKS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. KEELER moved for copies of all Orders in Council relating to the transfer by the Dominion to the Ontario Government of the River Trent and Newcastle District Navigation and Canal Works; also, of all correspondence upon the subject of such transfer; also, a statement of all sales and leases of lands, hydraulic powers and other property connected with the said works, and of the covenants or conditions binding on the Government, entered into with the purchasers or lessees; also, a statement of the total number of acres of land overflowed and for which compensation was paid at the time of construction of said works, and of the lands acquired by the Government for the purposes of such navigation and works; also, a statement of the total cost of said works up to the latest returns.

Motion agreed to.

MR. BOWELL.

SALMON-HATCHERY ON FRASER RIVER, B.C.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. McINNES moved for copies of all correspondence since May, 1877, relative to establishing a salmon-hatchery on the Fraser River, British Columbia. He said that the salmon-canning business of British Columbia was in its infancy, and that the present was the time to extend that protection and fostering care necessary to make it a permanent industry, and a source of wealth and revenue to the country. Six years ago there was no salmon-canning establishment in the entire Province. Now they had no less than ten, all of which were situated in the district he had the honour to represent. Eight of these were on the Fraser River—six in the city of New Westminster, and two within ten miles of the city. He found, by the Report of the Inspector of Fisheries for British Columbia, last year, that there were 555 fishermen, 1,530 shoremen, besides 18 boat-builders and 16 coopers, making a total of 2,519 men who were engaged in this enterprise during the last fishing season on the Lower Fraser. The combined labours of these showed that the very large amount of 5,051 barrels and 5,048,880 cans of salmon were taken from the Fraser River last year. As he had not the report of the other two canning establishments of the district, which are on the Netx and Skeena Rivers, he was unable to give the precise catch; but, from reliable information, the catch there was equally satisfactory to that on the Fraser. The run of salmon on the Fraser River generally commenced about the first week in July and continued to the middle of September. On the Columbia River in Oregon, U.S., the run set in in the middle of May and continued until the 15th September, thus it would be seen the run of the Columbia River was twice as long as that on the Fraser River. The reason why his constituents—he might say every constituency in British Columbia—were so anxious to have a salmon-hatchery on the Fraser, was not so much for the propagation of their own fish in order to keep up the supply, as for the introduction of the Columbia River salmon, which would give employment to thousands of the labouring classes during

four months of the year instead of two as at present. He did not see why British Columbia should not have a salmon-hatchery as well as other Provinces of the Dominion, especially when it was considered the Pacific Province did not participate in the advantages of the fishery clause in the Washington Treaty. He trusted the Government would favourably consider the matter, and make provision for it in the Estimates.

Motion agreed to.

DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY IN RED RIVER REBELLION.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. IVES moved for a return of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and Roderick McKenzie, of the township of Melbourne, county of Richmond, with reference to the destruction of certain property belonging to said Roderick McKenzie, in the Red River Rebellion of 1869-70, together with all vouchers and documents produced in connection with the matter, and all Orders in Council and Departmental Orders bearing upon the subject. He said Mr. McKenzie had moveable property at Fort Garry when the fort was taken by the rebels under Riel. The property remained there when the rebels left, and was taken possession of by the Government troops, either as plunder or in the belief that it was Government property. A correspondence took place between the Government authorities and Mr. McKenzie, and the last letter received by Mr. McKenzie was from the Treasury Board, to the effect that the Government had not power to compensate him for the loss without the authority of Parliament. He hoped the Government would, therefore, act in the matter and take the initiative by bringing down an amount in the Estimates to make the matter right.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there could be no objection to bring down these papers. He would look into the matter.

MR. MACKENZIE said Judge Johnson had been sent to Manitoba to settle all claims against the Dominion, in consequence of the North-West troubles. Claimants were invited by public advertisements to send in their

claims, and all claims were understood to have been sent in and adjudged on, and this gentleman's claim should not be admitted until it was established beyond doubt that it was one which should have been dealt with by Mr. Johnson.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS TO VETERANS OF 1812-15.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. IVES moved for a return giving the names and residences of all the veterans of the war of 1812-15 who received a pension during the year 1878, the amount received by each, the names of those who had previously received pensions and are now dead since 1st January, 1878, with a supplementary list shewing which of the pensioners were commissioned officers in the war. He said, when the appropriation of \$50,000 was made in 1875, it was expected each veteran would receive \$100.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. IVES said he had been informed so by members of the House. The amount, it was found, was only sufficient to pay \$20 to each last year. The amount was reduced in the Estimates from \$50,000 to \$35,000. He called the attention of the Government to this matter to see if it was not possible to continue the original grant. Some of those old men were in the most needy circumstances. He had the honour to know one man, Captain Toussaint Goddu, who bore a commission during the war of 1812, who was one of the heroes of Chateauguay, and who was, at present, in extremely indigent circumstances. He would beg the Government to look into the matter, and thought they would be justified in making his an exceptional case.

MR. MASSON said it had been the settled policy of the Government to give \$20 to each veteran. As to the case referred to, he would give it his attention.

Motion agreed to.

ABSENCE OF CUSTOM-HOUSE OFFICERS FROM DUTY.

MOTIONS FOR STATEMENTS.

MR. TELLIER moved for a statement showing the number of days during

which Pierre Alexis Mercier, an officer of the Customs Department at Montreal, absented himself during the year 1878, with or without leave of absence; the date and cause of such absence; the number of days for which he was paid by the Customs Department, and copies of the letter or letters, if any, authorising him to absent himself from his duties during the said year.

Motion agreed to.

MR. TELLIER moved for a statement showing the number of days during which Edward H. Mercier, an officer of Her Majesty's Customs, and a landing waiter at the port of Montreal, absented himself during the year 1878, with or without leave of absence; the date and cause of such absence, and the number of days for which he was paid by the Customs Department during the said year; also, copy of the letter or letters, if any, authorising him to absent himself from his duties during the said year.

Motion agreed to.

GRANTS OF LAND TO IMMIGRANTS.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. OLIVER moved for copies of all correspondence to and from the Government, and all Orders in Council passed since the 1st July, 1878, on the subject of grants of land as payment for the encouraging of immigration and the settlement of lands in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to.

PIERS IN STE. ANNE DE SOREL.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. MASSUE moved for copies of all petitions, correspondence, reports of engineers, Orders in Council and other documents respecting the construction of piers to be built in the Chenal du Moine, in the parish of Ste. Anne de Sorel.

Motion agreed to.

NAVIGATION ON THE RIVER YAMASKA.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. MASSUE moved for copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, and

MR. TELLIER.

reports of engineers, during the year 1878, respecting the improvement of navigation on the River Yamaska.

Motion agreed to.

LOAN OF 1878.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved for a copy of the prospectus of the loan recently effected in London; and also a statement showing the amount of the commission paid thereon, and to whom paid; together with the amounts of the said loan subscribed for by the Bank of Montreal, or by the financial agents of the Dominion, with the dates of said subscriptions.

Motion agreed to.

LAND DAMAGES IN HALDIMAND AND MONCK.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. MCCALLUM moved for copies of instructions furnished land valuers before entering on their duties in valuing land damages in the counties of Haldimand and Monck, on the upper level of the Welland Canal; also, copies of all reports made by said valuers to the Government, and copies of all claims made on the Government and unsettled up to this date, whether for flooded lands or the washing of the banks, caused by the rising of the water for canal purposes.

Motion agreed to.

INSOLVENTS' ESTATES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DREW moved for a return giving the number of insolvents in each district or county from the 1st October, 1877, to the 30th September, 1878; the gross amount of liabilities furnished by insolvents; the claims proved; the amounts received by the assignees on account of the estates; the amounts promised, paid or secured under deeds of composition; the claims proved on which no dividends nor composition have been declared or promised; the number who have received discharges; the assignees' commission, miscellaneous expenses and law costs.

Motion agreed to.

HILLSBURG POST OFFICE.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. DREW moved for copies of all correspondence, reports and petitions in possession of the Government, in relation to the Hillsburg Post Office.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. LANDRY moved for a statement showing:—1. The number of men employed on the Intercolonial Railway in the county of Rimouski, on the 1st of August last; 2. The number of men employed on the Intercolonial Railway in the county of Rimouski, from the 1st August last to the 25th September; 3. The kind of work at which such men were employed; 4. The amount paid to each of them as wages.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 3rd March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRESCOTT CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

JUDGE'S REPORT.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Armour, one of the Judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, a certificate and report relating to the election for the Electoral District of Prescott.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 15) To repeal the Insolvency Laws now in force in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Lechard.)

Bill (No. 16) Relating to the protest of Inland Bills of Exchange.—(Mr. Doull.)

Bill (No. 17) To provide for the defendant's costs in certain actions at the suit of the Crown.—(Mr. MacDonnell.)

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Acts respecting the Isolated Risk and Farmers' Fire Insurance Company of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the Sovereign Fire and Marine Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 20) To amend the Act 41 Victoria, chapter 29, intitled: An Act to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Scriver.)

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Casey.)

FIRST READING.

MR. CASEY introduced a Bill (No. 19) To amend the Act respecting the election of members of the House of Commons. He said this Bill was intended to meet certain deficiencies in the law, which had come to light under the practical working of the Act. In some cases the Bill amended, in others it explained, the provision of the Election Law. It contained a definition of a candidate, by which any person becoming a candidate, would, from the time he became recognised as such, or from the time the writ was issued, be held responsible as a candidate for his actions in regard to matters referred to in this Act. He would not be allowed to escape the consequence of illegal acts previous to the nomination day, by declaring that until then he was not a candidate. The offence of general treating was so defined as to include cases not covered by the present law. A penalty was imposed on persons who, though disqualified by law, recorded their votes. The last clause provided that no informality or irregularity of a returning officer or other official concerned in taking a poll, could invalidate a ballot cast, and the judge on a recount should accept all ballots cast, unless such informality or irregularity had permitted fraud. He would enter more fully into explanations on the second reading of the Bill.

Bill read the first time.

SASKATCHEWAN COLONISATION RAILROAD COMPANY INCORPORATION BILL.—[Bill 6.]

(Mr. Schultz.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MACKENZIE said this railway, by the provisions of the Bill, would in-

terfere with the Canada Pacific to its detriment, and he did not think the Government should allow it to pass in this manner.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was customary to allow such Bills to go before the Railway Committee, and he did not see any necessity for adopting a different rule in this case. In the Railway Committee, the Bill would be fully discussed. These Bills might promote the construction of the Pacific Railway rather than interfere with it, and he did not consider it necessary to look into the provisions of this one, knowing they would be carefully scanned by those before whom they would come.

MR. MACKENZIE said that was well enough as a general principle. But, by one of the first provisions of this Bill, it practically interfered seriously with the Pacific Railway west of Selkirk. It was not a matter which the Government should leave with the Railway Committee. The hon. the Premier should say whether he was prepared to sanction what appeared to be the main provision of the Bill.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it would be the duty of the Government to see that no undue competition with the Canada Pacific was generated by other lines. He had not looked at this measure, but he assured the hon. gentleman that the policy of the Government in this respect would be fully carried out.

MR. SCHULTZ said he was pleased that attention had been called to the matter by the hon. member for Lambton, because it gave him an opportunity of explaining that, while indeed the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railroad proposed to start from Winnipeg, yet, as it proceeded westward, the divergence from the Canada Pacific Railroad was very great indeed, and he (Mr. Schultz) and the promoters of the Bill would be able to show, when the measure came before the Railway Committee, that the railroad in question not only would not injure the Government line, but, in colonising the rich lands west of the Province of Manitoba and providing a

means of transporting the grain of existing settlements, it would be found that not only the main line of the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railroad, but all its branches, would prove direct feeders of the national line and its Pembina branch.

Bill read the second time.

CANADA LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY
INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.—[BILL 7.]

(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) explained that, according to the original Act of incorporation, the Company had power to divide its profits between the participating policy-holders and the shareholders in the proportion of three-fourths to the policy-holders and one-fourth to the stockholders. This Bill proposed to extend this proportion to not less than ninety per cent. to participating policy-holders, and not to exceed ten per cent. to shareholders. The only persons who could possibly object to this would be the stockholders, and they, at a general meeting called for the purpose, resolved to carry out the suggestion of the directors. The Bill also sought to extend the powers of the directors as to the calling of meetings; to extend the right of voting, so that each shareholder could cast a vote for each share he held for himself or by proxy, instead of limiting the number, as under the present Act, to forty; to declare that all policies, contracts, etc., concerning the company should be signed by the president or vice-president, or in case of the absence or death of both, by a director, and also by the secretary; to extend the present powers of investment; to make the company safe in paying the personal representative appointed in any of the Provinces of the Dominion without putting such representative to the expense of taking out probate in Ontario where the company's contract was made, and where only it could be enforced; in the case of wills, to make it safe for the company to pay the executor of a will, if probate had been granted to him by a Court of competent jurisdiction anywhere; and to provide for a general and gradual

MR. MACKENZIE.

decrease in the number of directors by not filling up vacancies.

Bill read the second time.

SELKIRK AND SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY COMPANY INCORPORATION BILL.—[BILL 9.]

(*Mr. Rykert.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MACDOUGALL said this was another application for a railway, very nearly upon the same route as that which occupied the attention of the House a few moments ago. The desire to construct railways in that new country was so great that it was proposed to construct two lines very nearly parallel to the Canada Pacific Railway. He judged from the remarks of the hon. the Premier and of the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition that it would be the policy of this Government, as it was of the last, to prevent the people of Manitoba from constructing any line of railway, even at their own expense, which might possibly interfere or compete with the Canada Pacific Railway. He thought that some further definition or indication of the limitations within which that policy would be enforced should be given to the House for the guidance of the Railway Committee, at this the first stage of the question. If the Pacific Railway was to be constructed as a Government work, at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, how were they to explain away the fact that the small population inhabiting the North-West felt strong enough, with the aid of outside capitalists, to undertake the construction of two railways almost parallel to the Canada Pacific for several hundred miles. It might be a question for members, and, certainly, would occupy the public attention, whether, in the condition of our finances,—in view of the fact that we were obliged to borrow money abroad to carry on the ordinary affairs of the Government,—it was wise to proceed in the construction of the Canada Pacific Railway as a public work, at the expense of the people of the whole Dominion. Those Bills, however, might be merely speculative, brought into the House as feelers, or as a foundation for asking large public grants for the enterprise: in ques-

tion. On the face of them, no such intention appeared. Therefore, they had the fact that gentlemen, whose names stood well in the financial world, were asking the permission of the House to organise themselves to construct a railway near the line of the Pacific, over hundreds of miles through a new territory, at their own expense, and without public aid. He thought he was justified in calling attention to this fact, in view of the policy to which they were apparently committed. As one of the public men of the country responsible for the acquisition of the North-West Territory, he was gratified to learn that, in the short period since the acquisition, they had succeeded in advancing its development so rapidly, and directing public attention to it so strongly that capitalists were already convinced that great wealth was to be extracted from its soil, and large profits to be made in its development. Their willingness to expend large sums to effect railway improvements was indeed a very good sign. It ought to impress members, and even induce the Government to reconsider the policy with regard to the construction of the Canada Pacific Railway. In the past, the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) and his political supporters took strong ground against the construction of this railway as a public work. It was the policy of the old Liberal party to construct public works of this description by means of grants where required, but to leave them as going concerns in the hands of private parties. It was a cardinal principle with that party that the Government should be free from political entanglements in the execution, and especially the working, of such enterprises. That opinion, he (Mr. Macdougall) believed, prevailed to a large extent in the public mind to-day. He was convinced great doubt existed as to the propriety of placing the construction and management of great public works, such as railways, under the control of the Government.

Some HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. MACDOUGALL said that, perhaps, the hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side, representing Upper Canadian constituencies, who dissented from this view, were better informed;

but he spoke of the historical position of parties, and repeated that the opinion of the Liberal party had been strongly expressed and clearly defined in the sense described. He did not know the policy of the present Government in this matter, it had not been indicated; but a very grave question now presented itself, which it would be well for the House to consider—whether that policy was to continue. Indeed, he thought it would be the duty of the Government, when these Bills came before the House, to have their minds made up as to the policy which ought now to be adopted. All would admit that the railway from Thunder Bay to Red River, over an inhospitable and difficult country, must be constructed by public aid; but the railway beyond that point was another matter, unless those Bills were merely speculative. If, indeed, the inherent value of the territory and its resources had so impressed those capitalists that they were prepared to construct a large portion of the railway westward at their own expense, in the expectation of large profits, there was thus raised a material and important question to be considered at this early stage of their deliberations as a new Parliament, untrammelled by the opinions, and with power to amend the mistakes of their predecessors.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think this the time to precipitate a debate on the Pacific Railway question. He did not intend to be drawn into any discussion of it; but he was surprised at the announcement made by the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Macdougall) as to his views of public policy, and those that prevailed in former years. He was one of the Ministers who let the contract for the building of the Intercolonial Railway to ordinary contractors as a public work—a road to be afterwards worked by Government. That was the only occasion of any railway having been aided by the Dominion Government. The hon. gentleman had an opportunity of carrying out his policy on that occasion, and failed to do so. But the late Administration desired to assist, as far as possible, certain railways, without owning any. In pursuance of this policy they gave over some railways in their possession to private companies.

MR. MACDOUGALL.

They also invited tenders for the construction and working of the Canadian Pacific Railway consistently with the idea the hon. gentleman opposite now formulated. The present Government had not informed the House of the result of the invitation to tender. This was not, as he said, a new idea, but one always held by himself and former political friends. He (Mr. Mackenzie) entirely agreed with him as to the policy of Governments not owning railways; but would defer the discussion of the Canadian Pacific Railway matter to a more suitable occasion. The hon. gentleman was quite mistaken in fancying that the promoters of such charters designed spending their own money. He (Mr. Mackenzie) rather feared their chief object was the expenditure of other people's funds. Directors and managers of certain railways were generally men of straw, who hoped, by the manipulation of bonds, lands, and other means, to enrich themselves at the expense of English and other money-lenders, and of the Government. The hon. gentleman need not delude himself with the idea that it was the natural richness of the country and the anxiety to expend their great means that accounted for the action of the promoters of this and similar Bills. The motive was different. What the Government had to provide for was what would suit the interests of the entire taxpayers, and not a few speculators.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he agreed with the hon. leader of the Opposition, that this was not the proper time to enter into a general discussion of the Canadian Pacific Railway policy. It was very doubtful, indeed, whether there was any earnest desire on the part of the applicants for those Bills to spend their own money; probably they wished to carry out their enterprises mainly at other people's expense, and without any desire of ruining themselves in the operation. His hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Macdougall) said the road from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg must be built by public aid, and he (Sir John A. Macdonald) assumed the sections to and through the Rocky Mountains would be also. He did not think the taxpayers expected that all the sections through the unprofitable regions

should be built by them, and that those through the inviting regions, which would be thickly settled, and where a railway would be profitable, should be handed over to private individuals for their own benefit. If they could get capitalists to build and work the whole line, it would relieve the Government of the burthen of construction and the inconvenience of management, which would be a great advantage. But, so long as a considerable portion of the work was to remain in the hands of the Government directly, certainly it would be the height of folly to surrender any profitable portion to private speculators.

Bill read the second time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 10) To extend the powers of the Dominion Telegraph Company, and to amend the Act incorporating the said Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 12) To authorise the Welland Railway Company to convert their six per cent. Debenture Bonds into five per cent. Debenture Stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Drew.)

Bill (No. 14) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.—(Mr. Lanjevin.)

RIGHT OF FISHING IN THE SEIGNIORY OF BIC.

QUESTION.

Mr. VALLEE enquired, Whether the right of fishing in the Seignior of Bic, in the county of Rimouski, belongs to the Government or the seigneur, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): There is no express agreement. The fishery rights can only be exercised by the parties occupying the beach. The practice of the Department has been to give the preference to owners of the beaches.

STANDARD RULE FOR MEASURING SAW LOGS.

QUESTION.

Mr. FARROW enquired, Whether the Government has an authorised standard

rule for measuring saw-logs in the Dominion, and, if not, do they intend to adopt one, so that there may be uniformity in so important a matter.

MR. BABY: The Government have taken the question under consideration.

MAIL CONTRACT IN ST. FABIEN PARISH.

QUESTION.

MR. Fiset enquired, What are the reasons which caused the Government to take away from Joseph Danjou, Esquire, the contract for the conveyance of the mails between the railway station and the post-office in the parish of St. Fabien.

MR. LANGEVIN said the contract, when given, was terminable at pleasure. On the 17th of December, Danjou was notified that the contract, for which he was receiving \$135, would be discontinued, and it was given to another man for \$100, the Government thus effecting an economy of \$35. That was the sole reason for the change.

EMIGRANT SHEDS AT EMERSON AND ST. BONIFACE, MANITOBA.

QUESTION.

MR. DUBUC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect emigrant sheds at or near the railway stations at Emerson and St. Boniface, in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. TUPPER: It is the intention of the Government to provide an emigrant shed at the station at Emerson; whether further accommodation will be required at St. Boniface is not yet determined.

THE TORONTO POSTMASTERSHIP.

QUESTION.

MR. HAY enquired, Whether the salary which is being paid to Mr. T. Patteson, as postmaster of the city of Toronto, is larger than that paid to his predecessor, and, if so, how much more; and why it was necessary to increase the salary of that official.

MR. LANGEVIN: The salary of Mr. Lesslie, late postmaster of the city of Toronto, was \$3,500. His successor, Mr. Patteson, has a salary of \$3,000.

Therefore, there has been a saving of \$500 a year.

INCREASED PAYMENT TO POSTMASTERS.

QUESTION.

MR. DREW enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to increase the pay of those postmasters who are paid under the 50th section of 31st Victoria, chapter 10, and from what date such increase, if any, will commence.

MR. LANGEVIN: Under the law, the salaries of postmasters are calculated as follows:—Forty per cent. on net revenue derived from postage prepaid by stamps, up to \$800, and 25 per cent. on the balance. Postmasters collecting less than \$25 are allowed \$10 per annum for salary. The salaries are now in course of readjustment, and the increase, if any, will be allowed from 1st July last.

TAMPERING WITH REGISTERED LETTERS.

QUESTION.

MR. LITTLE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make such arrangements as will have the tendency of further preventing registered letters being tampered with; and, if loss is sustained by the sender of such a letter, whether compensation will be allowed under certain conditions by the Post Office Department.

MR. LANGEVIN: The Department is not aware that registered letters are being tampered with more than they have been before, and we do not know of any other arrangements than those taken up to now to prevent these letters being tampered with. But, if the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman, make any suggestion in that direction, the Department will be most happy to take the suggestions into consideration, in order to better the service, if possible. In answer to the second part of the question, I have to reply that it cannot be done, because it is entirely at the will of the sender whether he sends bank-notes or a money order. The money-order system is provided by the Department for that purpose; and, therefore, the sender could not do better than send a money order, if there was any risk of loss.

MR. LANGEVIN.

IMPROVEMENTS IN RIMOUSKI WHARF.

QUESTION.

MR. Fiset enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry out, next summer, the improvements in the wharf at Rimouski, recommended by the engineers of the Intercolonial Railway.

MR. LANGEVIN: This matter is under the consideration of the Government.

CAMPS OF MILITARY INSTRUCTION.

QUESTION.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause camps of military instruction to be formed this year. If so, when, and of what strength.

MR. MASSON: That question is being considered by the Government. As soon as the Estimates are brought down, I shall be able to give the hon. gentleman a more complete and satisfactory answer.

APPOINTMENTS IN HAMILTON.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved for a return of the names of all persons appointed in the Inland Revenue Office (including Inspectors of Weights and Measures), Post Office, Custom House and Emigration Office, in the city of Hamilton, between 4th November, 1873, and 10th October, 1878, the dates of such appointments, the ages of the persons appointed, their salaries when appointed, and whether increased during the above period, and, if so, the amounts of such increase; also, the names of the persons superannuated, and the amounts of said superannuations.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said that all the information the hon. gentleman could get under this motion had been ordered by a resolution passed by the House on the 17th ult. If the hon. member wanted to get further information, as he (Mr. Cameron) did, the motion would have to be amended. He would, therefore, suggest that the period be from 1st January, 1873, to 1st March, 1879.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he did not desire the additional information.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENTS TO W. R. CLARK FOR SERVICES TO THE FISHERY COMMISSION.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH moved for copies of all Orders in Council, letters, accounts, petitions and correspondence relating to the payment of \$10,000, in accordance with an Order in Council, passed in December last, to W. R. Clark, for alleged services rendered to the Canadian Government in connection with the Halifax Fishery Commission; also, a statement showing the full amount paid to the said W. R. Clark by the Dominion Government, or any Department thereof, in the years 1871, 1872, and 1873, in connection with the same service. He said that he noticed, by a return made by the Government, that the sum of \$10,000 had been paid to Mr. Clark, who resided at Boston, for services alleged to have been performed by him in connection with the Fishery Commission at Halifax. He thought there must be some mistake in regard to this matter, and that the Government must have acted under some misapprehension, because he was satisfied that Mr. Clark had no claim to that money. During the whole of his (Sir A. J. Smith's) term of office, he never heard he had any claim for services in that connection, or ever made such a claim. All claims for such services were paid before he left the Department, under his supervision and by his direction. In 1872, he ascertained from an officer of the Department that Mr. Clark, who was, he understood, a friend of Mr. Mitchell, his predecessor, had performed some service in connection with this business. He (Mr. Clark) procured for the Department a number of affidavits of Americans taken in various parts of the United States. These affidavits, however, they could not use with any kind of propriety or decency, and consequently they were not used. No information procured by Mr. Clark was used before the Commission. Mr. Clark received a large sum of money for services he performed in 1872;

several thousand dollars, the precise amount he was not prepared to say. He, on several occasions, complained to the officers of the Department that Mr. Clark had been largely overpaid for any services he performed. He made this motion in order to see whether there was any pretence or excuse which could justify the Government in making this payment.

Motion agreed to.

BOARD OF CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) moved for a return showing the names of the gentlemen composing the Board of Civil Service Examiners; the amount of the yearly expenses of said Board during the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878; the number of candidates examined during these years; the number of unsuccessful candidates, and the names of the successful candidates; also, the number of candidates who, having successfully passed, have received appointments in the Civil Service of Canada during the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878.

Motion agreed to.

WORK DONE IN THE COUNTY OF RIMOUSKI.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. LANDRY moved for a statement showing the nature of the work done at Matane and at River Blanche, in the county of Rimouski, before, during, and immediately after the last general elections, from the 1st of July to the 10th of October, 1878; by whom such work was done; whether by the day, by contract or statute labour; the names of the superintendents of such works; the names of the persons to whom the money was delivered; and copies of all documents, correspondence and pay-lists relating to the said works.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would suggest to the hon. gentleman to add "Reports of Engineers."

MR. Fiset said that he proposed to add a few words in amendment to the motion of the hon. member for Mont-

magny (Mr. Landry) which would only render this motion more complete. He was convinced that he would have no objection to substituting the words "1st of December," for the words "10th of October," and to adding the following words:—

"Also a statement showing the work yet to be done to the Matane Pier to complete it, together with a copy of the correspondence exchanged with the Department of Public Works, with reference to the delay which occurred in the last payment of the workmen; and also a copy of the reports of the engineers on the subject, and all the correspondence relating thereto."

MR. LANGEVIN said he did not see any objection to the enlargement of the motion as suggested by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) and the member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset). He was not aware whether the reports of examinations and estimates that he (Mr. Langevin) asked for last year in reference to this work were to be found in the Department. He had been told that there were no such estimates of works that were to be done at Matane and at the River Blanche. He asked for the reports from the Minister of Public Works, and he thought that all these papers should have been brought down. The present Government had no objection to do so. It would only be a pity if the way in which these works had been conducted could not be seen by these returns. If the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mackenzie) had seen the manner in which these works were conducted, he would have thought that the undertaking of the works by day's labour was a very bad way to conduct public works. That method of doing the work might have suited very well in order to get a large number of electors, selected from one party, to support a candidate on one side or another. He did not think the manner in which these works were conducted reflected credit on the Department headed by the hon. gentleman. He was not aware whether the then Minister of Public Works knew of any of these things. When the papers would be brought down it would be apparent to the House and the country that these works were, to a great extent, conducted for

electioneering purposes. He, therefore, had no objection to the motion being carried, by adding, "and all the correspondence relating thereto."

MR. MACKENZIE said he was not aware of anything of the kind stated; he had no reason to believe anything of the kind. The work was undertaken by day's labour on the report of Mr. Kingsford, who recommended that as the best method of doing the work, after a careful examination of the ground. Mr. Kingsford had submitted more expensive plans for the work; but he (Mr. Mackenzie) had not thought fit to adopt them.

MR. Fiset said that the hon. the Postmaster-General claimed that it was only in order to help him (Mr. Fiset) in his election that the Government had built the wharf at Matane by time work, and he had naturally concluded that this was an act of corruption on the part of the Government. He found a decided answer to the hon. gentleman's assertion in the report of the Minister of Public Works for this year. This was what the report said:

"Application was made by the inhabitants of Matane, who had formed themselves into a syndicate, to construct the pier by time work according to the design of the Department, and under its direction. As it was considered that a year's time would be gained, that the cost would be reduced to a minimum and the work efficiently constructed, this request was entertained and the authority has been given for the work so to be carried on."

That was what had been done by the syndicate chosen by the people of Matane, and formed of men of business belonging to both political parties; and the proof that this syndicate had effectively administered the affair was to be found in the fact that, with the sum of \$10,000 granted during the last Session for this purpose, they had built a first-class wharf 480 feet long. In order to complete the work, a sum of \$300 only was required. Unhappily, the Government had preferred to allow the work to remain unfinished, rather than expend this small amount. Moreover, the syndicate had been formed in June last, when it was not known that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Langevin) was to be a candidate in Rimouski. He knew that the majority he (Mr. Fiset) had obtained at Matane, and in the

MR. Fiset.

parishes of the upper part of the county, had cut the hon. gentleman to the quick. If, however, he remembered the election of 1874, he would not be surprised at this fact. In 1874, his (Mr. Fiset's) majority in the whole county had reached 1,475 votes; whilst his majority at the last election had only reached 449 votes. The hon. gentleman might congratulate himself on having obtained such a result. He would add, nevertheless, that it had not been without much labour and great sacrifices on the part of the hon. gentleman and his friends that this result had been brought about. It was certain that, if he (Mr. Langevin) had regretted not to have at his disposal the resources of the Public Works Department, in order to carry on his election, he had, on the other hand, discovered the means of utilising the services of one of those kind-hearted contractors on the Intercolonial Railway whom he had generously recompensed formerly at the expense of the Treasury, when he (Mr. Langevin) was Minister of Public Works. It was through the agency of this same well paid contractor that he had caused a lead mine to be opened in the parish of St. Fabien on the Thursday preceding polling day, and a road to be laid out over the mountains of Bic. At the same time agents were sent into nearly every part of the county, in order to solicit his (Mr. Fiset's) friends to go and work in this mine and on this road, with the hope, no doubt, of keeping them from voting. Their travelling expenses were paid, and they received \$1 a day at a time when workmen could be hired at 70c. a day. That was not all. Whilst these works were being inaugurated in the upper part of the county, in the lower part, that was to say below Matane, his (Mr. Fiset's) friends were being hired to go and raise a vessel that a few weeks previously had been wrecked on the coast of the Island of Anticosti. But the electors of the county of Rimouski were not for sale. They had gone to work on these divers undertakings, and, when polling day came, they had generously cast their ballots in favour of the candidate of their choice. Unluckily, this had also been the signal for closing the lead mine, and stopping the works on the famous road over the mountains of Bic, for, the day following the election, these

works were brought to a close. And it was after having made use of such means in order to carry this election that his (Mr. Fiset's) opponents wished to make this House believe that, if he had been elected, it was entirely owing to the pressure that the Government had brought to bear upon the electors. He thought that they were going a little too far. He had no objection to the motion being adopted; but he hoped, also, that no objection would be taken to the amendment that he had moved, seeing that it only completed the main motion.

MR. VALLÉE said that the House had not been summoned to investigate the doings of each individual member during the late elections. The question now before the House had reference to certain works that it had been decided to execute during the late local elections. At the beginning of the struggle, last spring, he had gone, in company with the Hon. Mr. Chauveau, to Matane, where this wharf was situated, and there Mr. Chauveau had declared to the electors that, at such a date, the Mackenzie Government would grant a sum of \$10,000 for the improvement of the harbour. He stated that, if the Mackenzie Government did not grant this amount within fifteen days, his friends should vote for his opponent. A few days previously, Mr. Chauveau had come up to Ottawa, and had met the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mackenzie), but at first nothing had been done on the part of the Government, seeing that no survey had been made. Under the circumstances it was naturally difficult to obtain from the Government a sum of money to carry on these works. But the election of a Minister of the Local Government was in jeopardy, and all possible means had to be employed to defeat his opponent. It had become necessary to turn over, at one stroke, not less than 400 votes. On the 28th of April, the Sunday before the polling day, he (Mr. Vallée) had met Mr. Chauveau's representative at the door of the church, and he had asked him whether the electors were at liberty to vote for him (Mr. Vallée) as Mr. Chauveau had promised, for it was then the 28th, and not a single cent had been granted for the works. It was admitted that he (Mr. Vallée)

was in the right, and that the electors could vote for him. On the Tuesday evening following, it was announced that a despatch had arrived from Ottawa, addressed to the parish priest, stating that a sum of \$10,000 had been granted for the improvement of the harbour at Matane. The result of this despatch was that the entire parish, after having pledged itself the Sunday previous to vote for the Conservative candidate, turned against him. He was, therefore, justified in saying that the grant of money for the improvement of the Matane harbour was the most shameful speculation—that was the word—that the Federal Government had ever committed. He had proof of the wrongdoing of the Mackenzie Government in the report that was now in the hands of hon. members. It was stated in this report that it was impossible to make a suitable harbour of refuge at Matane. This had been found out after the money had been granted. But that was not all. The late Administration had always loudly proclaimed in this House that no contract should be given without tenders being asked for. And yet what had been done in this case? The Government, disowning their own professions of faith, had authorized the member for Rimouski to form a sort of syndicate compound of Liberal canvassers, in whose hands this sum of \$10,000 had been placed for the execution of the works. That was surely an act of gross corruption. Naturally the Government wished to help the Liberal candidate, and this money had been expended at almost a dead loss, for the work had been executed without any definite plan. The hon. member for Rimouski, in the course of his remarks, had asked the Government to continue these works. He (Mr. Vallée) believed that the citizens and electors of Rimouski wished also that this should be done; but this harbour of refuge should not have been placed at this point. How was it that the late Government had decided to execute these works at Matane, whilst, in the same county, twenty leagues from there, might be found a magnificent harbour, prepared by nature, that would only have required an expenditure of some few hundred dollars? Simply because that parish was Conservative, and they had thought to bring

the electors over to the Liberal party by granting \$10,000 for these improvements. They had succeeded. With a third of this money expended in the parish of Bic, the Government might have made a very suitable harbour for shipping.

Mr. Fiset said that the hon. member who had just taken his seat had waxed very eloquent in order to prove that this \$10,000, put in the Estimates of last year for the wharf at Matane, had been granted solely for the purpose of defeating him (Mr. Vallée), and, like his leader (Mr. Langevin), he drew the conclusion that the Government had been guilty of an act of corruption. In order to convince him that he was in the wrong on this first point, it would be sufficient to tell him that, before there was any question of local elections, that was to say at the beginning of the Session of 1878, it had been decided that a certain sum should be placed in the Estimates for the wharf at Matane, and that he had, at that very time, informed the Mayor of Matane, Dr. Pelletier, of the good intentions of the hon. the Minister of Public Works with regard to this locality. It was true that this sum had not been granted till the close of the Session, when the Province of Quebec was in the midst of an electoral combat; but, for all that, it had been decided before the elections that this sum should be put in the Supplementary Estimates that were not then printed. He presumed that the hon. gentleman would have much preferred to see the electors of Matane deprived of this grant; but the money had been granted and very justifiably employed. The hon. member (Mr. Vallée) had, moreover, accused him of having written to his (Mr. Fiset's) friends at Matane, as soon as the item of \$10,000 had been voted. He admitted having done so. He admitted having written or telegraphed to his friends at Matane when this item was passed; and, as he had already stated, he had informed them, before the election, of the intention of the Government to include in the Estimates this sum of \$10,000 for the improvement of the harbour of this locality. But in doing so he had only stated the truth, and he did not see what he was to blame for. There was another reason that made him write to Matane that the

item had passed. The hon. member had not forgotten that, several days before polling day, the hon. the Postmaster-General, then member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), had written to his friends in the county, not that the item had passed, but that there was nothing in the Estimates for the improvement of the Matane harbour. The hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée) knew better than anyone else what an abuse had been made of this letter; he knew that it was with the support of this document that endeavours had been made to convince the electors of Matane that they had no chance of obtaining a grant that year, and that he (Mr. Fiset) was wittingly deceiving all these honest electors, by giving them to understand that the sum of \$10,000 would be granted for the improvement of the harbour. Under these circumstances, he asked whether he had not been justifiable in informing his friends, as soon as the item passed, and in destroying the false impression created by that letter. The hon. member for Portneuf had, moreover, stated that the people of Matane were not satisfied with this wharf, that it was useless; and he added that Matane was not the place for the harbour, but that Bic should have been chosen in preference to Matane. He believed that the hon. member was mistaken in saying that the people of Matane were not satisfied with the work done. If he had said that the few friends he (Mr. Vallée) had at Matane were dissatisfied, he would be nearer the truth. He was surprised to see the hon. member so strongly opposed to the wharf at Matane. He ought to know, however, that nearly every year serious shipwrecks occurred in the neighbourhood of this locality, and that a wharf at this point was of great service to ships in distress. Not longer ago than last autumn, if the schooner of a well known navigator of Matane had escaped being wrecked, it was owing to the wharf that had been built there. He would admit that this wharf was not long enough, that new improvements would be required to render it more serviceable; and it was to be hoped that these improvements would be looked upon as necessary, and as an effectual means of rendering the navigation of this part of the St.

Lawrence more easy and less dangerous. As to the harbour at Bic, he admitted that it was a first-class harbour, and he would be glad if it was improved. That was what he had been working for ever since he had been a member of the House. In 1876, he had obtained a first survey of this harbour; this survey had been concluded last autumn, after the elections. For, if the survey had taken place before the elections, his opponents would not have failed to raise the cry of corruption. But, because there was yet no wharf at Bic, did it follow that the Government should not have begun the works at Matane? He believed that the distance between Bic and Matane was great enough, since it was nearly 73 miles, to admit of the building of wharfs at both places, without warranting the cry of injustice being raised, and he was sure that the improvement of these two harbours would offer real advantages to navigation. He hoped that these works would be executed even by the present Administration.

Mr. LANDRY said that he congratulated himself upon having made the motion that was now before the Chair. It had given rise to a very interesting debate that had entirely brought to light the motives of the late Government, and those of the hon. member (Mr. Fiset), who was now representing the county of Rimouski, thanks to this harbour of refuge at Matane. That worthy member had endeavoured to justify his conduct. His justification had proved as weak as his conduct had been inadmissible, and had in no way weakened the charges brought against him by public opinion, and that he would substantiate when the papers he asked for were brought down. In his weak defence, the hon. member for Rimouski had made statements that he challenged him to maintain. According to the hon. gentleman, he (Mr. Landry) was the mouthpiece of the hon. the Postmaster-General, who had, if not drawn up, at least prompted, the present motion. Could the hon. member prove what he had insinuated? He emphatically denied the fact; he spurned the insinuation. He had never had any understanding with the Postmaster-General upon this subject. When he had drawn up his motion, and laid it upon the table

of the House, the hon. Minister was absent from the capital, and had no knowledge of the affair. But this mattered little. His own statement should suffice, and he declared that he had made this motion free from all outside influence, and that he was ready to assume the responsibility of his conduct. Moreover, he had not yet said his last word, and, with the permission of his hon. friend the member for Rimouski, he would have several other motions of a similar nature to bring before the House, for he wished to prove to the House and to the country to what a happy concurrence of circumstances the county of Rimouski owed its present representative. In the case under discussion, \$10,000 had been voted by the last Parliament, and expended in deepening a harbour of refuge at Matane. This money had been first granted in spite of an engineer's report, stating that it was impossible to deepen the harbour in question. But that was not all, and if hon. members would glance at the report of Public Works, the last one published under the control of the late Administration, they would admire with him how artfully, how scrupulously it was insinuated in every line that this money should be spent in this manner and not in that, by day-work and not by contract, so as to forward the political and private interests of the hon. member for Rimouski, and not the public interests. The hon. member (Mr. Fiset) should not state to the House that when this money was granted there was no question of the hon. the Postmaster-General being a candidate, for he (Mr. Fiset) knew that his conduct in the House, during the whole of the last Parliament, had been such that the Conservative party, whose ranks he had deserted, would be obliged to bring out an opponent against him. The name of this opponent was of little importance, and he maintained that, when this sum had been granted, the hon. member for Rimouski, whilst he was, perhaps, ignorant of the name of his opponent, knew perfectly well that the Conservative party would bring out a candidate against him, and the events had justified his expectations. But what did this assertion signify, and would it be believed by this House, especially after the explanations given by the hon. member for Fort-

MR. LANDRY.

neuf, that, when every one knew that when this sum was granted, the county of Rimouski was the scene of the hottest of electoral contests? Who had sent to the electors of the county the glad tidings that the Joly Government could find a refuge even in the harbour of Matane? None other than the hon. member for Rimouski himself. Had he disowned his despatch? Could he deny that this despatch had been sent during the late Provincial elections—the very day before the polling took place? He had denied nothing of the kind and he could not do so; and it was with these grave and compromising charges hanging over him that the hon. member stood up before this House and declared that when this money had been voted there was no question of elections. The hon. member would allow him to say that such an assertion was more than hazardous, it was a breach of truth. When the last supplies had been voted in this House, it was well known that the Province of Quebec had just been dumb-founded by the *coup d'etat*, and that the greatest agitation existed there. The dissolution of the Assembly had taken place, and the Province was over head and ears in the general elections. It was to be supposed that the hon. member for Rimouski was also over head and ears somewhere, since he could not remember what had taken place. But, at the time, he had not forgotten his \$10,000, and it was when his county was in the midst of an electoral contest, when the Conservative party was threatening to defeat his friend, Mr. Chauveau, that he sent the glad intelligence announcing to his friend that he could, for \$10,000, find a refuge, even in the little harbour of Matane. The hon. member for Rimouski had stated that it was a convenient harbour. There was no question whatever about that, and the immediate result of the elections had shown that it was very convenient indeed for the Liberal candidates in the county of Rimouski; but what he (Mr. Landry) could vouch for was that, though the hon. member for Rimouski had found a refuge in the convenient harbour of Matane, he would look in vain for a refuge in the confidence of this House. If he wished to wander from the question, or, at least, to speak of certain things that were

connected therewith, though a little remotely, a curious study might be made of certain intrigues resorted to by the Party of Purity in the county of Rimouski during the late general election. But for the moment he would admire the charming artlessness displayed by the hon. member, who, not satisfied with having squandered the public money for electoral purposes, asked, with the greatest candour, that the Government of the day should furnish him the means of working against them. Were they perchance on the eve of a new general election—at least in the Province of Quebec? The conduct of the hon. member would seem to indicate it. Later, when the papers asked for would be brought down, hon. members might gaze on the beautiful electoral purity that had lighted up the late general elections in the county of Rimouski, and that even within these walls shed its effulgence on the head of the hon. member for Rimouski.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

DUTIES PAID IN FEBRUARY.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved for a return of the amount of duty paid during the month of February, 1879, on the articles of tea, sugar, wines, cottons and spirits, respectively.

Motion *agreed to*.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved for a return of the sum paid on account of Customs and Excise duties during the month of February, 1879.

Motion *agreed to*.

REVENUE FROM THE SALE OF CANADIAN TOBACCO.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. VALIÉE moved for a statement showing the revenue collected on the sale of Canadian tobacco, and the cost of collecting the duty thereon, from 1873 to 1st January, 1879.

Motion *agreed to*.

SEIZURE OF AN AMERICAN WRECKING STEAMER.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved for a return of all reports,

evidence, protests, documents and correspondence in reference to the seizure of the steam tug *Sarah E. Bryant*, of Buffalo, N. Y., by the Customs authorities at Dunnville, in or about the month of November, 1874, for an alleged breach of the Coasting and Revenue Laws, in going to the rescue of the crew and cargo of the wrecked American schooner *Augustus Ford*, of Oswego, U.S., and statement of the fine imposed, and by whose directions and by what authority the said seizure was made and the said fine inflicted. He said he was induced to make this motion in consequence of the antagonism that had grown up between wrecking companies on the American side, and those on the Canadian side. He understood that, in November, 1874, the schooner mentioned in his motion was wrecked at or near the Grand River. The tug *Sarah E. Bryant* was telegraphed for and went to her assistance. She found the vessel stranded; the captain, female cook, and two sailors dead, frozen in the ice, on board the vessel. An effort was at once made to take off the bodies, and, after doing that, and after lending some aid to a Canadian lighter, the Customs authorities from Dunnville came out and seized her, and imposed a fine of four hundred dollars, of which, however, he was told there was afterwards some remission, but without explanation why. From the little examination he had been able to make into the papers he found in the Customs Department, he thought it desirable, as a great deal of discussion had been going on in connection with this matter, that the whole of the facts of this transaction should see the light of day. He submitted that his motion was in the interests of humanity. They ought to know whether it was a fact that in this country our laws prevented assistance going to the aid of a distressed or shipwrecked vessel, unless that aid was in the shape of a vessel belonging to our own marine, and that, before even that could take place, such aiding vessel must go into port and report to the Customs authorities.

MR. McCALLUM said, before the motion passed, he would like to make some remarks in reference to the matter. As he lived near the part of the country where the wreck and loss of life took

place, he could tell his hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) that he was very much mistaken as to the facts. The schooner *Augustus Ford* went ashore near the mouth of the Grand River in a storm, late in the season, and some of the crew perished. The survivors of that crew were rescued next morning by the Canadian tug *Jessie*. But the hon. gentleman, by his remarks, would lead people to believe that they were all savages in that neighbourhood, and rendered no assistance, and that the tug *Sarah E. Bryant* was seized for going to the wreck to save life, and that she was telegraphed for in the interest of humanity. But that was not the case; she was seized for coasting—towing in and out of the harbour while Canadian tugs were lying idle, and not for attempting to render assistance, as stated by the hon. member. Those that perished on the wreck were out of humanity's reach days before the tug *Sarah E. Bryant* arrived. It was all very well to say that the American tugs came to Canadian waters in the interest of humanity, but they came for a different purpose, simply to make money. Wreckers seldom saved life—the crews of wrecked vessels were, in a large majority, if not all cases, saved, or lost, before the wreckers got there—saved by the means at their own disposal, or assistance procured from the shore.

MR. DECOSMOS said he believed there ought to be some reciprocal arrangements between the United States and Canada, with a view to protect the lives and property of persons on board vessels wrecked on either shore. If the hon. member for Hamilton added to his motion, to bring down certain papers in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the House would have an opportunity of seeing that proposals had been made to the United States Government, with the object of allowing wrecking tugs on both sides to be used for the relief of wrecked vessels. In his Province they had about one hundred and fifty miles of navigation along the water boundary, and vessels occasionally went ashore on both sides, and it would be an advantage if a reciprocal arrangement could be brought about. He was thoroughly in favour of protecting our own

MR. MCCALLUM.

shipping, no matter of what character; but, as the hon. gentleman had referred to this matter as "an act of humanity," he thought the House should endeavour to get such a measure passed by the two Governments as would secure the earliest relief to vessels in distress. Therefore, he would move, in amendment, that the said resolution be amended, by adding thereto the following words:—"Also, any correspondence, between the United States and Canada, respecting reciprocal legislation with reference to using wrecking-tugs in the waters of the respective countries."

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he had much pleasure in acceding to the request of the hon. member who had just spoken; but he would say that the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) ought to be the last person to assume to attach a doubt to the motives for his (Mr. Robertson's) action in this matter, and that he ought rather to have thanked him for the motion he had laid before the House. He (Mr. Robertson) had not insinuated that all living on the northern shore were "Turks." He was induced to make this motion from information given him and from sworn statements he had seen, and from documents and reports in reference to this matter in the Department of Customs. He had no doubt there was a great deal of truth in what the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) said. There were generally two sides to a story; nevertheless, he submitted that in that there was additional reason why this matter should be brought before the House. He believed it was the duty of this Government and of the Government of the United States, to make such reciprocal arrangements as would allow of vessels on one side going to the assistance of distressed vessels on the other side, and *vice versa*. He was quite willing to have his motion amended in the direction suggested by his hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos), believing that it would have the effect of opening the eyes of the people of this country to the state of affairs that had been and were now existing. He had been very much surprised when he saw, among the papers in the Customs Department, the following circular:—

"(CIRCULAR, No. 210.)

" No. 3, CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT,

" OTTAWA, March 8th, 1878.

" SIR.—I am now instructed by the Minister of Customs to call your attention to the bearing of the Customs Law upon the treatment of wrecked vessels, or property, in Canadian waters, which provides, in effect, that no vessel, foreign or Canadian, has a legal right to interfere with wrecked vessels, or material, in Canadian waters, unless permitted by the Collector of Customs at the nearest port, after reporting to him; and no foreign vessel should receive such permission, as it is contrary to the Customs Law, and should be placed under detention, in case of violation.

" I have the honour, etc.,

(Signed) "J. JOHNSON.

" To Collector of Customs."

What he objected to in this circular was that it implied that, no matter where aid should come from, it should not be given to unfortunate people who were in distress, until the intended aid should first report to the nearest Customs authorities. He believed that the intention really was that aid should only be given by our own wrecking vessels; but this paper did not say so, and it went to the extraordinary length of saying that, under no circumstances, should aid be given, unless under authority, as stated. It seemed to him (Mr. Robertson) that it was a very heartless regulation, and one which called for amelioration immediately.

MR. STEPHENSON said he would rather the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) would allow this resolution to stand for a few days. He believed evidence would be brought before the House on this particular subject that would make it clear to his (Mr. Robertson's) mind that Canadian interests were not being lost sight of. They knew very well, in the western part of the country, that American tug-owners were boasting that they could violate our coast. It was no encouragement to Canadians who had gone to the expense of getting the necessary appliances. The Americans asked us for reciprocal arrangements, but they asked it simply because they considered they would get more than they would give. He was of opinion we should keep what we had got, and not give anything without getting *quid pro quo*.

MR. ROBERTSON said he had no objection to allowing the motion to stand for a short time.

MR. MILLS said it appeared to him to be an extraordinary way of promoting the public interest and encouraging the commerce of the country to say that a vessel in a perilous position should be obliged to wait twenty-four or forty-eight hours for assistance from a Canadian tug, when it might obtain assistance at once from an American one. Whether a vessel received little injury or became a total wreck, might depend upon its receiving assistance promptly. It would be discreditable in the last degree to the Governments of both countries, if they were to adopt a policy of retaliation. Under the treaty which established the boundary between Canada and the United States, the waters that formed the separating line, so far as navigable waters did form a separating line, were made navigable to both from shore to shore. If it were true that, under the treaty establishing the boundary, each Government had the right to use the water course from shore to shore, irrespective of the imaginary line which might form the boundary, he did not think the Government of the United States could prevent Canadian vessels going to the assistance of other Canadian vessels within those limits. They would be simply exercising those rights secured to them by the treaty. He had no doubt that the two Governments could, without difficulty, come to understanding on this subject, that of preventing tugs of one country from going into the waters of the other. On the lakes, large Canadian vessels were sometimes stranded that no Canadian tugs could take off, and Canadian vessels in distress, had, after efforts had been made to assist them by Canadian tugs, to apply to American tugs to enable them to get into port. If the matter were looked into, it would be found that Canadian vessels had a right to navigate on the coast of the United States, and American vessels had an equal right to our shores.

MR. BOWELL said he had no objection to bring down the papers asked for, but it seemed to him somewhat strange that the hon. member for Bothwell should give utterance to the remarks he had,

when, if he had reflected for a moment, he would have seen that the order read to the House had been issued by the Government of which he was a member, on the 8th March, 1878. The subject had given the present Government a great deal of consideration, more particularly as their attention had been drawn to its effect by the Minister at Washington. He hoped an amicable arrangement could be arrived at on this question, but in this, as in all other matters, he feared that those who now asked for reciprocity in tugging and wrecking, desired to have it nearly all on the one side. He did not think this order went to the length stated by the hon. member for Hamilton. There was a difference between vessels in distress and wrecked vessels. The order applied only to the latter, and he believed it was issued to protect the revenue as well as in the interests of Canadian tug-boats, by preventing goods being discharged from wrecked vessels, and landed without the authority and knowledge of the Customs authorities, and carried away without paying duty. In the past, the American authorities had maintained the exclusive right for their own vessels in American waters, to aid vessels, whether in distress or wrecked, whether of American or of British bottoms, and had seized and imposed fines on any British tug which had gone to the assistance of such vessels. That having been brought to the notice of the late Government, that "discreditable" order, as the hon. member for Bothwell had termed it, was issued by his own colleague. He was not prepared to say that the late Minister of Customs was wrong in issuing this order, though it might, perhaps, have been more explicit, by drawing a distinction—although it was not necessary for those engaged in maritime pursuits—between vessels in distress and wrecked vessels. This order did not prevent any foreign tug from going to the assistance of vessels, whether American or Canadian, in distress in Canadian waters; it only applied to wrecked vessels when it was necessary to protect the revenue, and advisable to give the work to Canadian tugs. It was stated, and he thought with some truth, that the American underwriters and the American wrecking or tugging companies were in league, and would pass,

MR. BOWELL.

though the wrecks occurred on Canadian shores, the ports in which Canadian tugs were lying, and go as far as Buffalo and other American cities; in order to obtain American tugs and bring them into our waters so as to deprive Canadian tug owners of the work which legitimately belonged to them. In cases of wrecks which took place in the western lakes, the Government were desirous of meeting the American tug owners, at least half way, or more than half way, in order that every facility might be given to wrecked vessels. He hoped shortly to be able to lay a report before Parliament which would show the course pursued in the past by both Governments, and the results which had flowed from the order issued by the late Government. In the meantime he would ask the hon. gentleman to allow his motion to stand.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said the tug service of Ontario had given the late Government a great deal of anxiety, as, in almost every instance of dispute, they were called on to act promptly. The American tug service in the lakes was larger, and more scattered, and better able to act impromptu than our Canadian service. They had, in the interests of humanity, as said by the hon. member for Hamilton, and for the saving of property, to put a liberal construction on applications made for immediate permission to use American tugs. The late Government had been frequently telegraphed to that a vessel was in distress and property and life in danger, and that it would be three or four days before a Canadian tug could render assistance. It was difficult in such cases to refuse immediate assistance. In the case referred to by the hon. member for Hamilton's motion, he (Mr. Burpee) could not remember the particulars. The circular referred to by the hon. the Minister of Customs, applied entirely to wrecked vessels and property, and was explicit enough. The late Government used every means in their power, as far as they possibly could, to protect the Canadian tug service from the encroachments of the United States Tug Company on Canadian shores. The question of right, under the treaty, was claimed by some, and a correspondence was going

on between the Governments of Canada and the United States on this question, with a view to bring about some satisfactory solution of the difficulty and a reciprocity in this service.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the Congress of the United States had passed a Bill operative on condition of a similar law being passed by the Dominion, for reciprocity in the matter. He had enquired into the matter, and found that a much larger number of wrecks had occurred on our side than on theirs, so that they would have all the advantage. Therefore, while he was pressed, on the one hand, to introduce a similar measure in this House, it was opposed strongly by important interests in Ontario.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had correctly described the position. It had been found that, with a larger capital engaged in the wrecking, all the work was done by Americans. Preference was always given, it was found, by Canadian shipping to American vessels, and Canadian vessels were charged exorbitant prices. In self-defence, a Canadian Tug Company was got up, to give our wreckers a chance in the business, the profits of which would be considerable, as the largest number of wrecks took place on our coast. As soon as the owners of tug boats in the United States found this out, this measure was introduced in Congress. It was a sham reciprocity, which would not have been proposed had it not been for this order by the late Government. The order was quite explicit enough. A wrecked vessel was still afloat, and, by the maritime law, all vessels could go to its rescue and claim salvage, but a vessel once fairly ashore stood in quite a different position. It was especially necessary along our line of water that our Customs should not be interfered with. A vessel might be of small value and have a most valuable cargo, and she could be wrecked, and the goods smuggled into our country. This order was made to prevent anything of that kind. When the papers came down, the matter would be discussed at greater length.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had been informed, by some of the shareholders of the Company, that it had cost \$20,000 to

get the vessel off, while, had they been permitted to engage a United States steamer, the cost would not have been a quarter of that amount. On Lakes Huron and Superior, where we had a number of large steamers, we had scarcely any tugs powerful enough to render them assistance. As to a vessel being utterly destroyed when she happened to be wrecked, the hon. gentleman was mistaken. Many vessels had gone ashore and been afterwards hauled off. It depended a good deal on whether by the beaching of the vessel she would sustain serious damage or not. They would have to take care, whilst measures were taken in order to do justice to the tug owners, the smaller interest, they did not shipwreck the hopes of shipowners.

MR. MCCALLUM said that the hon. member for Lambton had stated that it would take over \$20,000 to take off this steamer. He (Mr. McCallum) knew to the contrary. Two American tugs had been employed, and they went ashore and were wrecked. When they found they could not take her off they sent for the Canadian tug *Prince Alfred*. Finding her insufficient, another American tug was sent for, while the Canadian tugs were unemployed—that in the face of the law. His hon. friend said there were no boats in Canada. They had, however, as powerful boats as the Americans, and he contended that they could get their tugs from Windsor as conveniently as from Detroit. The schooner *M. C. Cameron*, at Goderich, went ashore, and there were negotiations with the Canadian Tug Company to take her off. But they found they could get an American tug a few dollars cheaper, and they obtained one from Detroit, contrary to law, while Canadian tugs were lying idle. The hon. member for Hamilton had spoken about humanity, but he (Mr. McCallum) could tell him that a good many of the men spoken of were out of humanity's reach. It was days after the storm was over when the seizure took place, and he did not think the fine imposed in regard to the *Sarah E. Bryant* was sufficiently heavy.

MR. KIRKPATRICK moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

EMIGRANTS AIDED BY GOVERNMENT
AT HAMILTON.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton), moved for return showing the number of emigrants who have received Government aid at Hamilton (Ontario), the date of their arrival and departure from Hamilton, the names of those to whom aid has been given, and the nature of such aid; the names of all persons to whom railway and steambot tickets have been issued by the agent at Hamilton, and the places to which such tickets carried the person to whom the same were given; the total number of tickets issued by said agent, and an account in detail of all moneys expended and to whom paid by the said agent, and for what purpose, and whether on account of the Dominion or Ontario Government; such returns to cover the period between the 10th October, 1874, and 10th October, 1878.

Motion agreed to.

MONTHLY RECEIPTS OF INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne), moved for a return showing the monthly receipts from that portion of the Intercolonial Railway between River du Loup and Halifax, for the two years ending December 31st, 1878, together with a statement of the actual working expenses of that portion of the line for the same period.

Motion agreed to.

FREIGHT ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne), moved for a return showing the number of car loads of the different kinds of freight forwarded from River du Loup into the Maritime Provinces, between January 1st and December 31st, 1878, together with a similar statement of the quantity and kind passing through River du Loup, from the Maritime Provinces, between January 1st, 1877, and December 31st, 1878.

Motion agreed to.

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

ROYAL INSTRUCTIONS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. MILLS moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United Kingdom upon the subject of the Royal Instructions prior to the 5th of October, 1878. He said there was a wide difference between the Royal Instructions given Lord Dufferin in 1872, and those received by the present Governor-General. Those brought down a few days ago were made to conform to the system of Government established by the British North America Act. It appeared the Colonial Secretary reserved to himself powers the Act did not contemplate. The Commission to Lord Dufferin provided that certain important questions which, by the British North America Act, Parliament was expressly authorised to legislate upon should be reserved by the Governor-General for the consideration of Her Majesty. Since that Act provided for the establishment of a system of Government similar to what existed in the United Kingdom, it was obvious the Governor-General could not be authorised to act in a manner inconsistent with its provisions and with the principles of parliamentary government, by Royal Instructions. The Colonial Secretary, under former Instructions, might have advised Her Majesty to reserve everything, so that not a single measure could become law without the authority of parties not recognised by the Act, nor in any way responsible to the Parliament of Canada for the advice they gave. The principle of the Instructions of 1872 was wholly inconsistent with the Constitution; and, if the spirit of the British North America Act were complied with, the Royal Instructions must be in accordance with its principles, and for the purpose of giving effect to its provisions. They saw those Instructions had been greatly modified, and all those objectionable features removed. In the Royal Instructions to Lord Dufferin, in the exercise of the power of pardon, His Lordship was expressly authorised, if he saw proper, to disregard the counsel of his constitutional advisers. It was perfectly clear the Parliament of Canada was authorised to deal with criminal legislation. It could scarcely be assumed that,

although competent to legislate upon the subject of crimes, and to advise the Crown in the appointment of the administrators of the law, they were not competent to advise it as to who were proper subjects of its clemency. The objectionable feature of the former Instructions was this—they assumed that the advisers of Her Majesty in Great Britain were superior to the law passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom as our Charter. Those objectionable features had been removed. There was no special class of subjects which His Excellency the present Governor-General had been instructed to reserve. There was no measure which, if now passed by Parliament, might not become law on the advice of those enjoying the confidence of the majority of the House. All those changes were in the direction of a more intelligent view of our rights and of a larger measure of self-government. Those changes, he believed, had been made in the Royal Instructions through the action of the late Government. When the correspondence between the Canadian and the Colonial Secretaries was brought down, he thought it would be seen that the late Canadian Government were not unmindful of the people's interests in this matter, nor indifferent to the encroachments made in the powers of self-government conferred upon Canadians by the British North America Act.

Motion agreed to.

CONTRACT FOR SLEEPERS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR TENDERS.

Mr. Fiset moved for a statement showing the names of the parties who tendered for the last contract for sleepers on the Intercolonial Railway; whether such tenders were for the whole contract or only for a portion; the price or prices named by each party tendering; the names of those who were awarded a contract or contracts, and the price for fulfilment thereof.

Motion agreed to.

TENDERS FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for a statement shewing the dates upon which tenders were received for public works;

the dates upon which the contracts were awarded; whether the lowest tender was accepted; if not, statement of the tenders, with the names of those making them, and their amount, respectively, including and below that accepted by the Department; whether, in cases where the lowest tender was accepted, the contract was made with the persons sending in such tender or if other and what names were substituted; and whether, in cases where the lowest tender was not accepted, a higher tender was accepted after report of the Engineer of the Department, and by Order in Council upon the report of the Minister setting forth the reasons for such action; the whole covering the period between the 1st November, 1873, and the 10th October, 1878.

Motion agreed to.

IMPROVEMENTS IN RIMOUSKI WHARF.

MOTION FOR ENGINEERS' REPORT.

Mr. Fiset moved for copies of the report of the engineers respecting the improvements required to be made in the wharf at Rimouski, in order to render it more convenient for the landing of the English mails.

Motion agreed to.

LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYÉS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved for a statement giving the names of all persons now permanently or temporarily employed on the Lachine Canal; the date of their appointments, and the amount of their salary or pay.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 13.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

FIRST READING.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced a Bill (No. 21) To amend the Do-

minion Lands Act. He said it was a Bill that did not involve any questions of policy. The amendments were simply of a technical character, suggested by the Surveyor-General for the purpose of correcting certain errors in the Act. During the present Session, he proposed bringing down another Bill involving questions of policy.

Bill read the first time.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 4th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RECEPTION OF PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS.

EXTENSION OF TIME.

MR. ROBINSON moved that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended for one week, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and *read the first time* :—

Bill (No. 22) To repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875, and to make provisions in lieu thereof.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

Bill (No. 23) To incorporate the *Gazette Printing Company*.—(Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre.)

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE FORCE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 13.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House *resolved* itself into Committee to consider certain resolutions respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.

(*In the Committee.*)

Resolutions *agreed to* and *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolutions *reported*, *read the first and second times*, and *referred* to the Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 13.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 13) To amend and consolidate, as amended, the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.

(*In the Committee.*)

On Section 5,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the clause contained the following provision :—

“Provided that the Commissioner may appoint supernumerary constables not exceeding in the whole ten men, in order to fill vacancies in the force, and may employ not exceeding in the whole ten men as scouts, at such rates of pay as may be authorised by the Minister charged with the control and management of the Force.”

MR. MACKENZIE : That is practically an addition of twenty men.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he explained, in introducing the Bill, the great service scouts were found to be of in the United States. The late Government had recommended the employment of one scout, and he had been found of such value that Colonel McLeod, the commander of the Mounted Police, asked for liberty to employ seven scouts. It did not, however, follow that the whole number would be wanted, probably not more than two or three.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked if there was any particular necessity for introducing a special clause in the Act. He thought last year a vote was taken for the employment of guides in the ordinary Estimates.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was a special order given last year for the employment of a scout, and he was paid by a special warrant, certainly not out of the ordinary vote. He thought it was better that the Government should know the number of men that could be employed for this useful purpose.

MR. SCHULTZ said that there could be no question as to the advisability of employing these Indian or half-breed scouts. So advantageous had it been found in connection with the United States army that the President had called attention to the advisability of it in his last Message, and the reports of the

Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior both strongly recommended their employment.

MR. MACKENZIE said what he wished to know was, whether the ten supernumeraries were to be employed as scouts?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No.

MR. MACKENZIE: This, then, is a practical addition of twenty men?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes; the scouts would not be policemen, but, largely, Indians or half-breeds of different tribes, speaking different languages.

MR. MILLS said the hon. the Premier took power to increase the force to 500 men in case of emergency, which would, probably, mean any complication with the Indians, which would require the police force to act as a military force also, in case of Indian hostilities against the white settlers. He thought it extremely questionable whether this was the best way of meeting the difficulties that might thus arise. In the event of hostilities the Government would, doubtless, be obliged to call in the ordinary military force of the country. He was strongly impressed with the idea that there was danger of difficulties with the aborigines at no very remote period. He believed the supply of buffalo would, at an early day, be exhausted, these buffalo being the principal means of support of the Indians; and, unless something was done, at an early day, to induce them to engage in industrial pursuits, serious complications would arise, when their present means of subsistence failed. He thought the proposed measure would prove a rather expensive way of maintaining peace in that country. The police, doubtless, were sufficient for actual wants, but would be wholly inadequate if difficulties arose with the Indian population. He thought the effect of the Bill would be to induce the officials to rely rather on this measure for the maintenance of order than to take those necessary precautions for the prevention of difficulties.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said no doubt the danger the hon. gentleman mentioned must always be contemplated.

The Government and Parliament must be prepared for an outbreak sometime when the Indians' means of subsistence failed or became scarce. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) thought there were satisfactory indications that the Indians were beginning, of themselves, in a very imperfect way, certainly, to see the advantage of settling down and becoming agriculturists, so far, at all events, as to raise their own food. There had been annual votes for seed grain, cattle and other things with that object in view. It was to be hoped they would be yearly more able to produce their own food from the soil, instead of trusting altogether to hunting. Still, all those efforts might fail, and the Indians be driven to violent courses by hunger, to fighting among themselves, or with the whites. It would, then, be absolutely necessary that an efficient force should be raised as speedily as possible to protect the whites, and restore peace. They had the nucleus of a well-trained force in the Mounted Police. The service was very popular, there being upwards of 800 applications for a chance of two vacancies in the spring. There would be very little difficulty in getting the best kind of men, who would make a valuable force, that would be easily increased and quickly trained in the event of any outrage in the North-West. The present force would be insufficient in case of war, when the militia would have to be raised to put down any serious rising. It was important, therefore, that, should a serious emergency arise, a sufficient force could be employed without the necessity of calling Parliament together.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he had not the slightest intention of opposing the power asked for in this measure, which was reasonable; but he wished to add his voice to that of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to the enormous importance of allowing no means to be neglected for inducing those Indian tribes to maintain themselves by other means than hunting. He had felt, so far back as 1872, there was serious danger in that respect. Nothing could contribute more to the embarrassment of the finances than an Indian war. He urged the necessity of the extremest, the most careful supervision over the Indian agents,

and, above all, the direction of the attention of the Indians, at the earliest possible moment, to the raising of a portion of their own supplies, at least. This was a matter in which he took a considerable interest, and he knew Colonel McLeod took a very great interest in it. He (Mr. Cartwright) thought there was reason, from the experience of the Sioux, to believe that, if the Indians were fairly dealt with and encouraged, they would do a great deal towards providing for their own maintenance; and, although he regretted exceedingly the necessity of increasing the grants to the Indian tribes, he felt that was better than being plunged into such troubles as those with which the American Government had been struggling for the last twenty-five years.

MR. MILLS said, in his opinion, their whole Indian system was a failure, and not entitled to the praise of superiority to the American generally, though there had been no difficulty in dealing with the few Indians scattered through the older Provinces of Canada, but, when they looked at that aboriginal population, and the long period they had been under civilisation, they must admit the uselessness of the efforts made to elevate them from barbarism. The Canadian policy had only served to impoverish them, and would, in the North-West, prove a total failure, unless they induced the Indians to remain fixed in the soil, and the tribal system and the influence of the chiefs as early as possible, and gave each individual a right of separate property in the soil, and induced the Indians to engage in agricultural pursuits. No doubt, before the time of the present Parliament expired, serious troubles would be witnessed in the North-West. It was highly important that Government should adopt some vigorous Indian policy, and employ, in the Indian Department, upright, energetic, intelligent men, prepared to run some personal risk, and submit to some personal inconvenience to promote the interests of the Indians. Unless the Government did that, gave personal attention to this subject, and pursued a policy wholly different from the present, there could be no doubt the provisions in this Bill would be wholly inadequate to the maintenance of peace in the North-West.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was extremely pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) in the support he gave the measure. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) quite agreed with the observations of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to the public necessity of, as speedily as possible, and without too strict attention to economy, making a strenuous effort to wean the Indians from their wild habits and make them settled residents. The sooner the tribal system was abandoned, and the Indian induced to settle on his own land, cultivate it, and, if valuable, hold it in perpetuity, the better. He thought the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Mills) did not suppose the power of alienation should be given the aborigines, who could be wheedled out of their rights. He was in the Indian Department for some time, and took certain steps with this object, which the present Government would follow up. They would, however, cost money, but he hoped that thereby a great advance would be made in Indian civilisation. Under our system, which was, doubtless, too much vaunted, but which was better than the American, the Indians had felt secure, and could be easily managed. The difference between the American and our management was the greater honesty of ours, though even in the Canadian North-West some frauds were said to have been perpetrated upon the Indians, such as giving them inferior grain and oxen. Whether that were true or not he had not been able to verify, but he agreed with the hon. member that every means had been taken to ensure the strictest honesty in the Government officials. It was, and would be, very difficult to keep a check on Indian agents. He had hoped that, under the system adopted by the late Government, of appointing the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territory Superintendent of Indians, all the subordinate agents might report to him. The Lieutenant-Governor had written that his position as Governor of the North-West clashed with his position as Superintendent of Indians, and he was obliged to resign the latter. They would have to appoint some person of standing, with rank equivalent in dignity to that of Governor, as a Commissioner of Indians, who would have, on

the spot, despotic powers over the various Indian agents, and thus be enabled to rectify at once any wrong practised on the Indians.

Section agreed to.

On Section 6,

MR. MACDOUGALL said he desired to know what was the liability of the Government in case of members of the force being injured or meeting with accidents which incapacitated them from further service in the force, or from earning a livelihood out of it. A case had come under his notice recently in which a very large claim was made, with apparent justice, against the Government for indemnity, in consequence of injuries received in obeying the orders of the superior officer, by which the soldier was exposed to severe frost, and crippled for life. In the latter part of the Bill, a clause was inserted stating that commissioned officers were entitled to superannuation in the same manner as other civil servants, but nothing was said about constables. Some provision should be made, fixing settlements of indemnity claims at a reasonable amount.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was no provision in the Bill providing for compensation to any of these policemen injured, nor was there any in the Militia Act. If a mounted policeman were wounded or injured in the performance of his duty, he would be treated by Parliament as a militiaman would be treated in a similar case. During the Fenian raid, Parliament came readily forward, and provided for certain militiamen who were wounded, and made allowances to the families of those who were slain. If a good case were made out, Parliament would, no doubt, provide ample compensation. It would be infinitely better to leave the matter as it was.

MR. MACKENZIE said he entirely agreed in that opinion. He recollected cases in which claims for compensation were made of a character which would not justify the Government in granting them. The pay was very good, and a reward of 160 acres was given at the end of the term, as a further inducement, and there was no more reason

for compensating men who suffered some injury or other while in the police service than any other labouring men. The Government would be willing, no doubt, to make such provision as could be made for men injured in their employment. In his Department, two men who had been injured in the police service were employed as writers. He would be strongly opposed to any permanent provision such as was given to soldiers of the regular army, whose pay was very small and who were exposed to dangers these men were not exposed to, being made. The claims for compensation arising at present were not of a character to demand any serious attention. One person had demanded compensation because a consumptive habit had been developed instead of cured by his service in the force. He ought never to have entered it, and it would have been an imposition on the country to have rewarded him because he spent one or two years in the service and during that time could only have discharged his duties.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was told the claim which the hon. gentleman had spoken of was made by a man who had lost his toe, and he asked \$10,000 for it. Very few people would refuse to give up a toe for that amount.

Section agreed to.

Progress ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Progress reported.

NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS AND ACCIDENTS ON RAILWAYS.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. FLEMING moved for a return showing the number of persons employed on the 31st December last on each of the railways in the Dominion (classified according to the nature of the work performed by them); also, a return of all accidents and casualties (whether to life or property) which have occurred on the railways of the Dominion during the year 1878, setting forth: 1st. The causes and natures of such accidents and casualties; 2nd. The points at which they occurred, and whether by night or day; 3rd. The full extent thereof and all the particulars of the same. He simply wished to say that it was desirable to

place before the House a full and complete statement of the accidents that had occurred on the railways of the Dominion. The question had frequently been brought before the House, and returns asked for. These, however, with the exception of one brought down last Session, had not been printed, and could only be found by a search among the files in the office of the Clerk of Records. It appeared that in three years over 1,200 accidents of a personal nature had occurred on the railways of the Dominion. A very large proportion of these—between 70 and 75 per cent.—had occurred to railway employes, in the prosecution of their labours. It was desirable to know the number of individuals employed in the different branches of the railway service, so that a comparison might be made between the number engaged in a particular class of work and the number of accidents which occurred in the performance of such work.

Motion agreed to.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if the usual annual report upon the railways of the Dominion was yet published, or to be published.

MR. TUPPER: It is intended to be published, and is now in course of completion.

THE TORONTO POSTMASTERSHIP.

MOTION FOR ORDER IN COUNCIL.

MR. HAY moved for a copy of the Order in Council under and by which the late postmaster of the city of Toronto was superannuated, and all correspondence in connection therewith, and which led up to the superannuation of the said postmaster. He said a good deal of comment had been excited in Toronto on the appointment of Mr. Patteson to the postmastership, and the people desired to know all the facts in relation to the change. He had been much pleased to learn from the hon. the Postmaster-General that the salary had been reduced instead of increased, and it was reported in Toronto—whether correctly or not, he could not say—that a saving had been effected of \$1,000 a year. The next question was, how came Mr. Lesslie to be superannuated at all while he was still able and willing to do the

MR. FLEMING.

work, as he (Mr. Hay) believed? He thought it was a bad beginning to burden the country with new appointments like that, when there was no necessity for it. It was very desirable that the most rigid economy should be observed in the Civil Service. The verdict of the 17th September last demanded it. In these times of severe depression, when thousands of good and honest men were unable to earn their daily bread, they should endeavour to be as economical as possible in all branches of the Civil Service.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if his hon. friend (Mr. Hay) would agree to the following amendment:—"Also, all correspondence and Orders in Council respecting the appointment of Mr. Patteson to the said office."

MR. HAY said he had no objection. Another thing had been done in Toronto by the Post Office Department a few years ago, which was nothing but a gross job. He referred to the case of Mr. Sweetnam, the inspector, whose duties were divided, and a gentleman appointed by the name of Spry to relieve Mr. Sweetnam. And this was done, although Mr. Sweetnam was one of the most efficient officers under the Crown, and quite capable of doing all the work—Mr. Sweetnam had told him so himself. It was not right that the Toronto post-office should thus be burdened with unnecessary officials.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was sorry his hon. friend had chosen to make the remarks he did concerning a public officer in Toronto. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was certain that every inhabitant of Toronto would say that Mr. Spry was quite as respectable a gentleman as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hay) himself. There was not a more respectable man in the city of Toronto than Mr. Spry, and the duties of the office were not performed, and could not be performed, by one inspector. The district was divided, and properly divided, because it was entirely too large for any possible superintendence by one man.

MR. HAY said he was informed by Mr. Sweetnam himself that there was no need of another Inspector. As for Mr.

Spry, he (Mr. Hay) did not know him, but he believed there was nothing against him personally.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, then, you should not describe him.

MR. LANGEVIN said there was no objection to the motion being adopted, nor was there any objection to the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman on the other side. The papers would be brought down as soon as possible, and they would show that the late postmaster at Toronto, Mr. Lesslie, had been an officer of the Government for 30 years; that he was over 65 years of age; that he had contributed to the superannuation Fund for a large number of years, and having arrived at that time of life when a man required some rest, it was only fair, after having been 30 years in the service, that he should be allowed superannuation.

MR. HOLTON: Did he apply for it?

MR. LANGEVIN: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE: Was he asked to apply for it?

MR. LANGEVIN said Mr. Lesslie applied for superannuation. The Government in this case had been as humane as had the hon. gentlemen opposite in the superannuation of Mr. Meredith, Deputy to the Minister of the Interior. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not find fault with themselves for that superannuation. Then there was the superannuation of Mr. Langton, who had also been a long time in the public service. Added to these was the superannuation of the Postmaster of St. John, N. B. Notwithstanding the fact, as all must admit, who knew either Mr. Meredith or Mr. Langton, that these gentlemen had some years of service left in them, they were allowed their superannuation, and it was only fair that they should have a few years' rest before they went to the grave.

MR. HUNTINGTON said that, during the period he occupied the position now occupied by the hon. the Postmaster-General, he never heard of Mr. Lesslie's desire for superannuation, and he desired to congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the early date upon which he found it

necessary to superannuate this gentleman. He wished to call attention to the nature of the criticism of hon. gentlemen of superannuations which had gone before, when it was found they had superannuated a man whom they knew did not desire to be superannuated, for the purpose of making a position for a friend. He did not object to the friend. He (Mr. Huntington) believed Mr. Patteson was not only an earnest and consistent friend in office, but a dangerous friend to disoblige. He desired, however, to call attention to the sincerity of the conduct of hon. gentlemen in condemning the policy of superannuation of the late Government, when they superannuated a man who did not wish to be superannuated, and thrust an individual into office whom the general voice of the country would declare had no claims to the position other than those for political services he had rendered.

MR. TUPPER said he thought this subject was of sufficient importance to attract some attention from the House, and that any member who would put on the paper a notice asking for the appointment of a Committee composed of members of both sides of the House, to examine into every case of superannuation that had taken place under the Act, and report to the House, would do a great service to the country. He was a little surprised that the hon. the late Postmaster-General should have feigned indignation at an aged public officer being superannuated after having expressed a desire for superannuation. Did the hon. gentleman never hear of the superannuation of the Warden of the Halifax Penitentiary by the late Government, of which he was a member? Those gentlemen found it convenient to make a vacancy for a member of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, for whom it was necessary to make provision, and he was given the position of Warden of the Halifax Penitentiary.

MR. HUNTINGTON: What did you say about it?

MR. TUPPER said that, when he was on the other side of the House, he characterised the course pursued by the Government as highly discreditable. He stated, at the same time, that the late

Government applied to the Inspectors of Penitentiaries to report the Warden, Mr. Donkin, for superannuation, and the answer they received from their own officers was that they were prepared to do so, but they would be obliged to report that he had no superior in his position in the public service. Notwithstanding that, however, they found means to superannuate Mr. Donkin, and placed another gentleman in his position. In this case the late Government brought in a new man with a largely increased salary, and that salary was raised with a view to the new incumbent. In the case of the Toronto postmastership, the vacancy was disposed of by placing an able, competent and energetic man, in the prime of life, to discharge the duties, at a salary of \$500 less than that of the previous employé. He (Mr. Tupper) had no doubt that the statements that had been scattered all over the country by the press supporting the hon. gentleman opposite, to the effect that with the installation of Mr. T. C. Patteson, the salary attached to the office had been increased, had done its work. Notwithstanding the explanations that had been made, hon. gentlemen were still dissatisfied. Even when they found Mr. Leslie had been superannuated at his own request, and that there had been a large reduction in the salary, it was still made a subject of animadversion. The Government, however, were prepared to challenge the closest investigation into the exercise of the power of superannuation, from the time of the passage of the Statute until the present time. If a Committee were moved for, as he had suggested, the report would show that the action of the present Government, both when in office before and since they had returned to office, would compare not unfavourably with the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. He wondered if the hon. the late Postmaster-General had any recollection of a very important superannuation he made in his own Department. Had the hon. gentleman entirely forgotten that he had superannuated an able and vigorous public officer to make way for a stranger to the country, who had no claim to consideration at the hands of the Government, who was brought into the Department and placed over the

MR. TUPPER.

heads of a large number of able and efficient officers? He (Mr. Tupper) trusted this matter would receive the attention it deserved, and that the suggestion he had made for the appointment of a Committee would be acted upon.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the hon. gentleman had been rather unhappy in his illustrations of the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. A few years ago, they passed a Superannuation Act which required that, when an officer of the Government reached the age of 65 years, it was necessary for him to obtain a report from the head of his Department that he was still competent to perform his duties, or he would be superannuated as a matter of course, that age being assumed to imply an inability to discharge efficiently public duties. But, after passing that Act, they appointed to the position of Warden of the Halifax Penitentiary a man who was 66 or 67 years of age, or above the age at which the Postmaster-General said they should give the poor old man, the late Postmaster of Toronto, a few years' rest before he slipped into the grave. The person appointed to the Halifax Penitentiary was utterly incapable of discharging at his age the duties of the position which required a man with strength of body and mind for the proper performance of the duties. He considered that the late Government not only acted rightly, but could not have acted otherwise, in providing for the retirement of a man of that age and appointed when he was too old for service and destitute of experience. There certainly was no analogy in these cases. The hon. gentleman had also mentioned the case of Mr. LeSueur. He presumed the hon. gentleman referred to Mr. LeSueur.

MR. TUPPER : I did.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could only observe that, if Mr. LeSueur desired an investigation of the reason which led to his superannuation, no one on that side of the House would object.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said Mr. LeSueur had written to him saying he wished for an investigation. But he could not understand why Mr. Meredith,

a man in the possession of all his physical and mental faculties, as able as ever he was, and, perhaps, more able from experience, to perform his duties, was superannuated. Knowing the wide experience and value of Mr. Meredith, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had asked him to return to the office he held before. He knew that there was not the slightest shadow of an excuse for the superannuation of that gentleman. Then there was Mr. Langton, an old man, but still as vigorous as ever he was in his life, and quite capable of performing his duties when superannuated. He desired to state, further, that he did not think the friends of Mr. Lesslie would thank the hon. member for Shefford for discussing this motion.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said a case of superannuation he desired to bring before the House was certainly not of so much importance as those which had been already referred to. But, when the papers came down, they would show that a certain Mr. Egan, a warm and enthusiastic admirer of the late Government, was as well able to perform his duties as any man could be. He was superannuated and received an allowance of \$700 a year. The week following, he entered into an arrangement with an insurance company from which he received a salary of \$1,000 a year. Here they had a case of a man receiving \$700 a year from the Superannuation Fund, able to perform duties which secured him a salary of \$1,000 a year. These things required ventilating, and he did hope the hint thrown out by the hon. the Minister of Public Works would be acted upon.

MR. DOMVILLE said he would like to refer to a case of superannuation in St. John, N.B., where they had superannuated a gentleman perfectly able to do his work, and appointed in his place a political friend and strong partisan of the late Government, at an increase of salary, and he served them, at the present time, by editing a paper in their favour. He (Mr. Domville) thought that illustration should be brought up on this occasion, because when they asked why that gentleman's name appeared in connection with the journal to which he was attached, the late Minister of Customs declared that he had received an assur-

ance from the gentleman in question that he would cease to have any connection with the paper. That hon. gentleman led the House to believe that the appearance of his name in the paper was a mere typographical error; yet his name continued to be freely advertised day after day and month after month. He regarded it as a great injustice that the people should be called upon to pay the superannuation allowance in such a case as this. He had nothing to say against the present Postmaster, as he was a gentleman well fitted for the position in every respect, but only made the illustration to show that the country had been saddled with extra expense for political reasons. Then, in regard to St. John Penitentiary, they appointed one named Ketchem, against whom complaints were made respecting certain moneys he had received in trust, as was usual in such cases, from prisoners. An investigation into the charges was held, with a very damaging result; but, so great a partisan was the Warden, and so faithfully had he worked for the party, that he was not displaced in the face of this investigation, which condemned him in the highest degree. Those papers were in the hands of the Department, and should be brought down. He gave two illustrations from New Brunswick alone, and should like to ask the late Minister of Customs how he could justify his Government in regard to the question of the postmastership.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said the late Postmaster referred to was not superannuated a day too soon in the interest of the public service. He (Mr. Howe) was not fit for the position he held as Postmaster. He had the post-office in difficulties years previous, having been unfit to conduct it properly. He was reported to be more than half of the time absent from the office by indisposition, and was often, in consequence, incapacitated for business when in attendance. With regard to the assertions about the Warden of the Penitentiary, he was very old when superannuated. It was said to be necessary he should be retired, which he (Mr. Burpee) understood was on the recommendation of reliable authorities. As to Mr. Ellis's

position, he (Mr. Burpee) would repeat now what he stated last year, that he had been told that he (Mr. Ellis) would disengage himself from his business partnership at the very first opportunity. It was quite well understood his interest in the paper had ceased, beyond the interest in his money remaining in it when he left it. No man in St. John would assert the superannuation of the late Postmaster, Mr. Howe, was not necessary and proper under the circumstances named, and the fact of his having over forty years' service in the Department.

MR. BOULTBEE said he happened to know the gentleman who had been appointed Postmaster in Toronto, and must notice that, while exception was taken to the Minister of Public Works terming him a public official, in fact Mr. Patteson had been an officer under the Government of the late Sandfield Macdonald, and had performed the duties of his office most efficiently, as he (Mr. Boulton) had been told more than once by Mr. Macdonald; and in fact there was no better man for the position. The debate had taken a rather wide range. He did not think the Minister of Public Works should have commented so severely on the conduct of the members for Shefford and Lambton (Messrs. Huntington and Mackenzie), in speaking with a good deal of severity of an appointment like the present, because the gentlemen opposite were Reformers all their lives, and had been asking for economy incessantly, while out of office, and censuring their adversaries for not practising it, in regard to removals of old, and appointments of new, men. Being out of office again, it was quite natural that they should feel in the same economical mood, whether they experienced it in office or not. It might be that while they were in power they were forced to submit to the exigencies of political necessities though against the convictions of a lifetime, which obliged them to infringe somewhat on their principles. They had found it impossible to resist the pressure put on them, as in the case of the late Postmaster, to whom they had behaved most leniently and shown every consideration even far beyond what was right. But he (Mr. Boulton) ventured to say

MR. BURPEE.

that, seated now in their own proper place, to the Speaker's left, where they would probably remain for some time, they would be found inspired with as lofty feelings of purity and economy as before; because their minds would naturally return to their ancient grooves. They would find them again criticising every necessary appointment, though not acting upon their professions should they again come into power, the prospect of which was remote, however, at present. In office again, human weakness might once more prevail, and cause them to yield up their great principles, to make appointments like those already condemned, and undergo again the criticism of an intelligent press and the condemnation of the people.

MR. MILLS said hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side had taken a singular way of defending this particular transaction. The Premier stated the late Ministry did very wrong, and he admitted the present had done like their predecessors; that was an extraordinary defence. The hon. gentleman stated that the superannuation of Mr. Meredith, Deputy Minister of the Interior, was highly improper, a transaction similar to that of which complaint was made by the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Hay). There was, it was said, pressure brought to bear by the Postmaster-General upon Mr. Lesslie, to induce him to apply for superannuation. No doubt, the hon. gentleman could tell a great deal more than he had actually revealed; more than the papers would disclose. But Mr. Meredith asked for his superannuation on cogent grounds; and, when the Government looked at his age, the provision of the law, his long service, and repeated applications for superannuation, and his alleged ill-health, they granted it accordingly. The law contemplated superannuation under such circumstances. When a party reached 65 years of age, the law assumed that he was unequal to his work, unless the contrary was shown. The burthen of proof was upon him to show that he was fit to continue in office. The hon. Premier had superannuated parties in many cases, and had promoted the retirement of Judges from the Bench after a very much shorter service than Mr.

Meredith's term. The resignation of the late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who was not older, and had not served longer than that gentleman, was, it appeared, accepted by the right hon. gentleman. He supposed the resignation of the Chief Justice was accepted on the ground of ill-health also, and the Premier would have some reason to complain if the Opposition had charged him with improper conduct. With regard to Mr. Lesslie, the case was different, ill-health and old age not being established in the sense of producing inefficiency; on the contrary, Mr. Lesslie had shown that he was fit. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches admitted they had acted improperly; that Mr. Lesslie was still qualified to perform the duties; but they said to the late Government: "You did the same thing." The late Ministers replied that the cases of Messrs. Meredith and Langton were not on all fours with the Toronto postmastership. The Premier said Mr. Meredith had declined to return to the service. He (Mr. Mills) believed Mr. Lesslie would be perfectly willing to resume his duties. It was rumoured that Mr. Lesslie was informed by the present Postmaster-General that his resignation would be accepted, and that Mr. Lesslie came to Ottawa to show the Postmaster-General that he was in excellent preservation, and that he was still fit for his duties; but the hon. the Postmaster-General insisted upon making him an unwilling object of his disinterested beneficence; they still insisted, much against his will, that he should have a few years of delightful retirement before going to his grave. Mr. Lesslie was very unwilling, but the Government insisted on conferring upon him blessings that he had not, so far, appreciated.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) was not correct in saying he quoted the cases of Messrs. Meredith and Langton as on all fours with Mr. Lesslie's. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) was not in the House when the matter came up, but he did say that Messrs. Meredith and Langton were quite capable, physically and mentally, of performing their duty. With regard to Mr. Lesslie, his hon. friend (Mr. Langevin) was no more

reticent than he felt it his duty to be, and he had no cause of objection to any inquiry into the matter. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) would move for a Committee to enquire into every case of superannuation from the time the Act was passed until the adoption of the resolution, so as to ascertain all the facts as to every superannuation by way of annuity or gratuity. He had known Mr. Lesslie all his life, and had great respect for him, and regretted very much on his account that this discussion had been pressed so far. The only question was whether his hon. friend the Postmaster-General would be justified in recommending the superannuation with a retiring allowance at all. The hon. gentlemen opposite would have the advantage of hearing all the evidence when brought before the Committee.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he regretted very much that the hon. gentleman had seen fit to state that Mr. LeSueur had asked for an investigation, and that the Minister of Public Works saw fit to bring up that matter. He could assure the House that nobody more than Mr. LeSueur must regret the fact, because it was his (Mr. Huntington's) duty now to move for the papers in the case, which he thought it would have been better, in the case of an old public servant like him, not to have done. But he could not leave himself under the imputation of having thrust out an old official and replaced him with a favourite of his own, which had been reiterated here, and, falsely, over and over again, for which there was not a tittle of justification; and he would therefore move for the papers which would show the falsehood of the insinuation made in the newspapers. He should have been glad, if possible, to leave this without taking such a course, but he was constrained to adopt it by the course taken by the hon. gentleman himself.

MR. ROCHESTER said Mr. LeSueur would be perfectly delighted to have the matter examined into.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said it would be more convenient to wait until some case had been made out as to the working of the Act before condemning it; but as he had himself been Chairman of the

Board, under which most of these superannuations took place, for five years, he desired to make a few remarks on the subject. The late Government were quite prepared to defend their action with respect to any or every superannuation made during that period, and no doubt hon. gentlemen were equally willing to defend their course of action during the considerable period before. This Act was not introduced by the late Government. They found it on the Statute-book, and, if, in its working, hon. gentlemen thought there was danger of unfairness, they were justified in calling public attention to it, and in introducing such amendments as might prevent fraud or political favouritism. With respect to the cases alluded to, although it was rather unfortunate that they should be brought up in that fashion, he might say that, wherever an error might have been committed, that a man was superannuated who was fit to do his work, under a certain age, the Statute expressly provided that the Government might call him back to the service. If the case mentioned by the hon. member for Hamilton, of Mr. Egan, fell under that category, it would be the duty of the Government to inform Mr. Egan that he had obtained his superannuation in a way in which he ought not to have obtained it, and that he was now re-established and might return to the public service in a position corresponding to the one he had occupied. Mr. Egan was superannuated on the certificate of respectable medical men that he was unable to discharge his duties or bear the confinement of an office. It might be the case that under medical care he recovered his health, or that the certificates were falsely given. In either case, it was perfectly competent for the hon. gentlemen to restore him to the public service, although, from the number of applications received from other disinterested gentlemen to enter the public service, they would not be very anxious to take that method of rectifying the error.

MR. BOWELL said the late Government had taken care there should be no vacancies to fill.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he thought hon. gentlemen opposite had found room for a good many persons not as experi-

enced in the public service as Mr. Egan. As regarded other cases, more particularly the case of the superannuation of Mr. Langton, he would observe that he had passed the age of three score and ten before being superannuated. It had been specially provided that, when any man passed 65, the head of the Department must certify that he was fully fit for the duties of the office.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : There is no such provision in the law.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said if it was not stated in the law, the hon. gentleman would find it stated in the Orders in Council passed by the hon. gentleman himself, and which were, by the provisions of this Act, incorporated with the Act, and therefore a part of the law. The hon. gentleman thought, then, that when a man arrived close to 65 years of age, his mental and bodily vigour somewhat failed, but he (Mr. Cartwright) was glad to find that the hon. gentleman's own experience led him to think that, after 65, he might continue to do the public some service ; but, when ten years younger, the hon. gentleman's views were not precisely similar to what they were now. If the hon. gentlemen opposite thought it desirable to alter that provision they had full power to do so. All he had to caution them against was, that great inconvenience would result to the public service if they decided that men were not to be removed from it, except when a Minister preferred special charges against them. Cases continually occurred of men who, after having done good service, had become rusty, and not up to the duties of their office, and that provision was made to meet such cases. With all deference to Mr. Langton, or any man in such a position, he did not believe there was one in ten thousand who was fit, at seventy-one years of age, to discharge the duties of the head of a Department as competently as when fifty or sixty or sixty-five years of age. If the hon. gentleman had any complaint to make as to the conduct of the late Government in the matter of superannuating Mr. Langton, and would move for the papers, he would have no hesitation in defending their conduct, though he might

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

tell hon. gentlemen they might find it a very inconvenient precedent in the future if every exercise of the discretion of a Minister, within the terms of the Statute or Order in Council, was to be called in question in this way. If they thought there was any danger of this Act being abused, nothing was easier than to introduce such amendments as they deemed necessary, or wipe out the Act altogether.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. GRANDBOIS moved for a statement showing the names, occupation and salaries of all persons employed in the service of the Intercolonial Railway, except day labourers, on the 31st December, 1878.

MR. CARON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

FISHING RIGHTS IN THE SEIGNIORY OF BIC.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. VALLÉE moved for copies of the lease of the rivers of the Seigniorie of Bic, in the county of Rimouski, granted to W. D. Campbell, Esquire, Notary, of Quebec; 2. Of the contract establishing his right of fishing on the shores of the St. Lawrence in the said parish of Bic, and of any document authorising him to levy certain dues from persons setting salmon fisheries in that locality.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a return showing the quantities and values of the different articles of merchandise imported into British Columbia from other Provinces of the Dominion in 1878; also, the exports from British Columbia to other Provinces of Canada, up to December 31st, 1878; also, the exports and imports into British Columbia, to and from foreign countries, between

June 30th, 1878, and December 31st, 1878, but not including goods of provincial growth or production. He said he would ask the Minister of Customs to look into the archives of his office, in order to discover what those imports amounted to. It would not be difficult to get the information respecting the interprovincial trade between British Columbia and the Eastern Provinces, as it was practically isolated from all the others. The trade was very extensive. It commenced in 1872 with \$22,114; in 1873, it amounted to \$75,604; in 1874, to \$66,104; in 1875, to \$117,054; in 1876, to \$129,735; in 1877, to \$160,314, and for the half-year ending 31st December, 1877, to \$57,162. The total imports from the old Provinces amounted in the six and a half years ending 31st Dec., 1877, to \$628,688, and he asked the Government to be pleased to send down the imports into British Columbia during 1878. He also asked the hon. the Minister of Customs that, in the annual reports, the amount of imports and exports be shown, so that there might be, in future years, a return showing the interprovincial trade between the Western and the Eastern Provinces; and, if possible, now that the Government had engaged the services of a very accurate statistician, it would be of great advantage to have as much information gathered respecting the interprovincial trade of all the Provinces as possible, and publish it in the annual returns. This would render it unnecessary to call for these returns in future.

Motion agreed to.

MAIL CONTRACT WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) moved for copies of contract for mail service with Steam Navigation Company of Prince Edward Island, at the time the Island entered Confederation; also, copies of documents relating to any alteration that may have taken place, and all correspondence in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 5th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.*(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)*

FIRST READING PROPOSED.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend an Act intituled: "An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway," passed in the 39th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought this was a copy of a Bill introduced last year by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper). It was, in fact, a Bill to establish rights which did not now exist, and he gave his hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) notice that he should oppose the Bill. He was surprised that the Government permitted it to be introduced.

MR. TUPPER said he differed very much in opinion from the hon. the leader of the Opposition. He did not consider this Bill proposed to establish rights that did not exist. It was simply a measure to carry out a pledge given by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, when standing where he (Mr. Tupper) now stood, on the occasion of his introducing a Bill to amend the Intercolonial Railway Act. At that time he (Mr. Tupper) had brought under the notice of the House the fact that it was claimed by the Halifax City Railway Company that they had rights under existing legislation which would be prejudicially affected, and the hon. gentleman, then Minister of Public Works, stated that no private rights would be interfered with. He accepted that statement, and the Bill passed the House and went to the other branch of the Legislature, and there the member of the Government in charge of the Bill gave a specific pledge that no private rights as they existed should be interfered with. He (Mr. Tupper) did not say that the Halifax City Railway Company had any rights which would be

MR. MACDONALD.

affected, but that they claimed that they had, and he understood that, subsequently, when they undertook to press their claims before the Supreme Court, this Act was used to estop the consideration of their claims. All that was proposed to be done by this Bill was simply to prevent an Act passed two Sessions ago from operating prejudicially against existing rights, if any did exist. When he sat on the other side of the House, he held that the Government ought not, by legislation, to remove any existing private right which any individual enjoyed. He believed that to be sound constitutional doctrine at the time, and he thought so still.

MR. MACKENZIE said the claim which was set up was that the Government of the Dominion had no right to extend the Intercolonial Railway into Halifax, because it competed with the Street Railway, and the person concerned claimed that the Dominion should compensate him, because the track of the Intercolonial Railway went a certain distance in the direction in which his line extended. The claim was too preposterous to be entertained for a moment. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was not aware of what had passed in the Court, but he was almost certain that his Bill could not have been used as an estoppel of the action. He was quite satisfied that that Bill did not affect any private rights, and, if there were any old legislation of the Province of Nova Scotia which could be interpreted so as to prevent the Dominion from continuing a railway of its own in that Province, that legislation was not to be observed by the Dominion Government. He did not believe that was the effect of the legislation, and he did not believe in any Bill being introduced into this House, with the consent of the Administration, which had for its object the creation of a claim against the Government.

MR. TUPPER said the only effect of this Bill, if passed, would be to put the Halifax City Railway Company in the same position they occupied under the law, and under their charter, when the Bill was introduced by the hon. gentleman. If they had any right — and he should be surprised to find that they had any such rights as appeared to have been claimed by them —

this Bill would simply place them in the position they occupied before. If they had such rights, they ought not to be overridden by Parliament; if they had none, this measure would give them none.

MR. MACKENZIE said he wished to call the attention of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government to this Bill. In the first place, it would not be introduced unless it were supposed it would give certain rights against the Crown, which its promoters did not possess. Therefore, by their admission, the rights of the Crown were involved in the introduction of this Bill, which, therefore, could not be introduced till the Crown had given its consent.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said the Bill spoke for itself. The explanation of the hon. the Minister of Public Works was perfectly correct. The Bill simply placed the parties interested in the position they occupied previous to the legislation of 1877. During that year, an Act passed this House depriving them of certain legal privileges and rights they possessed as a corporate company under the laws of Nova Scotia; and a pledge was given in this House that that legislation should not have the effect of interfering with those private rights. Notwithstanding, it was found, when litigation took place before the Exchequer Court here, the Company was absolutely deprived of setting up certain privileges and rights conferred upon it by the Legislature of Nova Scotia. The result was that the Dominion Government, inheriting all the rights and powers and privileges of Nova Scotia in respect of her railways, was thus relieved from its obligations, and that in face of the direct assurance of a Minister of the Crown in this House to the contrary. The object of the Bill was to restore those rights. As to the right of the Government to make a railway through the city of Halifax, there was no question at all. The whole question was one of compulsion—the taking away of the property of those parties—and the Bill was designed to restore to them the particular tribunal provided in the local Acts, but not confer any rights which did not previously exist. The Crown was not inter-

ested excepting as a mere party to an ordinary suit.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would press his objection. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockburn) admitted he expected to claim compensation for some persons for the removal of property belonging to some railway company which, he said, the Government deprived them of. If compensation was thus to be claimed from the Crown, the Bill could not be introduced without its formal assent.

MR. COCKBURN said he would ask his hon friend the Premier to give the assent of the Crown to the introduction of this Bill. It was promised by hon. gentlemen, then Ministers, now in opposition, that the Bill passed in 1877 should not affect the rights of the Street Railway Company; and the same promise was given by Mr. Letellier in the other branch of the Legislature; and, in the face of that assurance, when the case came before the Courts, the parties were prejudiced by the terms of that Act.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have not the power to grant the assent asked for, without submitting the matter to His Excellency the Governor-General. I have heard the remarks of both hon. gentlemen, and will ask my hon. friend the mover (Mr. Cockburn) to leave the Bill over till to-morrow, when I shall be able to give a positive answer.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

JOHN STEWART DEPOSIT BILL.

(*Mr. McCarthy.*)

FIRST READING PROPOSED.

MR. MCCARTHY moved for leave to introduce a Bill to empower Robert G. Dalton, Clerk of the Court of Queen's Bench, Ontario, to pay to John Stewart, of the City of Kingston, surgeon, one thousand dollars.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would call the attention of his hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), to the fact that this was not, like the Bill of last year, a proposal to amend the Statute, but it was one to deal with moneys which were alleged to be John Stewart's, but

which probably were not John Stewart's, and his hon. friend proposed to get an opinion of the Legislature that this \$1,000 ought to be paid to John Stewart. He thought the hon. gentleman would have to give notice of this in the *Gazette*, and get a private Bill introduced by petition in the ordinary way. They could not dispose of other people's thousands and dollars in this way.

MR. MCCARTHY: I am glad to find from the hon. gentleman that he knows that this is not Dr. Stewart's \$1,000. If not, perhaps he can tell me whose it is.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, I think I could.

MR. MCCARTHY said he understood, at all events, that this money was deposited by Dr. Stewart, in filing a petition in the old Election Court of the Province of Ontario, and the difficulty was that that Election Court had ceased to exist. The money was deposited in the hands of the Clerk of the Court, who said he could not pay it out without an order from the Judges, and the Judges said they could not make the order as the Court did not exist. This was not private legislation, but was simply intended to restore to the Court or the Judges the right to deal with this \$1,000. If the Judges were not satisfied that the money belonged to Dr. Stewart, they would, of course, order it to be paid to whomsoever it really did belong.

MR. HOLTON said the Bill ordained that Mr. Dalton should pay the money to Mr. Stewart.

MR. MCCARTHY said of course that was not right, and would be amended. It should be left to the Judges.

MR. HOLTON said the Bill was wrong *ab initio*. The provision that the money should be paid was the very essence of the Bill. He objected to its introduction.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said the phraseology might be a matter of detail, but he was not clear that the Bill was not open to another objection. This was a matter affecting property and civil rights, and it was a question whether the Local Legislature was not the proper place in which to introduce it.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Bill, as introduced, interferes with private rights.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said that was a question of law, and not one for the decision of the Chair. It was for the House to decide, as it was not a question of order.

MR. SPEAKER said he thought it was a question of procedure, and that such Bills should be introduced by petition.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and *read the first time*:—

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and to extend the time for the completion of the said railway.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*.)

Bill (No. 25) To abolish the use of French Weight in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. *Casgrain*.)

Bill (No. 26) To authorise the trustees of the Toronto Savings Bank to sell and convey to the Home Savings and Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Cameron*, North Victoria.)

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Williams*.)

COLLECTION OF MONEY DUE BY CIVIL SERVANTS.

QUESTION.

MR. STEPHENSON, in the absence of Mr. DOMVILLE, enquired, Whether the Government have taken any steps towards recovering sums of money that may be due from officers of the Public Service; if so, what steps.

MR. TUPPER: The Government have taken steps towards recovering sums that may be due from officers of the Public Service.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

QUESTION.

MR. BERGERON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to widen and deepen the Beauharnois Canal, as has been done in the case of the Lachine Canal.

MR. TUPPER: It is not the intention of the Government, at present, to widen and deepen that canal.

WIDENING OF ST. ANNE'S LOCK.

QUESTION.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government soon to give out the contract for the widening of St. Anne's Lock, in the county of Jacques Cartier, and to proceed with the work in the spring; if not, when the work will probably be commenced?

MR. TUPPER: The Government does not intend, at present, to give out the contract for that service, but will proceed with it as soon as it is in a position to do so.

DISMISSAL OF CAPT. PURDY FROM THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER NEWFIELD.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) moved for copies of all correspondence, reports and instructions referring to the dismissal of Captain Purdy from the command of the Government steamer *Newfield*. He said it was desirable to ascertain all the reasons given for the dismissal of that officer, who had been in the Government service for ten years. He had had twenty-seven years of seafaring life, and, until the present, had not been known but as an efficient seaman, and good and faithful officer. His dismissal was a matter of great surprise in St. John, where he had many friends. The captain was also a very respectable man, and had been strongly recommended by St. John people.

MR. DECOSMOS said he wished the hon. mover would amend his motion by adding a clause, asking for all the papers connected with the removal of Captain Daniel Morrison from the steamer *Sir James Douglas*, in British Columbia, and the substitution of Captain Deveaux. In all probability, the cases would be found parallel. Captain Morrison was in the command of the *Sir James Douglas* when the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) was at the head of the Marine and Fisheries

Department. There was no good or just cause for his removal, which was an act of caprice, to which, it might be, some of the members from British Columbia urged the Government; but he (Mr. DeCosmos) questioned whether there was any justification for the act.

MR. MACKENZIE: What the hon. gentleman (Mr. DeCosmos) wishes attached to the motion has no connection with it. Notice of the amendment should have been given independently. This is making a specific proposition in a specific case.

MR. DECOSMOS said he thought there would be no difficulty, if the leader of the Opposition did not object.

MR. BUNSTER said the motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) met the case, and deserved consideration, for Captain Morrison was discharged at a moment's notice, and another person placed in command of the *Sir James Douglas*. If the matter were left to the people of British Columbia, who knew the abilities and character of both men, it would be decided in favour of Captain Morrison. He hoped the amendment would pass.

MR. TUPPER said there could be no question the amendment was not in order, as its subject had no connection with that of the main motion. Such amendments would do away with notices on the paper. He thought, if the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) heard the explanations of the Minister of Marine, he would admit the cases of dismissal were not parallel.

MR. POPE (Queen's P.E.I.) said there could be no possible objection to bringing down the papers asked for by the member for St. John (Mr. Burpee). It was, however, due to himself (Mr. Pope) to make some explanation, as so much had been said about the dismissal of Captain Purdy. When he assumed the charge of the Department, he found that one of the best of the Government steamers, the *Lady Head*, had been lost through carelessness and neglect. She was run ashore in June last and so seriously damaged that, when got afloat, she had to be sent to Pictou, and an expense of \$700 or \$800 incurred for repairs. After

this, and during the summer, she, through the same carelessness, was nearly being on shore two or three times. No notice was taken of this gross carelessness and neglect, and finally, in August, she was again run on the rocks and became a total loss. He did not hesitate to say that, if the officers in charge had been properly reprimanded or dismissed the service, as they should have been when guilty of the first neglect, and more competent men put in their places, this vessel, valued at \$30,000 or \$40,000, would have been saved. An investigation took place, and the Commission reported in the strongest possible terms, with regard to the carelessness and incompetency of the officers in charge, and suspended the master; but this did not amount to much, as neither he nor the mate had any certificate of competency, whilst our laws required that all masters of merchant ships should have certificates of competency, and that no Custom-house officer should grant a clearance unless the master was so certified. The Government ships were filled with masters and mates who were not certified. The *Newfield*, bound for Sable Island to land some coal and other supplies there, was, during the night, when there was no occasion for it, run into the harbour of Whitehead, and stranded on the rocks, and the only wonder was that she was not totally lost. When taken off, she was sent to Halifax for repairs. The whole keel was knocked out of her, and other damage sustained which cost some \$3,500 to repair. This, with incidental expenses, would cause a loss of six or seven thousand dollars. If acts of this kind were allowed to go unpunished, they would only be repeated and there would be no security for the safety and protection of the public property, in the interest of which alone he felt it to be his duty to dispense with the services of Captain Purdy. When a former vessel was lost, she was replaced by one purchased by the late Minister of Marine from friends of the hon. member who moved for these papers.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said he had no friends that ever had an interest in it.

MR. POPE said this well-known vessel, the *Glendon*, was purchased from

MR. POPE.

some friends of the hon. gentleman and in her, perhaps, there was one advantage, and that was, that she had not speed or power enough to put her on the rocks so that she could not be hauled off again, he believed, with a five-knot tide in her favour. She could go six miles an hour. She reflected no credit upon the Department, and was thoroughly unfit for work—as a proof of this, after the accident happened, the *Newfield* and she were undergoing repairs. The agent at Halifax asked that the *Napoleon III* should besent to Halifax for the purpose of visiting the Sable Islands, it being considered unsafe to send the *Glendon* out. The *Newfield* was a valuable ship costing \$80,000 or \$90,000, and there was no desire to lose her. It was his intention to place no man in charge of her, either as master or mate, unless he had the necessary certificate required by law. There were other reasons why he would have taken the responsibility of dismissing Captain Purdy from the service, viz: for wasteful expenditure in the management of that vessel. The expense of running the *Newfield* during last year amounted to nearly \$35,000. The provisioning of her cost nearly \$7,500, or \$3,000 more than it should have been. He was quite prepared to take the responsibility of the dismissal of Captain Purdy.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the statement of his hon. friend, that no master was allowed to clear a vessel out of port without his certificate, was incorrect. That law did not apply to coasting vessels, and the *Lady Head* was a coasting vessel and did not clear out for foreign ports.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.): I said it was required in the merchant service.

SIR A. J. SMITH said it was not required in the merchant service. The law applied only to vessels going to foreign ports, not to coasting vessels. The hon. gentleman had said that Captain Purdy was dismissed because Captain Lavoie had cast away the *Lady Head*. Was that the way he was going to rule his Department? So far as the *Lady Head* was concerned, he (Sir A. J. Smith) was prepared to undergo the strictest enquiry with regard to his administration in connection with her. Because an accident happened, it was not to be attributed to carelessness or want

of skill or knowledge of the officers. Navigation was perilous, and accidents happened under the best of masters and officers. His hon. friend was himself a shipowner. Did he discharge a man because an accident happened to his ship, without any enquiry; without giving him a hearing? Circumstances would arise when the most experienced masters could not avoid accidents or wrecks. His hon. friend had stated there was a great deal of extravagance in connection with the commissariat department of this vessel. Did he not know that Captain Purdy had nothing to do with the supplies; that they were under the control of the agency at Halifax, presided over by Mr. Johnson, appointed by the predecessors of the late Government? If there was any extravagance in the supplies, the responsibility lay with Mr. Johnson, and not with Captain Purdy. This vessel had rendezvous at Halifax, and was under the eye of Mr. Johnson, who should be held responsible. The hon. gentleman had said that Captain Purdy had no certificate. Captain Purdy had one, granted in 1852. He had then been in the Government employment for some time. He (Mr. Smith) was not satisfied with his certificate of service, but, before entrusting him with the *Newfield*, required that he should undergo examination. He was examined by Captain Scott, of Halifax, Chairman of the Board of Masters and Mates, who, the hon. gentleman must acknowledge, was a fit man. Captain Scott certified that Captain Purdy was, in every respect, qualified to take charge of that ship, and he was put in charge. He (Mr. Smith) could bear testimony to the efficiency of Captain Purdy. There was not a more competent man for the work in this country, and, until this accident happened, the ship had never touched ground. Last year, the vessel went to Paris in connection with the exhibition, under command of Captain Purdy. The mate had no certificate, and it was thought desirable to employ a competent person to assist Captain Purdy, and Mr. Tobin was employed. She had a most successful trip across and return trip. He was not going to prejudge the case; but he was not satisfied, nor was the House satisfied, with the explanation given by his hon. friend for the

arbitrary exercise of power in dismissing Captain Purdy. The hon. gentleman did not cause an enquiry to be made, but because Captain Lavoie cast away the *Lady Head*, and the accident happened to the *Newfield*, he displaced Captain Purdy. He displaced Captain Lavoie from what? The vessel was a wreck, and, therefore, there was no necessity to displace him, there was no employment for him; but Captain Purdy was displaced. There was a rumour that a political complication existed in Halifax, and it was necessary to sacrifice Captain Purdy in order to solve it. The position of shipping-master became vacant, and it was promised to Captain O'Brien. On account of some political difficulty in Halifax, Mr. Bligh had to be provided for, and he was made shipping-master, which led to great dissatisfaction in Halifax, and it was found necessary to find a place for Captain O'Brien. The accident to the *Newfield* occurred in November, but the displacement of Captain Purdy did not take place until the latter part of January. He did not know whether this rumour was based on fact or not, but he knew that Captain Purdy complained of being badly treated, and had written to him on the subject, as was quite natural, having been so long under his authority.

MR. DOMVILLE said he had lately come from St. John, and there was none of the feeling there of which the hon. member for Westmoreland had spoken. The gentleman whose case had been brought up happened to be a political adherent of the hon. gentlemen opposite, otherwise they would not have taken such an interest in him. Capt. Purdy had been removed, and he was glad to see that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was looking into the working of the Department. The hon. member for Westmoreland had not said a word about the *Glendon*. If the *Glendon* had been properly examined before she was bought, this country would have been saved the large sum of money which had been thrown away in her purchase. The argument made for the purchase was that Mr. Smith had recommended it; but Mr. Smith was not a practical steamboat man, he was only an inspector of boilers, and gave a certificate to suit the terms on which the

vessel was bought. He remembered seeing her in the harbour of St. John, N.B., where she was found to be useless and laid up. The Government took her up, and, at a very large expense, put her in order and equipped her for the public service. As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had said, with a five-knot tide, she would go six knots an hour. As far as he knew St. John, and he knew a little about it, the people there endorsed any action taken by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries which would give them a proper service, and it was time some action was taken to curtail useless expenditure. He thought the time had arrived when they should drop all political partisanship. He thought, if Captain Purdy was not the proper officer, he should be replaced. There were plenty of gentlemen in Westmoreland capable of taking the position. He regarded it out of place for his hon. friend to make such a difficulty about Captain Purdy. It had been done with a view of obtaining the political influence of Captain Purdy's friends, and he did not think the matter should have been brought before Parliament at all.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said his hon. friend did not practice what he preached. He would not have seen fit, under the circumstances, to have continued Captain Purdy in his employ. He desired to state that, in the matter of the *Glendon*, he had given three explanations, entirely to the satisfaction of both sides of the House. The *Glendon* cost, for building, \$30,000, and, after she had been running for two years, she was purchased by the Government for \$20,000. The purchase was made on the recommendation of Mr. William M. Smith, Steamboat Inspector, an officer appointed by the late Government. He was a man of some experience, and competent in every respect to certify as to the qualities of vessels. So far as the *Glendon* was concerned, he thought he stood entirely acquitted of blame. They naturally looked to their officers for information in these matters, and, before he closed the bargain, he sent to St. John for the necessary information. He was assured that any investigation into the transactions in his Department would not impeach in any way his integrity and honesty.

MR. DOMVILLE.

MR. TUPPER said, if anything were required to satisfy the House of the entire absence of any case to submit to Parliament in connection with the motion of the hon. member for the city of St. John, that was to be found in the remarks that had fallen from the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. gentleman had said that, because Captain Lavoie was dismissed, Captain Purdy had also to be sacrificed.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I did not say that.

MR. TUPPER: What did the hon. gentleman say?

SIR A. J. SMITH: I said that, because Captain Lavoie had cast away the *Lady Head*, Captain Purdy had also to be sacrificed.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman knew there was no foundation for that statement. His hon. friend formerly stated that, when he came to administer the Department, he found that Captain Lavoie, after having met with several serious mishaps, finally cast away the *Lady Head*, by which a great amount of public money had been lost to the country; that he found the *Lady Head* had been entrusted under the administration of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to the control of incompetent hands, that the parties in charge of her were entirely devoid of those certificates which the law required they should possess, and that this great sacrifice of public money had resulted from neglect on the part of the Minister to see that this valuable public property was not entrusted to the hands of persons competent to take care of it. The hon. gentleman also stated that so great a loss of public property had recently occurred as to enforce upon him the necessity of making an example not only of Captain Lavoie, but of taking such action as would teach those entrusted with the management and control of public property that, if, by their incompetency or negligence, a sacrifice of public property was made, they must take the consequences and leave the service. Then he had stated that Captain Purdy had been relieved of his command on account of his having taken the *Newfield* on to the rocks on his voyage

to Sable Island, and having caused \$3,000 or \$4,000 damages. His hon. friend the hon. member for King's, he believed, was not correct in the impression that Captain Purdy was an opponent of the Government. However, he was assured that no question of political expediency or necessity actuated the Government in this matter. The first he heard of the removal of Captain Purdy and the appointment of Captain O'Brien was from his hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That gentleman stated that he was obliged to remove Captain Purdy on account of the incompetence and negligence he had displayed in the discharge of his duties. Captain O'Brien was a captain in high standing, and regarded as one of the ablest sea captains in the merchant service of the Maritime Provinces. He had been recommended for the vacant office of shipping-master of Halifax, and, no doubt, would have been appointed; but, while that appointment was under consideration, his hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated to him (Mr. Tupper) and his colleague the Minister of Justice, that he was obliged to dismiss the captain of the *Newfield*. Upon that, his hon. colleague and himself told him that, in their judgment, they could not find a person better qualified to fill that position than Captain O'Brien.

MR. ANGLIN: Are we to understand this took place before Mr. Bligh was appointed to the office of shipping-master?

MR. TUPPER said the facts were as he had stated, and he thought the House would fail to discover any question of political necessity or expediency in that appointment. Another person was subsequently appointed to fill the position of shipping-master. His hon. friend the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries advanced a strange doctrine to the House, and one which should not pass without being challenged. He stated that captains of these Government steamers were not responsible for the disbursements of the steamers. He had propounded the extraordinary policy that the agent of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in Halifax, whose business was simply to supply the disbursements the captain wished or were necessary, should be

held responsible. The hon. gentleman virtually said that, because the agent of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was appointed under a Conservative Administration, he, therefore, should be held responsible for the disbursements which the captains of Government steamers might waste. He thought the hon. gentleman was hard driven for some means of relieving Captain Purdy from a wasteful expenditure of public money, which in itself would have rendered his dismissal inevitable. That doctrine, however, was not more remarkable than the statement the hon. member started with, in which he made a charge of ignorance upon his successor in relation to the certificates required for the command of the *Newfield*. He said that, because that ship was engaged in the coasting service, there was no necessity for her captain to possess a certificate such as was required for the captain of a vessel engaged in foreign service. He wanted to ask his hon. friend whether the *Newfield* was on coasting service when he sent her to France.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Captain Purdy had the necessary certificate.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman, knowing that Captain Purdy was not able to take the vessel to France, had to employ another who had the proper certificate. He thought, in reference to the charge of ignorance, that his hon. friend would not undertake to say that, in any matters relating to the naval and merchant service of this country, he was able to teach the present Minister anything.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the hon. gentleman had stated distinctly that he had made statements which he never did make, and which the hon. gentleman must know he did not make. It was not true that another captain was put in charge of the vessel when it was sent to France, because Capt. Purdy had not the necessary certificate. Mr. Purdy had the necessary certificate, and that matter he had explained before. They found it necessary that the vessel should go home in the middle of winter, and therefore it was necessary that they should have another person, who had a certificate, and who was competent to navigate the ship.

With reference to the other point, he had not misquoted his hon. friend, his successor. That hon. gentleman had said it was necessary by law that the captains of these vessels should have a certificate. He (Sir A. J. Smith) took issue, and said certificates were only necessary in the case of vessels going to foreign countries. At the time, he held the law did not require it; he referred to the law in confirmation of what he said.

Mr. FORTIN said the letter of the law might be in favour of the gentlemen on the other side, but, certainly, the spirit of the law was not. For it seemed to him that vessels, performing different services, should be commanded by captains having, not only a diploma of service, but of competency as well. If Captain Purdy had only a certificate of service, the Government did well to replace him by a man whose competency could not be doubted, because, having a certificate of competency, he had had to undergo an examination before the Board of Examiners, in order to obtain that certificate; while a certificate of service only meant that the bearer had commanded a vessel during a certain number of years, and that he was, moreover, sober and of a good moral character. No examination was exacted in this case. It appeared to him that, when Government vessels, performed services such as those allotted to the *Newfield*, and which were likely to be called to cross the Atlantic, the most able and efficient men attainable should be got for the positions of captains, mates, and second mates. But he was sorry to say that, heretofore, it was not the practice in this country. He (Mr. Fortin) had seen Captain Purdy at Gaspé two or three years ago, in command of that beautiful vessel, and he was surprised, knowing that he had no certificate of competency, that the Government had appointed him, cognisant as they were that the vessel was liable to be sent abroad. This was the way in which the late Government had performed their duty to the people of this country as regarded marine matters. He had known the *Lady Head*, which had been employed during the last four or five years for the protection of the fisheries, and also her commander, who, he might say, was at

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

present politically dead, so to say, though he (Mr. Fortin) had done nothing to bring about that, and, he had believed from the way he was conducting matters, that his own friends would throw him over; and, indeed, it was before a tribunal, composed mainly of his own friends, that his incompetency was proved. He would not speak of the way in which that gentleman, commanded the vessel, as he was not now the commander, as regarded the nautical part of his duties, and what kind of officers he employed. He (Mr. Fortin) would have nothing to say against the sailing master, who had a certificate of competency, and had seen sixteen years of service abroad; but he would say that the chief mate of the *Lady Head* not only had no certificate of competency or service, but was unable to read and write, and the second mate was not much better. He defied any man in or out of the House to deny the truth of this assertion, and he knew the mate well, and he had served under him (Mr. Fortin) as a sailor, and certainly was utterly unable to fill the position of lieutenant on board of an ocean Government steamer, flying the pennant like a man-of-war, and performing a difficult and important service. He was glad this discussion had been brought on, as it enabled him to state things relating to a Government vessel as they were. He was not satisfied with it, as it proved that we were in the background as regarded the nautical instruction of our mariners, and that in some quarters nautical instruction was not valued at all. He was also glad that he had an opportunity of stating these matters, which ought to open the eyes of the Government and the House on the subject. He had always felt humiliated when he knew that this Government vessel, working with men-of-war, who had to call at many ports, and meet with many vessels, carried two officers entirely incompetent, the first of whom could not read or write, and had to take charge of the vessel in the absence of the master. How could this lieutenant receive people on business. Suppose a letter or document was presented to him to read, he would have to acknowledge he could not read. What a humiliation for us all. This state of things continued

for several years. It might be asked why he did not report the matter. He would say it was because he believed it was useless to do so, as he knew no change would take place unless there was a change of Government. He hoped that what he had said, and what every person would say, in the interest of truth in the matter, would open the eyes of the Government to the importance of having on board Government vessels the best officers to be found, no matter to what nationality they might belong. The positions of masters and mates on board of Government vessels ought to be given to those who possessed the best education or the greatest capacity, as an encouragement to the development of nautical education in this country. We possessed a large mercantile navy; we were rated as the fourth or fifth naval power as regarded the merchant ships, but he believed there was exaggeration, and, to keep pace with other nations, we must extend to our mariners the best means of educating them and putting them on a level with the best mariners of other countries, and this could not be done unless educated mariners were held in honour, and the best of them promoted to situations on board of Government vessels whenever vacancies happened. There were also on board of other Government vessels incompetent officers, and he hoped for the honour and good of this country they would be changed, and all Government vessels, either at Halifax or Quebec, would be put under the command of the best qualified captains and mates. He heard some hon. gentlemen refer to the steamer *Glendon*. He had seen that celebrated vessel at Quebec, when she was being rigged before the Government sent her to protect our fisheries in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and she was not fit at all for that service, as she had only been built, as he had heard, to carry deals and logs. The proprietor, not being able to make anything out of her, had had the choice of selling her to the Government, when everybody pronounced her unfit for the service, for about \$25,000, while the Government refused to buy a fine iron steamer, built in Glasgow, that would have suited the

service well. He opposed the acquisition of the *Glendon* as much as possible, not on practical grounds, but because, as a Canadian, and as a representative of a country much engaged in the fisheries, he wanted the fisheries to be efficiently protected, and he knew the *Glendon* could not perform the work allotted to her, but that she could be, as she was, too, the laughing stock of our own, as well as the foreign fishermen. And what better proof did they want that she was worthless, when, at the end of the season, she had to be condemned as unfit for sea service. He felt that the Department of Marine should have known better than to have purchased such a vessel at such a large price, and the employment of such a vessel had made the service of the protection of the fisheries ridiculous in the eyes of English, French and American fishermen. He believed that, since the House had thought proper to pass a Bill to oblige the captains and mates to pass an examination, and make themselves competent to command vessels, the Government should see that the regulations in this respect were carried out. Inducements should be held out in order that the best men could be obtained, to receive command in our navy. If the present Government made any appointments such as those he had referred to, as having been made by the late Government, he would not support them. However, he had a better opinion of the gentlemen who were now at the head of affairs in this country. He had confidence in the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and he hoped he would make a clean sweep of all those who were incompetent for the positions they filled.

Mr. DALY said the hon. gentleman who was recently the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, had assumed a position which was scarcely consistent with the dignity, propriety and responsibility which ought to attach to a member of the late Government. He (Sir A. J. Smith) had said that the expenses with which his late Department had been charged in connection with the services of the steamer *Newfield*, at Halifax, might be justly charged to the agent of that Department there, who, as he (Sir A. J. Smith) was ready to admit,

was a most efficient and deserving officer. If he made such a charge, he ought to assume the responsibility of that charge; otherwise he would be refusing to maintain the dignity of the position which he lately occupied. The hon. gentleman, as a Minister of the Crown, was himself responsible for the administration of the affairs of the Department over which he presided, and was bound to see to the proper economical management of that Department. If Mr. Johnson's estimates for the expenditure were excessive, the head of the Department should have interfered and put a stop to that expenditure. He thought the appointment of Captain O'Brien was a judicious one, and his previous knowledge would enable him to render good service to the Government in his new position. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith), that it was necessary to secure the services of Captain Tobin in order to enable the officers of the *Newfield* to navigate that ship from Halifax to Havre, with the exhibits intended for the Paris Exhibition, he would say that the hon. gentleman might try to escape the allegations that Captain Purdy was unfit for the position he held, by saying that it was the second mate whose incompetency it was necessary to fill by the appointment of Captain Tobin; but it would be evident to the House that, had the captain of the vessel been an efficient navigator, the services of Captain Tobin would not have been required. He would also mention another fact, or rather rumour, which had been brought before the House by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith). Now, when that hon. gentleman mentioned rumours in this House, he should have some slight grounds for belief in those rumours before mentioning them. If they were but rumours, and had not been investigated, it was not worth while intruding them upon the time or the attention of the House. The rumour was, said the hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith), that Captain Purdy had been removed in order to suit the convenience of the Government. From his (Mr. Daly's) own knowledge of the facts of the case, the rumour was contradicted by the fact that, long before the vacancy occurred in the shipping - master's

office, a large number of applications had been made to the Ministry for the expected vacancy which was to occur in the command of the *Newfield*. It was even rumoured—since rumours were to be brought to the attention of the House—that Captain Purdy had already been dismissed, and he (Mr. Daly) believed he was safe in saying that the dismissal of Captain Purdy was already determined upon—at least, so he was informed by the Ministry—before the appointment of Mr. Bligh to the office of shipping-master was made. Therefore, he (Mr. Daly) could not congratulate the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side upon their very unsuccessful attempt to raise to a position of political martyrdom, a gentleman of Captain Purdy's incompetency to discharge the duties which he had previously sought to perform. He thought they would have to go further before they could establish any charge against the Government of having improperly discharged that officer from his command.

MR. KILLAM said he had no desire to prolong the discussion, and he did not intend either to attack or defend the Ministry for their course in this matter. But he felt called upon to say a single word in behalf of Captain Purdy, whom he had known for a long time, and whom he had known of for a much longer time. Captain Purdy was a native of the constituency which he (Mr. Killam) had the honour to represent, and belonged to a family who had for many years been known as efficient seafaring men. So far as he had observed Captain Purdy in command of the steamer, he had always found him a most efficient officer, and he was very much surprised when he heard that circumstances had occurred which could be considered as warranting his dismissal from the position he occupied. Having a certificate of service from England, granted as long ago as 1852, Captain Purdy must have seen over 30 years of almost continuous service in command of vessels, and have been considered as a competent man. And, when it was also considered that, as stated by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith), he had been examined previous to appoint-

ment to the *Newfield*, he (Mr. Killam) thought they might say that he had not only a certificate of service, but one of competency as well. In fact, his competency certificate was as good as granted, although it did not exist upon paper. Whatever might have been the case, his certificate of service was quite sufficient to enable him to navigate a vessel to any part of the world under English laws, and to enter or clear at any port. As to the manner in which the commissariat was conducted, he (Mr. Killam) knew nothing about that. He concurred in a great deal that had been said by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) with respect to certificates of competency of officers of vessels generally. He (Mr. Killam) was pleased to see that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Daly) took such an interest in shipping, and he hoped both the members for that city would continue to take an interest in it. He could not entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) in reference to the gentlemen on the Treasury benches; but, in any case, whenever they did anything worthy of praise, he (Mr. Killam) should be very happy to give them merited commendation. But, if the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Pope) found that in this matter he had acted, or the Government had acted, upon insufficient information, or upon garbled reports, he (Mr. Killam) hoped that justice would yet be done to Captain Purdy, who had served the public so long and faithfully.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said he thought he was not going too far when he expressed the opinion that he understood quite as much about the working of the Navigation Laws as did the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith), and, if called upon to procure a vessel for efficient service, he believed he could make as judicious a purchase as the hon. gentleman did when he purchased the *Glendon*. What he (Mr. Pope) had said was that the Government required from all masters of merchant vessels certificates of competency, and that on all the Government ships, some of which were 700 or 800 tons, the masters and mates should, in his opinion, have certificates of competency. It was true that for the coast-

ing trade such certificates, under the law, were not required, but his opinion was that the operation of the law should be farther extended in this direction. When the hon. gentleman (Sir Albert J. Smith) spoke of certificates of service, it simply amounted to nothing. At the time the regulations were made, all men who were in charge of a vessel were entitled to receive certificates of service, as a matter of course, without passing any examination. But the hon. gentleman, in speaking of the qualifications of Capt. Purdy, said that he had passed his examination. The fact of Captain Purdy having a certificate of service did not prevent him getting a certificate of competency if he was fit to get it. But, if he had passed his examination before the proper officers appointed by the Government, why, he (Mr. Pope) would like to know, did he not get a certificate of competency? The fact of his not having a certificate of competency was the strongest evidence that he was not fit to pass the necessary examination.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I say that Captain Scott signed his certificate.

MR. POPE: If he passed the examination required for masters, why did he not get a certificate?

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: It was not necessary.

MR. POPE said very likely Captain Scott signed a certificate that Captain Purdy was fit to navigate inland waters. If the captain or the officers of that vessel were competent or qualified men, there would have been no necessity of sending to St John to get a qualified master to go with Captain Purdy to take her to France and bring her back. Another point which his hon. friend (Sir Albert J. Smith) had referred to was the waste of money in furnishing the commissariat of that ship, and he had attributed the fault to the agent instead of the captain. Perhaps it was the case, but, if so, the agent received his instructions to purchase from political friends and supporters, and much larger prices were charged than the same supplies could be purchased for in the market. If necessary, he could lay before the House accounts to prove the truthfulness of this

statement. He could assure his hon. friend (Sir A. J. Smith) that an end had been put to the system,—every master on board every ship would hereafter be required to send his requisition for what he wanted, and would be held responsible for the expenditure of everything that went on board his ship. Nothing would justify the extravagant waste of provisions which had hitherto taken place.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) had just charged his (Sir Albert J. Smith's) Department with having directed agents to purchase provisions from political friends, and pay large prices for them. He (Sir Albert J. Smith), from his place in Parliament, challenged that hon. gentleman to produce any evidence substantiating the statement he had made. He declared that statement to be absolutely untrue, and challenged the hon. gentleman or the Government to institute an investigation. He would appeal to the officers of the Department to say if he had ever directed them to instruct any agent to purchase goods beyond their value from any political friends. He asked that hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) to inquire of the officers of the Department whether he had not invariably instructed them, and the employés in every Department, to buy goods at the cheapest possible rate.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not say so.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he did say so, and he now challenged an enquiry. The hon. gentleman must not think that he was going to reflect upon him (Sir Albert J. Smith), or his administration. He was prepared to defend his conduct. He was not perfect any more than other men; but he denied, in the most positive manner, this accusation, and challenged the hon. gentleman to produce any evidence against his integrity. He thought that the hon. gentleman must have had reference to times anterior to his own, and that it was his predecessor that was meant. Let him (Mr. Pope) look over the records of the Department before he (Sir Albert J. Smith) took charge of it. The hon. gentleman must

have been mistaken, and have confounded two Administrations together. Let him go to Quebec and to other places, and he would find, perhaps, what he thought he had found here. The charge might be applicable to his (Sir Albert J. Smith's) predecessor, but not to himself.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.): Tell us about the *Glendon*.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he had explained about the *Glendon*, and the hon. gentleman knew that it was a *bonâ fide* transaction. It was true that she was not a fit vessel for the service, and he acknowledged from his place in Parliament that it was a mistake, but he did not feel that he was responsible for it. He had appealed to the officers of the Department for information concerning her, and had bought her at the cheapest possible price. She was considered by everybody at the time a cheap vessel, but he did not hesitate to say that her purchase was a mistake.

MR. ANGLIN said the House would be satisfied that it was now incumbent upon the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries either to produce the evidence which he said he had it in his power to produce, and so satisfy this House directly, or through a Committee selected for the purpose, that his charges were true; or, failing this, it was his duty as a Minister of the Crown, as a member of the House of Commons of Canada, and as a gentleman, to withdraw and retract, in the most unequivocal and positive manner, the serious and disgraceful charge that he had made against his predecessor. It was sometimes well to meet a possible charge by a counter-charge, as a matter of policy. The principle of carrying the war into Africa was a very old one, and had, in its time, proved an effectual mode of dealing with some matters. In this case, counter-charges were made; the case of the *Glendon* was introduced, and the character of the purchase, and the character of the vessel were impugned. On a mere motion for the production of papers relating to the dismissal of Captain Purdy, numberless other transactions had been brought up. In fact, as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith)

MR. POPE.

had justly said, the answer to the charges made or implied against the Government, was this: "You did as bad as we are charged with doing, or perhaps a little worse." The case of Captain Purdy, he thought, could very well stand upon its own merits, and it might be discussed on its merits, without introducing any extraneous matter. The hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville) had contradicted the statement of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee), that there was much excitement in that city on this subject. But the hon. member for King's had left St. John three or four days before he (Mr. Anglin) did, to come to Ottawa, and had not been back there since. At the time he (Mr. Anglin) left St. John there was very little or no talk about the dismissal of Captain Purdy, for the simple reason that no one believed he was dismissed or would be dismissed.

MR. DOMVILLE: Before I left St. John, New Brunswick, I was asked to sign a petition to reinstate Captain Purdy, and consequently my premises were correct when I stated that I was conversant with the appointment, and that there was little or no excitement in the city of St. John.

MR. ANGLIN said he accepted, in the fullest possible manner, the statement of the hon. gentleman, and could only say that he (Mr. Domville) possessed an amount of information which he (Mr. Anglin) did not possess, and that he believed very few in the city were possessed of. There was a rumour in the papers some time before either of them left the city that Captain Purdy would be dismissed, and that rumour, he thought, was generally discredited. Now, it was an ugly feature in this case, and a singular coincidence, that a place was wanted for Captain O'Brien just about the time the place was taken away from Captain Purdy. This was a remarkable coincidence, to say the least of it, and he had hoped, when the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Daly) rose to reply to some remarks made upon this point, that he would have gone more fully into that part of the case, and would have shown that there was, in reality, no connection whatever between these two circumstances. Now what were the rumours?

That Captain O'Brien had applied for and been recommended to the position of shipping-master in the city of Halifax. That was a statement which, he believed, was beyond all question. Another was that Captain O'Brien, receiving information from some parties—he (Mr. Anglin) believed from one of the members for Halifax—that he was to receive the appointment, left his vessel in the West Indies, and returned to Halifax to obtain and occupy that very position. Rumour said that, when he arrived at Halifax, he found that Mr. Bligh, a gentleman not connected in any way with maritime matters, who had no particular knowledge of vessels, or of the business, had received this particular appointment, and this notwithstanding the recommendation of the members for Halifax that Mr. O'Brien should have the position. Rumour said that there was great discontent in Halifax in consequence of the appointment of Mr. Bligh, and the disappointment of Mr. O'Brien. Rumour said that a great many meetings were held in various places in the city of Halifax, and that there was an extraordinary amount of pressure brought to bear upon the members for Halifax, in order that they might use all the influence they had, and all the power they possessed, with the Dominion Government to have this Mr. Bligh put aside, and to have the position given to Mr. O'Brien. Rumour said in the papers, that an offer was made to O'Brien of this position in the *Newfield*, and that O'Brien at first refused to be so satisfied, or to accept the office at the expense of a gentleman for whom he had some respect; or, at all events, that he did not wish that any man should be displaced merely for the purpose of giving him a position. Rumour said that those things continued a long time; that the hon. members for Halifax, yielding to the pressure of their friends, to the threats, even, of many of them, made such pressing, urgent representations to the Government, and particularly to those members who had participated in this transaction, that Captain Purdy was displaced, and Mr. O'Brien put into his place. They had had that statement contradicted by the Minister of Public Works, whose statement, if he (Mr. Anglin) understood it rightly, amounted to this: that, about

the time it became necessary to fill the office of shipping-master in Halifax, he learned from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for the first time, casually it would seem—because it might be assumed that, as Minister of Public Works, he had no interest whatever in the matter—that it had become necessary to displace Captain Purdy, and that, therefore, it was resolved to offer this as a better position to Captain O'Brien, before the post of shipping-master was either given or offered to Mr. Bligh. That was entirely in opposition to all the statements and rumours that had been afloat for some time past, and to the many statements made, from time to time, in the Halifax newspapers. This was the ugly part of the whole transaction. Another very ugly feature was the attempt to destroy the reputation of Captain Purdy as a ship-master, and to render it impossible for him, hereafter, if the reports of the debates of this House were to have the effect they ought to have, to obtain employment as a ship-master; because it had been stated, by hon. members on the other side, in effect, that, not only had Captain Purdy no certificate of competency, qualifying him to command a vessel of any value, but that he was incapable of obtaining any such certificate. It was asked why, if he was capable, he had not obtained one. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) had explained clearly and satisfactorily that he required Captain Purdy, before entrusting the command of the *Newfield* to him, to undergo precisely such examination as those underwent who wished to obtain the ordinary certificate, the object being to ascertain whether he was competent for the command; and Captain Scott, after his examination, had reported Captain Purdy competent. Surely, then, he had done all that was necessary, or to be expected. Why should Captain Purdy, therefore, take the trouble of asking for a certificate such as was required by ship-masters seeking employment in the merchant service, when he was already in the employment of the Government, and the certificate required by the Minister had been furnished by the examiner. He (Mr. Anglin) regarded that as a quite satisfactory answer to the assertion that the captain was incompetent, and that the Minister of

Marine, in giving him the command of the *Newfield*, was guilty of a serious impropriety and neglect of duty. Besides, there was nothing to show that the late Minister (Sir A. J. Smith) could possibly have had any motive or reason for neglecting his duty in this matter, or for showing any undue favour to Purdy. That Minister found him in the service, employed by his predecessor, and had reason to assume, under the circumstances, that his political opinions were not such as to entitle him to any favour at his hands. It had not been shown that Purdy was a personal friend of the late Minister, or that he owed Purdy or his friends anything that should induce him to neglect his duty in this matter. He (Mr. Anglin) did think it was cruel in the extreme, not only to deprive Captain Purdy of his position without any trial or opportunity of being heard in self-defence, but afterwards to justify that act by attempting to destroy his reputation and character as a seaman fit to take charge of a vessel. The attempt to cover up the matter by charging the member for Westmoreland with neglect of duty and positive malfeasance in office was quite as bad. It was the duty of the Minister of Marine to bring down the proof, if these charges were well-founded, so that the House could deal with the late Minister as his conduct deserved. If this charge was well-founded, he should be visited with the strongest possible censure; if ill-founded, let it be known that he had been falsely accused of conduct which would utterly disgrace any Minister of the Crown.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said he was sure the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) would not willingly wish to misrepresent his statements. He (Mr. Pope) did not charge the late Minister of Marine with giving the instructions to purchase supplies at extravagant prices. What he did say was this: that, instead of the business having been conducted properly, the captains being required to send in requisitions for what they wanted, and the provisions being bought on the best terms, they were bought by agents, under instructions from political friends, at their own prices, and that these prices were excessive.

MR. ANGLIN : It was done by instructions ?

MR. POPE : Done by instructions, with their political friends. As to the prices they were not instructed, but only to buy from political friends, who charged what they pleased, excessive prices. There was not the slightest foundation for the report as to political prejudice being brought to bear against Captain Purdy on the part of present Ministers. He (Mr. Pope) did not know what his politics were, but understood he was a political friend of some members of the present Government. He was dismissed in consequence of his having got his vessel on the rocks, and causing to the country the loss of a large amount of money, and not on account of any political influence, or to make way for any political or other friend. In his (Mr. Pope's) opinion, this dismissal was necessary in the public interest, and in the protection of public property.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he understood—

Several Hon. MEMBERS : Order ; spoke.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he must tell hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side that the Opposition might be numerically weak, but they were prepared to vindicate themselves and assert their rights. Hon. gentlemen opposite refused him a hearing in his own defence. Was that the spirit that characterised them? They should not, however, stop his mouth at this, the beginning of the Session. He would say, in reply to accusations against his official conduct, that he had endeavoured to administer the affairs of his Department with honesty and integrity, and he challenged the fullest, strictest and most searching investigation. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had said he withdrew his charges against him now.

MR. POPE : No.

SIR A. J. SMITH : Then let the hon. gentleman repeat it.

MR. McCALLUM : I rise to a point of order. We have had enough of this. The hon. gentleman has spoken about six times on this question.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he had no doubt some hon. gentlemen opposite did think they had had enough of the debate with its refutations of their statements ; but he was surprised his hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should refuse him a hearing, when such charges were made against him. He thought that hon. gentleman a man of a different spirit, and willing to give the Opposition fair play. What was the charge against him (Sir A. J. Smith)? He understood him to say that the whole of the provisions and stores were furnished those vessels by improper parties, but that he acquitted him (Sir A. J. Smith) of any blame in the matter.

MR. POPE : I did not say I charged you with anything, nor did I acquit you.

SIR A. J. SMITH : What did the hon. gentleman say then? I think every hon. member understood him to say that the supplies were furnished those vessels, but I had no connection with the business.

MR. POPE : What I found fault with was the method of business adopted—that the captains were not asked to send in requisitions ; that the agent was allowed, or, I presume, instructed, to make purchases from political friends and supporters of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his party.

SIR A. J. SMITH said it was very easy to make charges, but he challenged the hon. gentleman again to prove his complicity with any dishonest transaction in the Department. Let him appeal to its officers whether they would not acquit him (Sir A. J. Smith) of any such accusation. While it might be true that in some cases political friends were patronised, there were no instructions given to deal with a friend at inordinate prices. The officers of that Department could testify as to whether he had instructed any employé or agent to purchase supplies at other than the cheapest possible prices. He challenged enquiry as to whether he had patronised political friends at the public expense in the manner charged. He thought his successor had treated him most unfairly, unmanly, and that his conduct could

not be defended. He got up and practically withdrew the charge, and then, when he (Sir A. J. Smith) asked him to withdraw it formally, he declared he had not withdrawn it. He consequently repeated his challenge.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said it had been more convenient to follow the usual course of bringing down the papers before entering upon a discussion of this kind. But he thought that the House, and particularly members on the Ministerial side, might congratulate themselves, and especially his hon. colleague (Mr. Pope) on the result of the debate. The late hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries appeared to feel somewhat warmly the position in which the debate had left him, and he did not wonder at all at the feeling he had exhibited, because certain members of his party, and he, a public officer charged with the administration of an important public Department, were put in an extremely false position before the country—in a position in which he entirely and absolutely failed to justify himself and them. His hon. friend from Westmoreland had challenged the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to make and formulate some charge which he alleged had been made against him. He (Mr. McDonald) would take the liberty of putting before the House and country, as clearly as he could, the facts which he thought the report of the debate would vindicate as correct. What his hon. colleague (Mr. Pope) did say amounted to a charge against the hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith) of having conducted the affairs of his Department, not wilfully or knowingly, in a manner permitting the most gross extravagance in its administration. He (Mr. McDonald) agreed with the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) that, if the hon. Minister of Marine was unable to justify or substantiate the charge, he ought to retract it. But he (Mr. McDonald) undertook to say that it would be a long time before hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side would be able to put his hon. friend (Mr. Pope) in any such position. He was not a man to make rash statements which he could not prove. When he made allegations of such a character, he

had the proof of them under his hand. The hon. gentleman opposite had tried to avoid the issue. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had stated that one of the grounds for the dismissal of Captain Purdy was the gross extravagance in the management of the vessel under his care, and he was quite sure none of the hon. gentlemen who, unfortunately for Captain Purdy, adopted his side of the question, would attempt to vindicate that. His hon. friend had stated, what? That the hon. gentleman had asked his political friends in Halifax to sell goods to this vessel at double the ordinary prices? Not at all. But he did say that the goods supplied cost double what they ought to have cost, and that by instructions from the office of the hon. gentleman himself, not through his own hands—there was no such allegation—but from some one instructed from his office, the agent in Halifax was authorised, not to go into the open market, but to buy from the political supporters of the hon. gentleman. That was the charge made, and he undertook to say that, before any Committee the hon. gentleman might choose to ask for, that charge would be sustained. That was not the only case, but he did not intend, nor was he here, to assail any gentleman, or deal with any question, other than the one before the House. He might refer to the case of the *Glendon*. He did not intend to adopt the law of retaliation, suggested by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), but he might fairly retort upon the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries the admission he made in this House, an admission more damaging to his reputation than even the charge brought home so conclusively by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) admitted that, so imprudent was the staff under his control, in the regard for the interests with which they had to deal, that the *Glendon*, an utterly worthless old tub, was bought under the eye, and at the wharf almost, of the hon. gentleman himself, from his own political friends, at an enormous price. They had the admission of the hon. gentleman himself given to them to-night that he knew that was the case.

SIR A. J. SMITH : I know nothing of the kind. I know it is not the case.

MR. McDONALD (Picton) said the hon. gentleman had used these words : "I admit it was a mistake, and I would not do it again." He would like to know if the hon. gentleman would deny these words. He would say a word or two with reference to Captain Purdy. He knew not to what side of politics he belonged. He had never seen the gentleman, but he knew he was justly discharged. What did the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries find on entering office? They were only now on what an hon. gentleman behind him described as the threshold of the investigation which the pure Administration of hon. gentleman opposite would furnish with this and probably next Session. He found that, by incompetency admitted proved before a competent tribunal, a valuable ship which had cost enormous sums had been thrown on the rocks and utterly destroyed, while in the charge of a man who had been for years in the service of the hon. gentlemen, and who they must have known was incompetent, who had no certificate either of service or competency. They had the declaration of a man whose authority in matters of this kind was recognised all over this Dominion, the hon. member for Gaspé, who said the two principal officers of the vessel could neither read nor write. Would the hon. member for Westmoreland, or any other man in the country, be suspected of conducting his own private affairs in that way? Would the hon. member send one of the fine ships in his fleet under the command of a captain who had no certificate, a mate that could not read, and a second mate that could not write? The result was that the hon. Minister found ignorance and incapacity controlling this valuable property. A few weeks later, he found the next best ship in charge also of a man who had no certificate, lost for a reason no one could comprehend, on a coast which he had been acquainted with for years, in a locality which he should have known was a dangerous one; and this occasioned great loss to the country. The hon. the Minister, finding this man was not a sailor or a compe-

tent sea captain, did right in discharging him. They were told that Captain Scott had said he was competent. If so, why did Captain Scott not give him a certificate?

SIR A. J. SMITH: It was not necessary.

MR. McDONALD said he would ask where was the evidence of that? He would undertake to say that was not Captain Scott's view of the question. When he examined a man and was satisfied of his competency, he gave him a certificate. He would undertake to say that a man having charge of a vessel, desiring to preserve his character and fortify his position, would demand the certificate to which he was entitled. He would like to know why they had not from Captain Purdy a complaint of the tyrannical conduct of his hon. friend? At whose instance was this motion made? If it were at Captain Purdy's instance, he regretted it for Captain Purdy's own sake, for if it were proved that he was not competent to discharge his duties; that, in consequence of his incompetency, great public loss was occasioned, his character would suffer, but the Government were not to blame. It was not trumpeted throughout the country that Captain Purdy was incompetent. The hon. the Minister simply relieved him of his charge, regretted he could not retain him in the service. If he were disgraced, he might thank hon. gentlemen opposite, who sought to make a little political capital by the charge brought against the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He regretted extremely the position in which Captain Purdy had been placed, and could not congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on the position in which this debate had left him.

MR. RICHEY said that, after this discussion, he would not venture to say a single word, did he not feel he would do an injustice to his constituents, the Government and the House, if he were to permit it to pass without denial of the elaborate statement, based upon rumours, which had been made. The hon. member for Gloucester had referred to it as a singular coincidence that, when a place was wanted for a gentleman in Halifax, a vacancy was found. Was it not a more striking coincidence that two vacan-

cies were found, either of which that gentleman could fill with credit to himself and advantage to the country? The only foundation for the rumours referred to by the hon. member for Gloucester was that, while Captain O'Brien was recommended for one of the offices, he was placed in the other by the Government, who, doubtless, considered him the most suitable man they could procure. The pretence or the rumour that pressure was brought to bear upon the Government for the appointment of Captain O'Brien to the *Newfield* by the members for Halifax, and that pressure was brought to bear upon them by their constituents for this purpose, was altogether unfounded. They had recommended Captain O'Brien for the office of shipping-master, and only regretted that the Government deemed it necessary to appoint him to the other office, instead of adopting the specific recommendation which the members for the county had made. That was the only ground upon which any degree of disappointment could exist in the minds of the members for Halifax, and the slight foundation upon which the charges of the hon. member for Gloucester were based. He hoped that that hon. gentleman would now, after this distinct and unequivocal denial on his part, be satisfied that Mr. Purdy's dismissal was in no way owing to causes which, relying upon mere rumours, he had thought fit to allege in this House.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Acts respecting the Isolated Risk and Farmers' Fire Insurance Company of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the Sovereign Fire and Marine Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 20) To amend the Act 41 Victoria, Chapter 29, intitled: An Act to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Scriver.)

House adjourned at

Twelve minutes after

Eight o'clock.

MR. RICHEY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 6th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

MR. McDONALD (Picton) presented, —Report of the Minister of Justice as to Penitentiaries in Canada, for the year ended 30th June, 1878.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

FIRST READING.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) introduced a Bill (No. 25) to amend an Act intitled: "An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway," passed in the 39th year of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. He said that, when he introduced the Bill yesterday, objection had been taken to its introduction, on the ground that its subject-matter affected the public revenue, and that it required the assent of the Crown. That objection had been looked into, and it was found that it was not entitled to prevail. The hon. the Premier had satisfied himself that the assent of the Crown was not needed. The merits of the Bill would, of course, be discussed before the proper Committee.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, on looking into the Bill, he did not think the assent of the Crown was called for, and it could be introduced without such assent. He did not pledge himself or the Government to sanction it hereafter. The Bill would have to be very carefully scanned before receiving the sanction of the House.

Bill read the first time.

NEW BRUNSWICK ELECTION TRIALS.

QUESTION.

MR. DOMVILLE enquired, Whether the Government intends to take any steps to have the election petitions tried in New Brunswick, which have been so long delayed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government have no means of taking any steps in the matter. The litigants and the Courts must settle the matter between them.

AID TO COLONISATION ROADS IN
MANITOBA.

QUESTION.

MR. RYAN (Marquette) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a general Bill for assisting, by grants of land, such roads in Manitoba and the North-West as may be necessary for the purposes of colonisation, and which would, if built, act as feeders of the Canada Pacific Road.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This subject was brought before Parliament last Session by the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell, as Minister of the Interior. That Bill, with the matters on which it was founded, is now before the Government, and they have it under serious consideration.

BOUNDARY OF ONTARIO ARBITRATION.

QUESTION.

MR. MILLS enquired, Whether the Government purpose, this Session, to introduce a Bill to confirm the boundary between the Province of Ontario and the Territories of Canada, as declared in the award of the Arbitrators; and if not, why not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: All the papers on this important subject are now in the hands of a member of the Government, and the matter is under serious consideration.

DISMISSAL OF CAPTAIN PURDY FROM
THE GOVERNMENT STEAMER
NEWFIELD.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for the House to resume the further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Burpee (St. John), for copies of all correspondence, reports and instructions, referring to the dismissal of Captain Purdy from the command of the Government steamer *Newfield*, read.

MR. WELDON said, in reply to the remark of the hon. member for King's

(N.B.), that this was a case of political partisanship, all he had to say was that he did not personally know Captain Purdy, and had no information as to his character beyond the reputation which Captain Purdy had acquired of being a man of ability and experience, and one who had filled, with credit, the position of shipmaster for upwards of forty years. The hon. the Minister of Justice had stated, yesterday, that bringing the light to bear on this matter would only reflect to the damage of Captain Purdy, and that, for his sake, he regretted it had been brought under discussion. The hon. the Minister of Justice must have forgotten that, through the press which supported the Government, from Toronto down to Halifax, and more particularly in the city of St. John, in the *St. John Daily Sun*, it was put forward that the dismissal of Captain Purdy was owing to his incompetency and mismanagement, and Captain Purdy smarting under the wrong and indignity heaped upon him, at once wrote an indignant denial of the statements in the article. The charges against him were that he had no certificate of competency; that he was, therefore, incompetent, and, through his incompetency, has caused damage to the *Newfield*, and that he was guilty of an extravagance which implied dishonesty. With regard to the first charge, they found that, under the Merchants' Marine Act, Captain Purdy held a certificate under the Imperial Act, which entitled him to sail any ship that floated under the British flag, upon any sea; further, as the hon. Minister must have been aware, he had been examined as to his competency by Captain Scott, Chairman of the Board of Examiners appointed by the Government, and was several years after in charge of that vessel. That he was competent must be inferred, because, otherwise, Captain Scott would have been guilty of a dereliction of duty in not having informed the Minister of Marine of his incompetency and failure to pass a satisfactory examination. No better certificate of competency could be given to any man than to be placed in charge of a Government ship, with the full confidence of the Department under which he was employed. So far as his competency was concerned,

he (Mr. Weldon) could appeal to every person in St. John acquainted with Captain Purdy, fully confident they would endorse the reputation given him by the hon. member for Yarmouth, more especially with regard to coasting services, for which Captain Purdy was more peculiarly adapted, and for which no certificate of competency of masters was required. The next charge, based upon the fact that he had no certificate of competency, was that he had caused damage to that vessel, and the hon. the Minister of Marine, in the exercise of his discretion, had thought fit to displace him. As a private shipowner, the hon. the Minister could exercise his undoubted right to discharge a man, but, if that man were dismissed improperly, he could appeal to the tribunals of justice for redress. But Captain Purdy stood without means of obtaining redress except before this House, and, in regard to that, he would refer to the practice in the Mother Country, and the manner in which justice was dealt there to masters and other officers of vessels. The captain or commander of any of Her Majesty's ships which, by misfortune, had got into difficulty, became cast ashore or a total wreck, had the right to appeal to a court of enquiry, or even to a court martial, where the case was examined, and if no fault was found with him he was honourably acquitted. In the merchant service, before a man could have his certificate of competency suspended or taken away, the charge was investigated before a legal tribunal, and the utmost fair play shown to him, the expenses of the witnesses for the defence being borne by the country. With regard to the other charge made against him, of extravagance, which, to a certain extent, implied more than mere extravagance, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had stated yesterday that the expenditure during the past year had been something like \$35,000. Had the hon. Minister looked into the accounts of his Department submitted in his report, he would have found that during the year the expenses charged to this department were \$23,320, not \$35,000. Out of the \$34,000 charged against that ship, \$11,000 was refunded by the Receiver-General for the employment of that ship from the 15th December to the

Mr. WELDON.

16th February, for services going to the Paris Exhibition, transporting a valuable cargo across at a season, probably the most dangerous in the year, and bringing the vessel safely back. In the previous year the expenditure was \$27,150, or, taking the time the ship had to be employed, a steamer of gross tonnage of nearly 800 tons, manned by 34 men, to be ready at any moment for any emergency, an average rate of nearly \$75 per day. It was only fair to the hon. member for Westmoreland, in regard to these matters, to make a contrast of the expenditure, during several years. In 1871-2, the expenditure of the *Napoleon III* was \$23,357; in 1872-3, it was \$23,040; while in 1877-8, it was \$22,215. The *Druid*, a small vessel, caused an expenditure, in 1871-2, of \$17,456; in 1872-3, \$14,000; and in 1877-8, \$12,112. He would like his hon. friend, the member for Halifax, if he (Mr. Weldon) was wrong in his statement, to correct him, and he would state that Mr. O'Brien, on the death of Mr. Cumings, was summoned to Halifax, from a port in the United States, for the purpose of succeeding that gentleman. The first thing, however, that Mr. O'Brien knew, the position was given to another man who, so far as he (Mr. Weldon) was informed, was not at all acquainted with shipping, except in so far as supplying groceries to a small schooner was concerned. Captain O'Brien was thus left out in the cold, and when the command of the *Newfie'd* was offered to him he refused it, preferring to remain without office, rather than turn out another man. This was a matter where a public servant had been unfairly dealt with. If the charges were true, they would prevent him from again exercising his profession. He thought it was a matter which called for the fullest enquiry, in order that justice might be done to Captain Purdy, and in order to show that he had not been discharged for political purposes, but with a due regard to the interests of the country.

MR. OGDEN said that some of the remarks that had fallen from hon. gentlemen were far from correct. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) had read an extract from a St. John paper, written over the signature of Captain

Purdy, stating that the *Newfield* had never touched bottom while under his command. That statement was false. The steamer did touch bottom under his command in the harbour of Whitehead, not three hundred yards from his (Mr. Ogden's) premises. A great deal had been said condemning the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for doing his duty, but he considered that the hon. gentleman did nothing more than his duty in removing Captain Purdy, who he did not know had any political feelings. He thought he was as good a Conservative as he was a Liberal, and he believed that, in the grounding of the *Newfield*, Captain Purdy had shown himself to be incompetent, and his negligence justified the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in removing him. He maintained that, before the office of shipping master was rendered vacant, it was proven that it had been resolved to remove Captain Purdy. The hon. member for St. John stated, the other day, that the postmaster was superannuated, because, through incompetency and vacating his office, he got himself and all his friends into scrapes. For this the late Government thought it necessary to give him a large superannuation. In this instance, however, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, finding Captain Purdy incompetent, promptly discharged him and put a better man in his place. He had knowledge of the fact that Captain Purdy had acknowledged the justice of his punishment, and, but for the great row that had been kicked up in the House, he believed Captain Purdy would never have said one word in regard to the matter. He did not originally intend to have spoken on this subject, but, when he heard the erroneous statements which had been made to the House, he regarded it a matter of duty to state that, in his opinion, the hon. gentleman was fully justified in making the change complained of.

Mr. BOWELL said he desired to say a word in reply to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Welton), who had read a letter, signed by Captain Purdy, declaring that the *Newfield* had never been ashore near Sambro. The gentleman might as well have said she was never ashore before Quebec, Timbuctoo or at

Niagara Falls or at many other places, and the reading of the letter would mislead the House and the country as to the charge made by the Minister of Marine against Captain Purdy. The charge against Captain Purdy was that he ran the *Newfield* ashore at the Whitehead harbour, and he held in his hand the report of Captain Purdy of the whole voyage, in which he said: "After the engine had made six or seven revolutions, she took the bottom forward, it being then about thirty minutes before low water." This settled that point, and any attempt to evade it, by denying that the vessel went ashore at Sambro, was not only puerile, but an attempt to evade the question by denying that of which he was never charged.

MR. ANGLIN: Read all the letter. Let us hear all about it.

Mr. BOWELL said that the hon. gentleman, when he got the papers, could read the whole of the report at his leisure. In the meantime, his only object was to show that Captain Purdy had reported to the Department that the vessel had been on shore.

MR. ANGLIN: But he states it was not by his own fault.

Mr. BOWELL said he was then discussing the question of fact; he was not saying whether he was competent or not; it was not at all likely that Captain Purdy would acknowledge, in a report, that he was to blame. The letter of Captain Purdy was read for the purpose of leading the House to believe that the charge against Captain Purdy, made by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was untrue; this was evident from the manner in which the reading of the letter was cheered, the hon. member for Gloucester cheering as loudly as anybody else.

MR. ANGLIN: Will the hon. gentleman allow me. The statement made by Captain Purdy, in the letter, was not a contradiction of any charge made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He contradicts a specific charge made in the newspaper to which the letter was written, which newspaper charged him that he had put his vessel ashore at Sambro. That charge he denied. He did not

enter into a reply to anything that had been said or done by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : That is not a point of order.

MR. MACKENZIE : The hon. gentleman merely rose.

MR. BOWELL : The hon. gentleman had no right to rise.

MR. MACKENZIE : But there was a question of order raised.

MR. KIRKPATRICK : Who by ?

MR. MACKENZIE : If hon. gentlemen are to refuse all courtesy to hon. gentlemen, we had better know it.

MR. BOWELL said he thought it very ungraceful on the part of the hon. gentleman to talk about courtesy, for the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been allowed to speak no less than seven times during the debate. The hon. member for Gloucester asked him a question and he sat down to let him explain, but he did not know that, because he gave way to one hon. member, he therefore had to surrender the floor to the hon. member for Lambton.

MR. MACKENZIE : I did not ask it.

MR. BOWELL : No ; you did not ask it, for you took it. He would repeat that the letter referred to had been read for the purpose of leaving upon the House and upon the country the impression that Captain Purdy's vessel had never been ashore. He was quite as well aware as the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) of the cause which produced the letter in question. He had a letter from Captain Purdy, dated Jan. 1st, 1879, in which he stated : "The ship took the ground forward, causing her to make water in the fire compartment. I remained there till the 27th November, awaiting a favourable opportunity for landing at Sable Island, but, none offering, I deemed it most prudent to return to Halifax to ascertain the amount of damage." That was all he desired to say to the House, in order that the whole facts might be known.

MR. ANGLIN.

MR. MACKENZIE said he rose before simply to correct the Minister of the Interior (Sir John A. Macdonald), who assumed that his hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) had risen to a point of order, and who rose to upbraid him for making what was not a point of order. The hon. member for Gloucester rose to make an explanation, and, that explanation being made, he sat down. Therefore, the hon. gentleman was entirely wrong, and he was sorry the hon. gentleman had not allowed him to proceed. No one could have listened to this debate without observing the extreme irritability of the gentlemen on the Ministerial benches. It was not enough for the hon. gentleman to reply—as he could have done, temperately and quietly, as his hon. friend did in making his motion—to whatever charge was implied in the motion. His hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Burpee) in a few concise sentences gave his reasons for making the motion. The reply of the Government was not merely a general denial of the alleged facts, which he did not object to, if correct ; but the hon. gentleman, in order to justify what seemed to be taken in advance as a wrong, went on to expatiate on alleged wrongs in the public service, committed by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith). These charges were improperly brought before the House when there were no documents before the House to sustain them, and at a time when no one expected his hon. friend would be charged with a shameful dereliction of duty in his office. Then they had the Minister of Justice gravely assuming that the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been clearly and decisively placed in the wrong by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Such language applied to an old and respected member of the House, would carry no weight with the supporters of the Administration in the House. If the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had any serious charges to bring against his hon. friend from Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith), he was sure those charges would be made in a proper way, and at a proper time. They ought not to be brought on in the course of a debate like the present, with which they had no real connection. He did not intend to enter upon a technical dis-

cussion of the matters in dispute, but one thing was tolerably evident, that for four years this captain navigated his vessel safely. The mere fact that he had not a certificate of competence, as it was called technically, in contradistinction to a certificate of service, was no reason at all for his dismissal, because a certificate of service was admitted to entitle him to sail his vessel from any English port, and must surely, therefore, entitle him to sail a vessel on Canadian coasts. He believed, however, in regard to the matter of competency for managing those vessels, that an intimate knowledge of our own coasts and its charts was of far more importance in navigating a vessel connected with our lighthouse and fishery service than a certificate of competence for the high seas. They had, on the St. Lawrence, excellent pilots, entrusted with the charge of the best steamers that entered our waters, who were not able to read or write, but no one denied their entire competency for their duties; and nearly all the duties of sailing a vessel which the captain of the *Newfield* was called on to discharge were intimately connected with the pilotage service of the coast, except, indeed, a voyage across the Gulf, towards the Straits of Belle Isle, undertaken once a year. There was nothing that could be called a sea voyage to be met with in the discharge of that officer's duties; and, therefore, such a certificate as was now alleged for the first time to be necessary, evidently alleged in order to justify or cover up an improper dismissal, was not at all necessary. The mere fact that another vessel was lost had no kind of relation to the dismissal of Captain Purdy from his vessel. He (Mr. Mackenzie) would advise the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be, in future, a little more temperate in his remarks, especially when assailing a gentleman who he (Mr. Mackenzie) knew, and was sure hon. gentlemen opposite believed, had efficiently and conscientiously discharged his duties. It could serve no possible good to detract from the character of an able, virtuous, excellent seaman like Captain Purdy, and deprive him of the means of gaining a livelihood in order to gratify some dislike that might have been taken to him by the present Minister of Marine, and to justify that officer's dismissal. He (Mr. Mac-

kenzie) rose chiefly to complain of the tone and manner of the Minister of Justice in his remarks. They were, in his opinion, exceedingly offensive, and entirely unjustified by anything that took place in the discussion from the Opposition side of the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could not agree with the hon. gentleman who had just sat down in regard to the tone and manner of his hon. colleague's (Mr. McDonald's) remarks. For any remarks made of the sort described, the responsibility lay with the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith), who brought the criticism on his own shoulders. The discussion about the dismissal of Captain Purdy had taken a rather wide range; but it was not irrelevant in any way, entailing the consideration of his competency, conduct, and the reasons for his dismissal, which reasons had been shown, as also the expediency of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries looking sharply after the vessels employed in his Department, and of seeing to the employment of proper officers. By an easy and proper extension of the discussion, the loss of the *Lady Head* was introduced. The hon. member for Lambton justified the appointment of a man without a certificate of competency, and who could neither read nor write, against whom there was proof of incompetency, and had argued there was no reason for his dismissal. Such officers had been retained, and what was the consequence? The vessel they had charge of was lost, and, perhaps, if Captain Purdy had been kept, another would have been lost. The hon. member for Westmoreland went further, and boasted of the virtue and ability he had displayed in conducting the Marine and Fisheries Department, and challenged a comparison with his predecessor, whom he attacked. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) ventured to say he would not have made that attack had his predecessor been in this House. The last thing he would have ventured upon, would have been to say a single word against Mr. Peter Mitchell, who had left the Department in a state of efficiency, which would compare favourably with the state in which the late Minister (Sir A. J. Smith) left it. So, if there had been anything personal in-

roduced into the discussion, anything said unpleasant to that hon. gentleman, he had only himself to blame.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he did not accept the statement of the hon. member for Lambton, that he had used any expressions not directly called for by the occasion, or any unbecoming his office and position in the House. He only regretted, since, that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) had escaped his mind, for he dared say that, in vindication of a man who deserved the respect and confidence of the House as a member and a public officer, he (Mr. McDonald) might have used language that might have better called for the animadversions of the hon. member for Lambton. In the opening of his remarks, he (Mr. McDonald) referred to statements of the hon. member for Westmoreland, which, in his apprehension, then and now, attempted to misconstrue and pervert the meaning of the remarks made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That fact, he thought, was not denied by the hon. member for Westmoreland, and it was with the object of correction he spoke. He did not accept, on this occasion, and might not, perhaps, hereafter, the dictum of the hon. member for Lambton as to the propriety of his conduct in this House.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said he rose to ask if the rule against speaking more than once on the same subject was to be maintained or not. He thought it rested with the Chair to maintain order. He thought it would be found conducive to the comfort of the House, and good feeling, if that rule was maintained.

MR. HOLTON said he dissented from the view just expressed. It had been the practice of the House, when a personal discussion arose, or anything in the nature of a personal altercation, to allow the greatest latitude of discussion and explanation to and fro. This practice rather tended to limit discussions than otherwise, by enabling the speakers best acquainted with the facts and matters in dispute, to say all they knew, and fight the matter out among themselves. Great difficulties would arise were such speakers

held to the rigour of the rule, and debates would stretch more than at present.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he did not rise to take part in the discussion, which had taken a range calculated to satisfy the country that there was still some partisan feeling with a party that had been so successful. He merely wanted to call the attention of the new members to the circumstances under which they went to the country last fall, and to the feelings that must exist in the minds of those deputations which had been visiting the capital. He wanted to ask the gentlemen sent here for the purpose of dealing with the disasters of the country, how far they believed there would be any sympathy with this partisan spirit they had been occupying the first two or three weeks of the Session in displaying. Let hon. members remember the people's object in sending them to Parliament. Let them throw aside this party feeling which had, perhaps, disgraced or not disgraced the country in the past. Let them listen to descriptions of the deplorable state of the country from the Ministerial side such as heard during the late electoral campaign, and remember the glorious reforms which they were promised; let them pray for the political millenium which was to enable the Government, with a strong hand, to turn the stones of this country into bread, and not have those unseemingly wranglings when the people were crying for food.

MR. POPE (Compton) said he did not think the Ministerial side of the House responsible for the length or personalities of the debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite called attention to matters never before mooted in the House. His hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in discharging Captain Purdy, had done so on his own responsibility, and wisely, when he had found that officer quite incompetent for his work, and without a certificate. He had run his vessel on the rocks, and should not have been continued in his office. The hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith) had trailed his coat-tail before the people to see if any one would tread on it; he said: "I am the man that managed that great Marine Department so well," and went on to attack his predecessor as the author of all the wrong-doing. If there ever

was a head of a Department in this country that brought it into a position of which it might feel proud, it was Mr. Peter Mitchell, the attack upon whom came with a bad grace from his next successor. In the fishery arbitration, it was he that did the whole work. It was he who shook the bush while the late Minister picked up the fruit. When the hon. member for Lambton last lectured them, he was on the Ministerial side of the House, and he did not think they should now submit to his dictation, but that they should act on their own judgment, despite his censures. With regard to Captain Purdy, there was a letter here, from the man who actually sailed the vessel to France when it was nominally under charge of Captain Purdy, yet one would suppose, from Opposition eulogies, he (Capt. Purdy) was the best seaman in the world. Nobody had charged the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with having been actuated by political motives in dismissing Captain Purdy, or given any good reason why he should not have been dismissed. He (Mr. Pope) had no doubt that Captain Purdy had proved inefficient, had run his vessel on the rocks, and deserved dismissal. He (Mr. Pope) charged the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries with having neglected his duty, in that he had not before discharged Captain Purdy. Had he done so, much public property would have been saved.

MR. ALLISON said he was not familiar with the circumstances which led to the dismissal of Captain Purdy, or the appointment of Captain O'Brien: all he should say was that the Government were the parties responsible, who ought to know the facts, and must bear the credit or the blame. He was surprised, however, to hear gentlemen opposite affect indignation with anything like political dismissals. He claimed to know something of the political occurrences of the past few years in the county he represented, and would like to call attention to some of the dismissals in Hants. On the 12th September, 1874, Mr. Sandford, of Burlington, was dismissed from a way-office, and on the 19th January, 1875, Mr. Beekman was dismissed from office at Ellershouse, and on the 18th

May, 1875, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Marsters were dismissed from the offices respectively at Nine-Mile River and Upper Rawdon. He (Mr. Allison) had taken some trouble, both in the post-office at Halifax and in this city, to enquire into the causes of these dismissals. The reason assigned in one instance was that the incumbent "had left the place." If he had done so temporarily (which he doubted), his family discharged the duties to the satisfaction of the public, and the Government had unquestionable security. In the three other instances the reasons given were "changed from way-office to post-office." He need not tell any one familiar with the facts that a way-office was neither more nor less than a country post-office, and that anyone capable of discharging the duties of the one could discharge the duties of the other. On the 19th February, the *Toronto Globe*, which he believed was formerly the organ of the late Government, and was now the organ of the present Opposition, laid down the doctrine that "in the public interest there are but two considerations which can justify the substitution of one official for another, except in cases where the holder of a place has been guilty of misconduct—the new appointee may be better qualified for the situation than the old, or he may be able to save the country a certain sum every year." He need not say that no saving was claimed as a defence, and he would say that, not in one single instance, was the man who was appointed better qualified to discharge the duties of the office than the man who was dismissed; that in two instances the changes made in the location were made to the manifest inconvenience of a majority of those who were interested, that in every instance the changes were made on political and on no other grounds, and, to add to the hardship of the case, in the instance of the office at Burlington, the former incumbent, Mr. Sandford, acting upon the advice of the Post Office Inspector, had gone to considerable expense in repairing and improving his office. The *Globe* of the 26th inst., in commenting on some recent political changes, unwittingly paid a high compliment to the hon. the Postmaster-General, when it said that "he is not enough of hypocrite to defend his acts on any

ground except that he likes to do what pleases him." He would respect that hon. gentleman more if, when making changes, he would make them openly, and take the responsibility, than, if he attempted, as his predecessors had done in the instances he had referred to, to shield himself beneath the screen of an apparent but false and purely nominal reason. The *Globe* of the same date also said: "When country postmasters are displaced for political reasons, something like a revolution in our public life has occurred. They have hitherto hardly been considered as public servants at all; their salaries are merely nominal, and they have always been held free to take what side they pleased. It has been left for the men who were to introduce a 'broad policy' to satisfy political hate by their sacrifice, and thus to take the first step towards establishing a Tory propaganda with the country postmaster bound to do the work of the party in power." He was happy to state that the very reverse was the case in the county of Hants; that, for political reasons, not a single Dominion official had been dismissed in that county from the era of Confederation till the resignation of the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald. They had to wait till the advent of the late Government, led by the hon. member for Lambton, whose principles were to be above suspicion, and whose practices were to bear the light of day, to see country postmasters dismissed for political reasons, and prevented from being free to take what side they pleased. It was left for the party of Reform to inaugurate the practice of "satisfying political hate by their sacrifice, and taking the first step towards establishing a Tory propaganda, with the country postmasters as agents, bound to do the work of the party in power." It might be said that these offices were comparatively unimportant, and that their emoluments were correspondingly trifling. Then he would ask how magnanimous must have been the spirit that prompted, and how dignified the conduct of the Government that executed, the changes. He spoke not in the spirit of partisanship, but as an independent supporter of a party, and, as such, would be ashamed to criticise or condemn any action of any Government

in making official changes that were necessary and judicious; but he thought, after the statements he had made, which were incapable of denial, that every member of the House would agree with him in the opinion that, judged by their own standard, by the rule laid down in their own party organ, the record of the members of the late Government was not clean with regard to the question of dismissals from office, and that their political habitation was too transparent in appearance, and too fragile in the material of its construction, to justify them in throwing stones.

Motion agreed to.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 4.]

(*Mr. McCarthy.*)

SECOND READING PROPOSED.

MR. MCCARTHY said that, in moving the second reading of this Bill, it was proper he should give the House some explanation of the changes which the Bill, if passed, would make with regard to the trial of controverted elections. The provision by which controverted elections were tried by the Judges had not been of very long standing; but he thought, although it had not given all the satisfaction anticipated from it, that public opinion was, to this extent, at all events, agreed that the present system was better than that which prevailed before the law, with regard to the trial of these elections, was placed upon the Statute-book. The change which he proposed was one that would obviate, to some extent, the objections now made against the present system. These objections were not made merely in this country, but in England, where a law similar to the one we had prevailed. It was objected that it gave too much power to one man, although that man might be a Judge, to set aside an election, and to disqualify a gentleman who might have been returned by a majority of the votes polled; and he thought there was a great deal of force in the objection. He believed the Judges themselves felt uncomfortable in the exercise of the powers conferred upon them. It placed them in a very unpleasant and unfortunate position, because either they had not the

moral courage to do their duty, or, if they did their duty, they ran the risk, nay almost the certainty, of being denounced by the press of either one party or the other. A case that had only recently been determined in the Ontario Courts was one instance of the action of the public press in such matters. The learned Judge of that Court,—actuated by proper motives, he had no doubt, and his motives had not been assailed,—had been attacked in one of the leading organs of public opinion of the West in his conclusion with regard to the construction which, as a conscientious and eminent lawyer, he felt himself bound to put upon that law. What was the remedy for this evil? If they did not desire to recur to the old procedure—that of having these controverted elections tried by a Committee of this House, and he did not think any member would desire to revert again to that system—they had no alternative than to add to the strength of the judiciary, to increase the number of Judges by whom the election petitions were tried, so that they would be able to discharge their duty with more satisfaction to themselves, and that in the discharge of their duty their decisions would carry more weight with the public. He, therefore, proposed that, instead of election petitions being tried, as they were now, by one Judge, these petitions should be tried by three Judges; that the decision of these three Judges should, on all matters of fact, and on almost all questions of law be final and conclusive, so that whatever that decision might be—whether the petition were dismissed or the prayer of the petition allowed—it would be final and conclusive. There was only one exception to that general rule, and that was that, when the Judges themselves thought proper, they might reserve for the consideration of the Supreme Court any question of law which was of sufficient importance to be thus reserved. The Judges who he proposed should preside at these trials would be three Judges—one to be a member of the Supreme Court, the other two to be chosen from the provincial Judges belonging to the Province in which the petition was to be tried. He was not unaware of the objections which had been made to this proposition. It was contended that it

would overtax the judicial strength, and that the Judges had now as much to do as they were able to perform. He supposed the Minister of Justice would have to consider this question—that the Government would have to come to a determination upon it. Speaking as to the Province of Ontario, he did not think it would be found that the Judges of that Province would not be able to discharge the increased duties that this measure would cast upon them. The present Legislature of that Province had already determined that all election petitions should be tried by two Judges. If they were satisfied with a system of that kind, he thought that this House ought not to be satisfied, unless hon. members were willing to admit that the election of members of this House was of less importance than the election of members of the local House. It would obviate, to a great extent, the grievance they laboured under as the law now stood. No matter what the decision of an election Judge might be, there was a simple remedy—by appeal. By the very simple procedure of getting security to a very trifling amount, either of the litigant parties had the right to appeal. The effect of this was to increase the expense, and the possible result was that a member who had been disqualified, might come down here (having given his notice of appeal) and take his seat in the House and vote. For these reasons, he thought the measure would not be thought out of place. He would not enter into the question of procedure, as that was a matter of detail. He would say, however, that he proposed petitions should be verified on oath, without which they could not be placed on the files; and that particulars given in support of those petitions should also be verified on oath. That would prevent, to some extent, the annoyance of having fishing petitions filed against them. He trusted that the change proposed by this Bill would become the law of the land during the present Session of the House.

MR. BAKER said the subject embraced by the Bill now under consideration was one of very grave importance, and affected equally the dignity and position of members on both sides of

the House. And the second reading of the Bill afforded a fairly opportune occasion for discussing the wisdom of a measure by which Parliament was shorn of one of its ancient and most honoured privileges, and the power of dealing with election petitions transferred from a Committee of the House to an external and independent tribunal. But he did not propose to enter upon that discussion. The wisdom of the policy had been affirmed, when, after debate and deliberation, the Controverted Election Act of 1874 was passed. And they had now to deal with the practical operation of the law and the amendments suggested by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It was extremely doubtful whether the abolition of the Committee system had been followed by the advantages that were anticipated from the measure which replaced it. It was very certain that, in many instances, the dignity and authority of the Bench had suffered. And he thought he was justified in adding that public confidence in the administration of justice had been rudely shaken by some of the decisions that had been rendered by the Courts. For the Judges, it was to be said that new duties of an onerous kind were suddenly cast upon their shoulders; they were suddenly called upon to interpret and enforce the provisions of a Statute that could be enlarged or restrained, and, for the elucidation of which, no long line of precedents existed to keep them within the narrow boundaries of a beaten path. Sitting singly, and, in many instances, far apart from one another, without the opportunity for consultation and comparison, it was not to be expected that perfect unanimity would prevail. Nevertheless, the profession and the public should be spared the shock of judgments diametrically opposed to each other, founded upon the same clause of the Statute, and based upon evidence precisely similar in every essential feature. And it was not surprising that dissatisfaction had arisen, where it was held in one case that a "thimble-full" of drink, attended by certain circumstances, might vitiate an election, while, in another, it was declared that agents, provided they had a "habit of treating," and

that it was consecrated by long usage, might literally flood the country with strong drink, and float the member in upon a perfect sea of beer. Worse than that, it had been held, in one Province, that charity, stimulated to an unwonted growth by the exciting surroundings of an electoral campaign, might find harmless expression in gifts of great munificence; while in another Province the candidate was actually prevented from taking his seat in this House because an elector and a supporter, moved by the sight of painful destitution, had yielded to human impulse, and given a piece of cloth to clothe a shivering child. And again, it had been held repeatedly in England, and in this country, that the employment of paid canvassers was permitted under the Statute, while, in the most recent decision of all, the contrary was affirmed. He mentioned these discrepancies, not because the motives of our Judges were to be questioned or impugned in this House, for he believed, that, as a body, the Judges of the Dominion would compare favourably with those of any other country in the world for ability, for learning, for zeal, and for impartiality; but he mentioned the discrepancies because it was notorious that they existed, and chiefly because, being judgments rendered by a single Judge, no matter how learned and accomplished he might be, they did not carry the same weight and the same force of conviction that they would if rendered by a greater number. In matters of such vital importance, affecting not only the right of a member to occupy his seat in this House, but involving disabilities of the gravest character, it was not in human nature to be satisfied with the conclusions of a single mind, no matter how gifted and accomplished it might be. If a man were accused of a grave assault or a misdemeanour, involving the payment of a fine or a short term of imprisonment, he had a right to be tried by a jury, and yet, in these election trials, where the issues were, in some cases, a thousand times more momentous, questions of fact and of law under the present system, had to be decided by a single Judge, without the intervention of a jury. And the Judges, in many instances, before their elevation to the Bench, having been political partizans,

the judgment of a single Judge, however pure and impartial he might be, was apt to be questioned, and distrust and dissatisfaction were the inevitable result. The changes, therefore, proposed by this Bill were of a most useful kind, and would be acceptable to the profession and the public. Except in outlying and remote Provinces—thought by the mover of the Bill, no doubt, too far distant for the reach of salutary legal reform—the trials would be presided over by three Judges instead of one, and he thought the change would unquestionably secure greater confidence and satisfaction in the judgments to be rendered. As stated by the hon. mover of the Bill (Mr. McCarthy), it would prevent the odium that might attach to a decision by a single Judge, and would remove one of the greatest objections to the working of the present law. Coming to the particular framework of the tribunals proposed to be substituted for existing ones, it was to be hoped that the provisions of the Bill would meet with the cordial approval and cooperation of the Judges, from whose ranks the recruits, so to speak, were to be drawn for carrying its provisions into effect. For, although the Judges must undertake any duties which the wisdom or the will of Parliament might impose upon them, it would yet be more satisfactory to know that they approved of the general provisions of a measure which proposed to make such important additions to their official functions.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said he thought a Bill of the kind proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was particularly desirable. Some changes in the Controverted Election Law were manifestly and absolutely necessary. He was glad some member of the House had undertaken to introduce a Bill dealing with this important question. He knew there were some gentlemen in the House who had serious doubts whether the present law was any improvement upon the old law, and that for many reasons. There was too much uncertainty in the present law. In one Province the law was rendered one way, and quite a different way in another Province. One Judge would lay

down the law in one way, and another Judge would lay it down in a directly opposite way. And that was not the only difficulty. In 1874, the trial of these controverted elections was taken out of the hands of the House and left to the Courts, in order to lessen the expenses connected with their trial. He thought the experience of the last five years had been such as to remove from the minds of those who had been actively engaged in those trials any belief in the benefits the country was supposed to derive from the law. It appeared to him that the expenses were greater now than they were under the old law, that parties had to wait just about as long to get decisions, and that the law was no better and no more effectively laid down now than it was under the old system. Still, he was not prepared to say that we should go back to the old system altogether. No doubt the present law required very considerable amendments, and when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) gave notice of his Bill, he (Mr. Cameron), imagined that, from his legal abilities, from his large experience before the Election Courts, that hon. gentleman was going to deal with this question in a more extended and broader spirit, and that the difficulties which, from time to time, cropped up in the administration of the present law, would be, to a certain extent, avoided in this Bill. So far as he (Mr. Cameron) was able to judge, from reading over the Bill a couple of times, he could not see that the hon. gentleman proposed to make any substantial change in the law as it now stood, with the one single exception of having all cases tried before three Judges, instead of before one. In fact, when the Bill was compared with the law now on the Statute-book, it was more to be noted for what it did not contain than for what it did contain. There were one or two points that might be an improvement, although he did not think they would amount to very much. For instance, verifying petitions presented before the Court did not appear to him to be much of an improvement, because, if a person was prepared to present a petition before the Courts, there would be very little difficulty in getting that person to make affidavit that, in so far as he was concerned, the several statements in the

petition were true. There were one or two other amendments in the Bill besides the one relating to the constitution of the Court. Now, it appeared to him that, in dealing with this question, it was desirable to have the law upon the subject consolidated and embraced in one Bill. The hon. member said that the present law gave too much power to a single Judge, since it gave power to unseat and power to disqualify. The Bill to some extent covered that objection, since three Judges instead of one were to sit on the case. But even on this point the Bill was open to a serious objection. The Bill allowed an appeal from the finding of the three Judges to the Supreme Court, but only upon a question of law. Now, from his own personal experience with election cases tried before Judges, he was not prepared to submit, even upon a question of fact, to the decision of either one or three Judges. If there was to be an appeal at all to the Supreme Court, the appeal should lie upon a question of fact as well as upon a question of law. Judges were human as well as other men, and apt to err as well as other men, and to make mistakes in the rendering of the law, or in the proper construction of a Statute. They all knew, too, that upon questions of fact one Judge would take one view of the evidence, and another Judge would take a diametrically opposite view of it. He was not prepared, therefore, to submit to the finding of two Judges. For instance, in the Court proposed to be created by the Bill, three Judges were to sit, and two might take one view and the third another view. He thought it only fair to the man whose seat was sought to be taken from him, and who might be disqualified and disgraced, that, if there was to be an appeal to a higher tribunal upon the question of law, there should also be one upon a question of fact. He had just now in his mind a case decided not very long ago, in which there was grave and serious ground to question the finding of the Judge, and for appeal, upon a question of fact, apart altogether from the question of law. Now, in his hon. friend's Bill, as he understood it, there was no appeal on questions of fact at all. If the law was to be amended, if there were to be changes of that kind, they ought to

make the Bill as perfect as possible, so that no injustice should be done either to the petitioners or to the sitting members. There was another omission which appeared of some importance—the Bill made no provision for an appeal from judgments on preliminary objections taken to the filing of the petition. Objections might properly be taken, for instance, as to the qualification of the petitioner, that he was not a candidate, or an elector, or, in other respects, was disqualified from entering a petition. The hon. member proposed that that point should be tried and settled solely by one of the Judges of the Court created by this Bill. They all knew perfectly well that a preliminary objection might go to the very root of the matter, to the right of the petitioner to petition at all, and, so far as he was concerned, he could not consent to submit to the opinion of a single Judge on a question of that kind. It was perfectly well known that, in all the Provinces, as the result of the last general election, many petitions were filed—that preliminary objections were taken to these petitions, and that some of these points went to the very right of the Courts to try the case, and to the very right of the petitioner to bring his case before the Courts at all. But, according to the Bill, both the respondent and the petitioner were bound to submit to the finding of one Judge instead of having great and important questions like that brought before a full Court. He was satisfied that questions of that kind should go before a full Court. If the hon. member's object was to consolidate the law upon this subject, why had he omitted from his Bill the Act passed in 1876, 39 Victoria, chapter 9, which provided, as one of the duties of the Court trying these election petitions, that, if corrupt practices prevailed, they should be reported by the Judge, with a view of dealing therewith. That provision, it appeared to him, should form part and parcel of this new law. There was another improvement that ought also to be introduced into this Bill. There was a provision in the law of 1878, that, under certain circumstances and in certain cases, a Judge of a County Court should have the power to recount and examine the ballots that had been cast for both parties. It gave, in effect, to a County

Judge, the power of deciding as to the right of a member to sit in this House. He was not going to enquire here whether that was a wise and proper provision or not, but it was practically a very important provision, since it gave the Judge the power of unseating, as it were, the man whom the returning officer declared entitled to the seat. They knew that one Judge in one of the Provinces had thus decided upon the validity of ballots, and that a Judge in another Court had taken an opposite view. They knew that the decision of County Court Judges was conclusive in this respect, and it seemed to him that this Bill was defective in not providing an appeal from such decision. Anyone who had been practising for twenty odd years in the Courts knew quite well that there was a great difference of opinion about the desirability of leaving such an important power as this in the hands of the County Judge. In these respects, the Bill of his hon. friend was practically a reprint only of the law as it formerly stood, with the exception of the constitution of the Court. As he understood the Bill, it provided that, in the Province of Ontario, three Judges of each of the four Courts were, by ballot, to select one of themselves to act as Election Judge, and any two of the Judges so selected, with one of the Judges of the Supreme Court, formed the Court for the trial of these election cases. The hon. gentleman knew quite well that a difficulty had cropped up in every Province as to the right of this Parliament to delegate to the Judges of the local Courts of the Provinces, the right or the power to investigate or to dispose of election petitions. The hon. member, however, as he understood it, proposed to get over the difficulty which had cropped up in the various Provinces, and was not yet settled, by utilising four of the Judges of the Supreme Court, and with that tribunal to dispose of these controverted election cases. He was satisfied the hon. gentleman would not get over the legal difficulty in any such way, because, if he had no right to utilise the Courts of Ontario or Quebec for the trial of controverted elections under the Dominion Act, neither had he the right to take Judges from those Courts, and clearly no right to give those Courts original jurisdiction.

He might take A. B. or C. D., and impose a duty on him, but he had no power to take a Judge of one of those Courts and make him and one of the Judges of the Supreme Court a tribunal for the purpose of trying these controverted election petitions. Besides, if Parliament had the power to do so, he did not agree at all with the hon. member that it was right or proper that they should throw this additional burden upon the Judges of the Courts. He was satisfied now that the Judges of the Courts of Ontario, at all events, had more work to do than they could reasonably perform; that there was no lawyer practising at the bar in Ontario who was more overworked than any one of these Judges, and to throw upon them this additional burthen and duty proposed in this Bill, appeared to him to be exceedingly unreasonable. It was never contemplated by the right hon. gentleman who led the House to vest this new jurisdiction in the local Courts, not only on account of the legal and constitutional difficulty to which he had referred, but from the manifest inconvenience of the thing. He recollected, when a Bill was introduced in 1873 by the present leader of the House, the hon. gentleman took that very ground, that this Parliament had no power to utilise the Courts of the Provinces, and that, had they the power to do so, it would be an unwise and injudicious exercise of that power; that the Judges were then overworked and unable to overtake the work cast upon them by the law of the land. That Bill was only to continue in force, and the power was only given to the local Judges to act, until the Supreme Court was established, when the trial of the controverted elections should be in the hands of the Supreme Court Judges. Not only that: the hon. the leader of the House, who was then also leader of the House, went a step further, and made provision in that Bill that the vesting of this new jurisdiction in the hands of the Judges of the several Provinces should not exist until the Legislature of the Provinces should authorise the Judges to deal with these questions. Whether the hon. the leader of the House was then right or wrong was to some extent beside the question

just now. While the matter was pending before the Courts, before the constitutional difficulty was got over, it was not a wise exercise of power to give the local Courts original jurisdiction over these cases, or to create a new Court in the mode in which the hon. member proposed to create it, and leave the unfortunate litigants to fight the matter over again. As the law did not apply to cases now pending, the matter should be allowed to stand, at all events, until they got a judicial decision from the Courts, and the hon. gentleman should do what his leader proposed in 1873, leave the matter in the hands of the Judges of the Supreme Court. He was satisfied the Judges of the Supreme Court were not overworked, and there was nothing to prevent them from taking the trials of these controverted election cases in the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. The hon. member's Bill did not propose that the Judges should deal with election cases in Manitoba and British Columbia. There was nothing, then, to prevent the Judges of the Supreme Court from dealing with these questions. They were not overtaxed, overburdened, or overworked. The Court established by the Dominion Parliament to dispose of questions arising under the legislation of the Dominion Parliament was the proper Court to deal with the matter. One Judge of the Supreme Court should try the case, giving the litigants the right of appeal from his judgment upon a question of law or of fact. There were more matters of detail for which the Bill did not provide. If there was one thing more than another which would make this Bill exceedingly unpopular and lead a large number of those experienced in such cases to ask for a repeal of the Act entirely, and a return to the old system, it was the enormous expense it would entail on the unfortunate litigants. A petition was filed against the sitting member; it came up for trial; 150 witnesses were subpoenaed to establish his case; of these 150 witnesses, the evidence of ninety-nine hundredths was wholly immaterial, and yet the unfortunate litigant was saddled with the expense of the whole of them. A grosser outrage did not exist. The Bill should

contain a clause to cover a difficulty of that kind. The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that most of these petitions were filed on speculation, and depended upon evidence which might turn up at the trial, and often succeeded through the testimony of some scaly witness then heard of for the first time, whose evidence might unseat a man. As a matter of precaution and to prevent this fishing for evidence, the Bill should provide that no witness would get a farthing unless the Judge who tried the case certified that his evidence had direct bearing on the case. If the hon. gentleman proposed to consolidate the Election Law, in so far as it related to the trial of controverted elections by this Bill, it should contain every Statute and all the law bearing upon the subject, and it ought to be amended by leaving the trial in the hands of one of the Judges of the Supreme Court, with the power to the litigants to appeal from him on questions of law and fact to a full Court, and it ought to be changed, amended and remodelled in many other respects.

MR. IVES said, before this Bill was read a second time, he thought it very proper that the hon. member who had charge of it should have his attention called to one or two difficulties which would arise through it, particularly in the Province of Quebec. This Bill proposed to impose upon the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Quebec, the labour of trying these election cases. He thought it well to remind the hon. gentleman that that would cause a very serious injury to the administration of justice in that Court. The Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Quebec, was very much overworked, and in arrears of work. They had, on the roll of the Court of Queen's Bench, a list of cases which was at least one year in advance, that was, it would take one year at least, without any new cases whatever being inscribed, for the Court of Queen's Bench to hear the cases at present inscribed. That Court was the most important Court in the Province of Quebec. It seemed to him it would be a serious thing if this Parliament were to impose upon the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench the labour of trying election cases in that Province.

MR. CAMERON.

That would be a very important change from the present law, because the present law provided that Judges of the Superior Court in the Province of Quebec should have jurisdiction in those cases. He was sure that difficulty would be so serious that the Bill would have to be modified, as far as the Province of Quebec was concerned, otherwise the general business there would have to remain in abeyance, or the trial of these cases would never take place in any reasonable time. There was another objection, which might not apply to Ontario, but which certainly did to Quebec. That was the provision that all these records were to be made up either in the cities of Montreal or Quebec. If an election petition was presented relating to an election occurring in the district of Gaspé, the parties must go to Quebec to file the petition; if from the Eastern Townships, they must go to Montreal. He did not see why this should occur. They had, in the district of St. Francis, a Judge who could act, and a clerk who could act as election clerk in the Court. There was no reason whatever why the parties who presented an election petition should be forced to go to Montreal in order to file it, and there to argue the preliminary or other objections that might be taken in the Court of preliminary proceedings, before the case was ready for trial. In that particular the old law was defective. It should provide, as their local Controverted Elections Law did, for the making up of the record within the judicial district where the election which was contested took place. He himself had conducted the prosecution of one of these election petitions under the present law, and had to make as many as half-a-dozen trips to the city of Montreal in order to be present when the papers were filed, and to argue objections, which journeys might as well have been avoided, if the law had permitted the Court of the district of St. Francis to have jurisdiction in those matters. No serious result would occur from the change, because the trial itself had to take place in St. Francis, and why should not the record be made there? Another objection was the question of expense. If they were to adopt the principle of having the trial they held be-

fore three Judges, they might do away with the appeal altogether, unless it were upon cases reserved by the Judges, and sent by them to be heard before the Supreme Court. There would be less injury in having a speedy termination to these cases than being subjected to the danger of being drawn before the Supreme Court, and there be put in for an immense bill of costs, the natural result of a trial before that Court. In fact, a poor candidate had better resign his seat than incur the risk of being taken before the Supreme Court, and have to bear the expenses of going there. If they were to have a trial before three Judges, it would be better to have their decisions final, more particularly if a Judge of the Supreme Court was to preside at all trials, for the reason that he could inform his brother Judges of the decisions in the other Provinces, and be guided by them in return, and thus, by degrees, bring uniformity into the rulings of the different Courts, without the expense of an appeal to the Supreme Court. As to the taxation of witnesses whose testimony was irrelevant, the present law was sufficient. It contained the general provision that irrelevant testimony could not be taxed against the opposite party. It was important, however, if there was any doubt on this point, that an amendment of that kind should be introduced, in order to prevent the party defeated in the suit from being taxed with the expenses of witnesses brought merely on speculation. He thought this Bill should be referred to a Committee which should take into consideration the various Election Laws in the different Provinces, with the view of incorporating, in the Dominion Act, all the provisions found in these local Acts, which would improve the law. In Quebec they had a good law, providing for a trial in the judicial district where the election was held, before one Judge; that was, the evidence was taken before one Judge, who transmitted it to the Court of Review, which was presided over by three Judges, and there the decision was rendered. This was a much less expensive way, and it would be well to look into the provisions of the Quebec law, with a view to ascertain whether those provisions would not be better than the mode adopted in the Bill. If

they were to have a trial before three Judges, why could they not dispense with the taking of evidence, either in long-hand or by the aid of a stenographer? The expense of taking the evidence would then be done away with, and the Judges might, as in criminal cases, take what notes they saw fit. If this were done, he was satisfied the present expenses of these trials might be reduced to one-third of the present cost.

MR. CASEY said he had no doubt every one would consider the object of the present Bill a most praiseworthy one; but he must agree with hon. gentlemen who had preceded him that there were defects in the proposed amendment of the law. If the decision of the proposed Courts was to be final, there might be some reason for having three Judges, but, if appeal were allowed, he saw no reason for going to the expense of having three Judges, as proposed in the Bill. He did not think the country would be willing to abide by the decision of these Judges as final. The interests involved in an election petition were so very large, so complicated, and so liable to misconception on the first trial, that he thought the House and country would always insist upon an appeal. He therefore agreed with the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) that every object proposed to be gained by the Bill would be gained by providing for the trial of these petitions before a single Judge of the Supreme Court coupled with an appeal to the full Court. He also thought that some hon. members' suggestions in reference to the non-payment of witnesses, whose evidence was not material, was deserving of great weight. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) argued that, as the law stood, such witnesses need not be paid; but he (Mr. Casey) was informed by gentlemen who had been concerned in these cases that the Courts had held otherwise. Judges had held that every witness must be paid whether his evidence was relevant or not, and even whether his evidence was called for or not, and he thought a new provision for the regulation of the payment of witnesses would be a wholesome one. He did not find in the Bill any reference to the conduct of elections, in amendment of the law regarding

MR. IVES.

bribery, treating, or the dealings of returning officers and other officials with the ballots. He had been so thoroughly impressed that amendments were needed in this direction that he had introduced a Bill providing for some such amendment, which might render necessary some change in the law for the trial of controverted elections also. The Bill, however, had not yet been printed. He would not go into details now, but he would ask the hon. member to look into the matter as soon as his (Mr. Casey's) Bill was distributed, and see whether any such change were involved, and if so, how far he could accept the amendments he proposed to make. As the laws were to be consolidated, it would be better that the amendments should be put in the same Bill, and that there should be only one Election Law.

MR. CASGRAIN said he objected to the principle of the Bill. The present law was not perfect, but it had worked pretty well. He had been twice subject to the law—once under the old system and once under the present law before the Courts—and in both cases they went off pretty well. The system of one Judge with the right of appeal was sufficient. The Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Quebec, were already overworked and not sufficiently numerous. If the proposed Bill were adopted, it would take at least eighteen months to complete the trial of the case when a new Parliament was elected. The law should not be changed in a hurry, and he desired to enter his objection to several parts of the Bill—the more so as the Bill would be difficult to put in operation, if not entirely impracticable, in the Province of Quebec.

MR. GUTHRIE said he thought they should have the opinion of the Minister of Justice upon this measure, which was a reconstruction and consolidation of the whole law. He thought there was a great deal of weight to be attached to what had fallen from the hon. gentleman who moved the Bill in regard to the change of tribunal. No doubt a unanimous decision of three Judges would be more satisfactory to all parties concerned, but the Bill left the final decision to a majority of the Judges,

and, therefore, practically it would carry no more weight than if one Judge still decided the whole question. If they were to have a decision which would carry weight, particularly in regard to disqualification, it should be at least a decision of three. It had often been said, in discussing the question as to whether the verdicts of juries should be unanimous or not, that the unanimous verdict of twelve men gave general satisfaction; because, if twelve men could be brought to view the matter in one way and give a decision, that decision must be in the right. Now, this argument applied in regard to election trials. Political feeling entered largely into the trial of these cases, and it was felt that they should be removed as far as possible from politicians. As it was proposed to give greater weight to these decisions, they should surely insist that, if the Judges should not agree amongst themselves, the charge should fail. It would be better, he thought, if there was to be no appeal, to have the trial conducted by two Judges and require them to agree, than to have three Judges and leave it to a majority. He also was of opinion that, if they adopted the tribunal of three Judges, a decision of disqualification should be unanimous. There were, however, strong reasons why this Bill should not be proceeded with at the present time. The constitutional question now before the Courts of New Brunswick, and he believed the other Provinces, had not been finally decided, and this Bill did not propose to settle the question in a satisfactory way. If the result of the discussion in the cases now before the Courts should be in favour of the view advanced in 1873 by the present leader of the House, or in favour of the doubt he then expressed—a doubt which had taken the shape of a legal defence in many of the election trials, namely, that this Parliament had no power to employ the local Courts or Judges of those Courts to try election petitions—then this Bill left the matter in the same position. If the question was decided in favour of the view that they had no jurisdiction, they would have to have legislation in the future to put the matter right. The Bill was not intended to apply to any of the elections hitherto held. As there would not, until

the next general election, be many cases to which the new law would apply, there was no necessity for the immediate adoption of the measure. There was no doubt that there were some omissions in the Bill as pointed out, and some improvements which could be made by reference to a Special Committee or a Committee of the Whole, if the House were to affirm the principle of the Bill. He held that, under the present circumstances, they should not adopt so radical a change as this Bill proposed. One of the greatest difficulties in carrying out the change proposed would be how to arrange for the meeting of the three Judges, so as to suit the convenience of all. He trusted the measure would be deferred for the present Session.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that, although he had seconded the motion for the second reading of the Bill, he must state it was not his opinion that three Judges should be employed. He thought the number should be two, and he seconded the motion with the understanding that this matter was to be brought up in the Committee to which it was proposed to refer the Bill. There would be a great difficulty in getting three Judges throughout the country. The Judges already complained that too much work was thrown upon them,—and in the Provincial Courts the cry was for more Judges. With a Court of three Judges, only two were required to give effect to a decision. He thought it would be advisable to provide that, if they had two Judges, and they were unanimous, the fact should be regarded as proved; if they differed, the fact would not be proved. If they were unanimous, it would be sufficient that there should be no appeal from their judgment, except in matters of law. For an appeal in matters of law, it would be unnecessary to go to the expense of sending up all the evidence. It would only be necessary to send to the higher Court the case upon which the question of law turned. The appeal then would be simple and inexpensive, and they would not again be troubled with the outcries of hon. members who had the misfortune to go before the Supreme Court. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) spoke of the desirability of allowing appeals to go

before the Supreme Court in all cases. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman had had the experience of the hon. the Postmaster-General (Mr. Langevin) in the Charlevoix case, some years ago, where they took several hundred folios of evidence which was printed at his expense and circulated ———

An Hon. MEMBER: Not circulated.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that, to all intents and purposes, it was circulated. The costs the hon. gentleman had to pay were \$6,000. This showed it was undesirable to have any appeal, and, if they had two Judges to try the case, who would agree, it would be sufficient.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that, if the two Judges agreed, the case would be settled, or, if they disagreed, it would be passed in the negative. There was no necessity for the third to concur or differ. Two Judges would, under this Bill, give the judgment of the Court, and so they would if but two were appointed to try the case. In all questions of fact they must agree, and any charge of bribery or corruption must be proved to the satisfaction of the Judges. He was of opinion the judgment of Judges on questions of fact should be final, without appeal, but questions of law might go to appeal, because it would be carried on simply and inexpensively, as there would be no evidence to take to the Court of Appeal, but simply the evidence of the witnesses relating to the case in which the appeal was taken up. He hoped, therefore, the Committee would consider this question about the two Judges, and endeavour to appoint only two for the trial of the petition. Election petitions could not be tried while the House was in Session, the reason given being that a member should not be taken away from his duties here to attend to the trial, lest the constituency be left unrepresented; so that the law would sooner have the constituency misrepresented than unrepresented. That did not seem right. If the person returned was not duly elected, the

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

trial ought to go on whether the House was sitting or not, so that the proper representative should be sent to Parliament at the earliest moment. Since the elections, nearly six months ago, very few election trials had taken place—in Ontario some half-dozen, and in New Brunswick not one. This was a most extraordinary state of affairs. They had witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of an hon. gentleman, a legal member, too, of the late Government, questioning the constitutionality of an Act passed by it—he meant the member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith). That opposition from a gentleman who helped to pass the Act was an edifying spectacle indeed.

MR. MACKENZIE: His Act passed in 1873.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, in 1874. The old Act was repealed. The original Act constituted the Election Courts, which the Act of 1874 did away with; providing, also, that election petitions should be tried by Provincial Courts. This was just the reason why this constitutional point was raised. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said that was the reason why this Act should not be passed now. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) denied that the House had anything to do with the question before the Courts. Let it be taken before the Supreme Court, and, if it declared the Act unconstitutional, it would be repealed, or be inoperative, being *ultra vires*, and no harm done. Then the Government would be called on to act. Let them not consider it unconstitutional till it was so decided. Ontario Judges, of great ability and learning, had decided that it was constitutional. He thought they should not hesitate to pass this Act in consequence of any doubt on this point having arisen. Let them, at the earliest moment, remedy the defects of any law on the Statute-book—amend, consolidate, and make a perfect law, because they knew not how soon further elections would take place, and further petitions be sent for trial. He hoped the Bill would be read a second time, and that the Committee would reach conclusions creditable to the country and the House, and that they would not have the edifying spectacle of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) taking the

earliest opportunity of denying the constitutionality of his own Bill.

MR. SHAW said he was very much pleased that this Bill had been brought before the House. He believed the House would concur in its provisions. A good deal of adverse criticism had been indulged in with regard to this Bill being an imperfect consolidation of the Controverted Elections Act; but this was a consolidation only of the Act respecting the trial of election petitions. It did not pretend to deal with the Act respecting corrupt practices. That Act might be dealt with by a separate Bill; and, in his opinion, that Act should be amended, and some amendments might well be made to the present Bill. He thought it would be well to provide that the particulars of the corrupt practice should be served together with the copy of the petition; this would cheapen the contest very considerably. The respondent was entitled to have the whole case placed before him. The statements should be under oath also, which would prevent some of the practices they had lately witnessed. He had seen lately, in some ridings, collectors, and sometimes postmasters, canvassing their polling divisions, and collecting money to get up a petition against the party possessing the greatest number of votes. Now, if the party filing the petition were compelled to swear to the truth of the charges brought against a member elect, it would, perhaps, prevent parties contributing who had no knowledge of the corrupt practice alleged until the alleged corrupt practices were sworn to. Such conduct was highly improper. It was stated that the Court of Appeal should try election petitions, but the adverse critics of this Bill had not specified how the Court of Appeal was to try the matter. If they desired it should be tried by one Judge, selected from the Court of Appeals—if only one would hear the evidence, there must be an appeal to the full Court in case of difficulty. There was difficulty, generally, respecting the facts, and it would be well if they were tried by more Judges than one. He believed three were not too many; that two would not be enough. Were three Judges appointed, the discussions that would take place

would, very likely, lead to a more correct decision. Many cases were decided on very doubtful grounds, the Court having to reach some decision. A third Judge, if dissenting, could give his opinion, also, which would go before the country, and sometimes lead to a favourable consideration of the party defeated. There was the other question of the constitutional ground. This Bill did not require any Provincial Court to try an election petition. It had been objected that this Parliament had not the power to select a Provincial Court to try an election petition; but he thought certainly they had the power to select particular individuals, were they Judges or not, to try them; and, when selected, they could constitute the Court. He did not think, therefore, there was anything in the constitutional objection, which could be well overcome by the provisions of this Bill.

MR. DREW said he agreed with the remark that the trial by two Judges would be much better than by three. He thought there was something in the argument of the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that the judgment of three Judges, one dissenting, was virtually the decision of one; that was simply taking one from two and one would remain. He thought that was the result of his argument. He (Mr. Drew) would certainly prefer the trial by two Judges, and that they should both agree; otherwise, the decision would be in the negative, in favour of the respondent. That would be much better than a trial by three Judges, with one dissenting. But he did not see they would gain much by the Bill, should there be no appeal. With the present right of appeal, a person on trial had a greater protection than were his case before two Judges whose decision was final; and the House should consider the importance of a measure of this sort, when they knew that every candidate might be put on trial for some act or other, and might be subject to a trial by which he might lose his seat and be disqualified. Members must feel that there would be nothing that would affect them so much as a judgment in a Court depriving them of the right of citizenship, and he could hardly agree with the principle

of a Bill which deprived them of the right of appeal. He thought the Bill, at any rate, should not be put in operation so soon after a general election, which had been held under the law as it now stood. This was a measure that should not be tinkered at every Session. They should allow sufficient time to elapse in order to have an opportunity of finding out its defects. It had been said by the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw), that the time of serving particulars should be at the time of the serving of the petition upon a party. There might be something in that, but his opinion was that the names of witnesses should not be given when the particulars were filed; but that the nature of the charge should be set forth, was nothing but reasonable. He thought it tended to defeat the ends of justice if the names of persons, who were to be called as witnesses, were to be given to the opposite party. It would open the door to these persons to be tampered with and their evidence made away with. He did not think a Bill of this importance should be allowed to pass through the House in the ordinary way, but had no doubt it would be referred to a Select Committee, where it would be fully discussed.

MR. MOUSSEAU said that the Bill introduced by his hon. friend the member for North Simcoe was very important. This Bill contained some amendments which were a great improvement on the existing law. But the manner in which the hon. member proposed to constitute the new Court presented some serious objections for the Province of Quebec especially. With regard to the choice of a Judge of the Supreme Court as President of the Election Court, he believed that Parliament had the right to do so. The Supreme Court, having been created by Parliament, Parliament had the right to confer upon this Court the powers and the jurisdiction required for the trial of election petitions. As to the question whether the House had the right to take two Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, in order to constitute, with a Judge of the Supreme Court an Election Court, he was in some doubt about it. He would like to hear upon that subject the opinion of the hon. the Minister of Justice. He trusted that, at

least in Committee, the House would have that opinion, in order to know what to think of the question. But it was, perhaps, well that the voice of the Province of Quebec should be heard upon this matter, and that members from Quebec should make known their views. He believed, in the first place, that the choice of Judges of the Queen's Bench would be the best, if it was in the power of the House to make such a choice regularly and constitutionally. He would much prefer to see the oldest Judges of this Court preside over election trials, for in these suits there was always mixed up so much bitterness, unfriendliness, and even hatred, that it would be well if the trial of these cases was confided to Judges far removed from politics, and who, not having taken part in elections for many years, were not liable to be influenced thereby. He was, therefore, of the opinion that, if it could be done without harm to our constitutional system, it would be very judicious to choose Judges of the Queen's Bench to constitute the Election Court, but in the actual state of things he did not think it could be done. As the hon. members for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) and for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) had observed, the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench had already more work than they could perform. Thus, if election trials in the Province of Quebec were placed in the hands of these Judges, we would fall back to the former system, that was to say, they would have election trials that would never come to an end. In this respect, he believed that the Bill of his hon. friend should be amended. In the second place, if all election trials in the Province of Quebec had to take place either at Quebec or Montreal, this would break up an entire judicial system. There were in the Province nineteen judicial districts, and a principal Court in each district, and, if the members for Gaspé and Bonaventure were obliged to go to Quebec with their witnesses, and the members for Pontiac and Ottawa to Montreal, they would fall under a more costly and defective system than the trial of elections before Select Committees. Witnesses would have to be brought from great distances, and he failed to see what good could come of

MR. DREW.

this change. He believed that the transferring of election trials to the ordinary Courts had been a serious mistake. It was the habit, or rather the manner, in this country, to copy all that was done in England. He remembered what had been said on that subject by the Chief Justice of England, when, in 1868, the Election Bill transferring the trial of controverted elections to the ordinary Courts was brought before the House. The Chief Justice of England then set forth the reasons why these cases should not come before the Courts. Two principal reasons had presented themselves against the transferring of these trials to another tribunal than the Parliament itself. In the first place the eminent Chief Justice contended that Parliament could not alienate its privileges, and one of the most essential of its privileges was the right to pass judgment on the qualification or the disqualification of its members. The other objection raised by the Chief Justice was that, by transferring controverted elections to the ordinary Courts, Parliament would run the risk of lessening the authority and respect due to the Administration of Justice. And, indeed, that was what had happened. Not long since a painful example of this truth had been seen in England, a dreadful proof that what the Chief Justice had said was true. An eminent and remarkable Judge had died a victim, so to speak, of one of these judgments—he referred to Judge Keogh. The same thing would occur here if the trial of controverted elections was left in the hands of Judges appointed either by a Liberal or a Conservative Government. The judgment rendered by one of these Judges, whatever it might be, would not be approved of by the other side. He did not pretend to say that people were right in this, but unfortunately these trials took place immediately after the elections, when partisan spirit was still alive, when political hatreds were still strong. Whatever might be the judgment of the Court, were it a judgment rendered by heaven itself, were it the wisest judgment in the world, it would be found fault with. This was perhaps mere conjecture, and he did not think that his opinion would prevail. To return to the question now before the House, he would say that, if

Parliament really wished to transfer the trial of controverted elections to well qualified tribunals, there would have to be a considerable change brought about. There ought to be a Controverted Elections Court, a Court specially created for that purpose, a Court composed of Judges whose sole occupation it should be to try these cases. The Judges could go from one county to another until all the trials were over; they would only have to travel from one district to another in order to meet the wants of the population. He believed that this was the only means that could be adopted, and that would fully meet the requirements of the public. He thought it was possible to form a *corps* of Judges, an Election Court, whose members should be chosen in such a manner as to offer perfect security to any one, and to all political parties. Whatever might be the Court, the Judges chosen should be those who had the greatest age and the greatest experience, and who were the longest out of politics, or who had never taken part in them; in a word, those Judges who were the farthest removed from political hatred, passion or necessity. Thus they could be looked upon as a truly impartial Court.

MR. DOMVILLE said he had not sufficient knowledge of law to enter deeply into the subject under discussion; but he knew, from the practical working of the present Act in New Brunswick, that it needed some alterations. To-day, when he had asked the question—what steps the Government were about to take in order to have the contested elections in New Brunswick tried, the First Minister of the Crown had informed him that the Government had nothing to do with the matter. Although nearly six months had elapsed since the elections, no cases had been tried, or judgments rendered in any of the cases arising out of that election, excepting in one instance of preliminary objections which had been before Judge Wetmore. He asked what right had gentlemen who knew they were not entitled to a seat in this House, to come here. The grossest corruption had been practised during the last election.

Some Hon. GENTLEMEN : Hear, hear.

MR. DOMVILLE: Hon. gentleman said "Hear, hear." They knew that joint notes had been made for large sums of money for election purposes—and the names on those notes were known, as well as the banks that had discounted them to raise money. The spirit of the law had not been carried out, and he thought that, on enquiry, it would be found that some Senators had unduly used their influence in elections.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for the House to resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Grandbois, for a statement showing the names, occupation, and salaries of all persons employed in the service of the Intercolonial Railway, except day labourers, on the 13th December, 1875, read.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR SESSIONAL PAPER.

MR. DECOSMOS moved :

"That Sessional Paper 42 (not printed), 1877, respecting fisheries of Columbia and the report of the Inspector of Fisheries of Columbia for 1878, with all correspondence in 1878 connected with the fisheries of that Province, be laid before this House."

He said he could not allow the motion to pass silently, as he desired to draw the attention of the House to the importance of taking the very greatest care of the fisheries of this Dominion. About one-tenth of the total exports of this country were derived from the waters of this Dominion, and he believed that out of the \$6,853,975 worth of fish that was exported from the Dominion last year, the Province to which he belonged sent \$423,840 worth of fish abroad. Of that total amount of fish, Nova Scotia produced \$4,322,925; Quebec, \$864,499; New Brunswick, \$800,445; British Columbia, \$423,340; Prince Edward Island—an island that lay in the midst of the fisheries of the country—only sent abroad \$349,787. The great Province of Ontario exported,

MR. DOMVILLE.

according to the returns for the year ending June 30th, 1878, \$90,622, whilst our inland Province of Manitoba produced \$1,857. It was a surprising fact that British Columbia, a Province which was scarcely twenty-one years old, should be the fourth greatest producer of fish in this Dominion. He would call their attention still further to the fact that the figures he had taken were derived from the annual return of Trade and Navigation. From the report of the Inspector of Fisheries for the Province of British Columbia for the year ending 31st December last, it appeared that the total value of fish exported from that Province was nearly \$1,000,000—accurately speaking it was \$925,766—thus placing the Province of British Columbia the second highest among the Provinces of the Dominion for producing fish that were exported from the country. There were several kinds of fish produced in that Province, but salmon was the chief fish exported. The total quantity of salmon exported from the whole Dominion in 1878 amounted to \$770,723; the total value of salmon exported from the Province of New Brunswick was \$245,000; from Nova Scotia, \$62,625; from Quebec, \$85,227; and Ontario, which possessed the mother salmon hatchery of the Dominion, only yielded \$919. If the Commissioner of Fisheries were to gather statistics in reference to salmon, some knowledge of the value of hatcheries in the Province of Ontario would be obtained. His hon. friend the member for Westminster had the other day called the attention of the House to the correspondence respecting the hatcheries in the Province of British Columbia. He (Mr. DeCosmos) was one of those who had very grave doubts as to the value of hatcheries. It was quite a new branch of art, and he could not find any statistics as to the actual value of it. The total amount spent in 1878 for hatcheries was \$20,088. Ontario spent \$7,500, or thereabouts, and the next yield of salmon in the Province of Ontario was only \$919. He could not find, in looking over the reports of the Fisheries Department, that there had been any increase in the take of salmon in those Provinces where the salmon hatcheries existed; he therefore desired to draw the special attention of the

hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this point, and to the necessities of devoting especial attention to the salmon hatcheries, in order to learn whether they were of any practical value or not. Everybody knew, as a matter of amusement, that fish could be hatched from eggs by artificial means, but it was a question whether the salmon hatcheries in any part of this Dominion had been productive of any increase in salmon, and had served to populate our waters with that species of fish. With relation to the fisheries in British Columbia, which had produced last year about a million dollars' worth of fish, he thought they ought to be divided into two districts, one to be the southern portion of Vancouver's Island and mainland, and the other to extend northwards to Alaska. He called the attention of the Government to this matter. Last summer he visited the northern section of the fisheries. One of the difficulties met in taking fish in that section was the claims set up by the Indians. They claimed that they were the owners of certain fisheries, and that no one should be allowed to take salmon at the best fisheries without paying them a tribute. Now he thought it was the duty of the Department of the Interior to despatch one of its officers to the spot, and make such arrangements with the Indians as—while not preventing them from getting their annual supply of food, their store of salmon for the year—should prevent them interfering in any way with the fishing enterprises for canning and pickling salmon. The Department of Marine and Fisheries ought also to have another Inspector in that section, in order to aid the fishing enterprises already in existence, or that hereafter might be started. The two duties might be merged in one person, to the great advantage of the Province, and to that special industry—salmon fishing. With respect to the motion calling for Sessional paper 42, it arose in this way:—It was brought down last year, and sent to the Printing Committee,* but, for economical reasons, it was not printed. He asked, therefore, that it be brought down again and sent to the Printing Committee along with the report of the Inspector of Fisheries for the Province for 1878. He be-

lieved the two documents had an important bearing upon the fishing industry, and should be printed in the interest both of British Columbia and the Dominion at large.

MR. DOULL asked if the hon. gentleman (Mr. DeCosmos) would not extend the scope of his motion, so as to embrace all the Provinces of the Dominion. The question was a very important one, and should receive more attention from the Government than it had received heretofore. He had a statement in his hands showing the expenditure for these fishing establishments, and the expense of protecting the fisheries. Now, he contended that these fishing establishments did not give to the country an adequate return for all the money expended on them. Instead of spending so much money on these nurseries, it would be far better to expend it upon the protection of our river fisheries which were now insufficiently protected. If the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were in his place, he (Mr. Doull) would ask him to take this subject into consideration, because it was one in which the Maritime Provinces, as well as the rest of the Dominion, were deeply interested.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) asked that, as the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not in his place, his hon. friend (Mr. Doull) would consent to adjourn the debate until the Minister should be in his place.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

DAMAGE TO THE WELLAND CANAL.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. HESSON, in the absence of Mr. MCCALLUM, moved for a statement giving the amount of damage caused by the break on the lower level of the Welland Canal in September, 1878; 1st. The amount required to make good and repair the damage to the Public Works; 2nd. The amount of damages to private property, and claims made for such damages; giving the name of each claimant, amount of such claim paid, and number and amount yet unsettled.

Motion agreed to.

TREATIES WITH INDIANS OF LAKES
HURON AND SUPERIOR.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. DAWSON moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Ontario, in reference to the arrears due to the Indians of Lakes Huron and Superior, under the treaties by which they relinquished their territorial rights; together with copies of the said treaties and all reports and documents bearing thereon.

MR. MACKENZIE said the arrears were not so much due to the Indians as to the Dominion Government. The Dominion had paid the Indians, but Ontario had not paid the Dominion.

MR. DAWSON said that his object in making this motion was to bring to the notice of the House and the country that there was a considerable amount due to the Indians, and that it had been withheld from them on account of a dispute between the two Governments as to which should pay it. This would appear when the papers came down. In the meantime, he would explain the position so far as to say that, in the case of the Lake Superior Indians, they had ceded their lands in 1830; that the annuities paid to them at first were small, amounting to but little over one dollar and fifty cents per head of the population, but the treaty contained a clause by which the Government became bound to increase the annuities to four dollars per head as soon as the revenues arising from the lands ceded should amount to a sum sufficient to admit of this being done without loss. The revenues had, for a long time, been considerable, but on Confederation the lands had passed to the Government of Ontario, while the Indians remained under the care of the Dominion Government. The Dominion Government claimed that the payments to the Indians were, in fact, a lien on the land, and that Ontario should hand over the amount. On the other hand, the Government of Ontario insisted that it belonged to the Dominion Government to deal with the Indians, and refused to regard the treaty as forming a lien on the land. Now what he (Mr. Dawson) wished to insist on was that, whatever Government

MR. HESSON.

might have eventually to pay the amount, the Indians should not be kept out of what was justly due them. Some nice legal points might be involved in the question between the two Governments, but the Indians had nothing to do with these points. Under any and all circumstances, faith should be kept with these poor people. And he believed that when the papers came down, the correspondence would be found to be so full that the matter would be thoroughly understood.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORT OF BAR IRON INTO NOVA
SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DOMVILLE moved for a return showing the number of tons of bar iron imported into Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for the year 1878; value for duty and names of importers.

MR. BOWELL said it would take a great deal of time to get the names of importers, as reference would have to be made to the invoice. He suggested this should be dropped.

MR. DOMVILLE agreed to the suggestion.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

IMMIGRANTS TO MANITOBA.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. DUBUC moved for a statement showing the number of immigrants who have come to Manitoba under the auspices or to the knowledge of the immigration agents, during the year 1878; the nationality of said immigrants, and the places they have come from.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN REGISTRATION OF AMERICAN
VESSELS.

MOTION FOR PETITIONS.

MR. VALIN moved for copies of the petitions of Messrs. Ross and others, of Quebec and Lévis, proprietors and builders of ships and steamboats, in relation to the registration in Canada of American vessels. He said the petitioners in this case believed they were treated very unjustly. According to the

Imperial Act, we were obliged to admit American-built ships to be registered in this country. Could not a measure be introduced, and an Address be drawn up, asking the British Government to rectify this injustice? It was an injustice done, not only to the Province of Quebec, but to the Lower Provinces as well; and it involved the whole Dominion. There was a large number of sea-going vessels and steamers now engaged in our coasting trade which never paid a cent to the revenue of this country, because they were built in the States and registered in Canada, without paying any duty. This was an injustice to our people, to our builders and mechanics, who had to pay a duty on everything employed in the construction of these ships. How many hands would be employed in the manufacture of engines for the different steamers which now were engaged in our waters if the conditions were changed? We paid these steamers a bounty by allowing them to be registered in this country without paying a cent of duty, while we paid from five to seventeen per cent. duty on our Canadian built ships and steamers. In consequence of this, we had no work for our people, and they would have to emigrate. In that case, where could they go, as there was no work for them anywhere else? Thus both they and their families would be reduced to beggary. The St. Lawrence and Ontario Company had been borne down by competition with an American line of steamers which paid no duty to this country, and the shareholders had been ruined in consequence. The petitioners dwelt upon the injustice of requiring them to pay duty upon materials required in shipbuilding. He desired to know why they should not pass an address asking the Imperial Government to remove the injustice done to this country, and trusted that the Government would remember this subject in the preparation of their National Policy, as it was a matter in which members on both sides of the House were deeply interested.

MR. FORTIN said that the House should endorse, by a large majority, the ideas that had been so ably expressed by his hon. friend from Montmorenci (Mr. Valin). His hon. friend was a most

practical man, being a shipbuilder and shipowner, and was thereby enabled to appreciate the great injustice under which shipbuilders and shipowners in this country laboured. The thing was very simple. On some of the materials required in shipbuilding, the Canadian builder had to pay $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent duty, and on the principal articles 5 per cent. The money which he had to pay into the Treasury of the Dominion augmented the price of the ship, and he had to earn that much more in order to derive any benefit. The Americans were enabled, under the present British Shipping Act, to build a vessel, and bring her to this country and sell her without paying any duty, whilst the Canadian shipbuilder had to pay, say from \$1,000 to \$1,500 duty on the materials used in the building of a ship. This was a great injustice, affecting both the shipbuilders, shipowners and the labourers, which he trusted would be remedied by the Government in the National Policy.

MR. DECOSMOS said he spoke as one of the representatives of a seaport where ships and steamers had been purchased abroad, American-built, and brought in registered, whilst they had machine shops, shipbuilders, and wood for building in their own country. A few years ago one of their enterprising citizens built of British Columbia wood a tug that cost \$120,000. He purchased machinery in Scotland at a cost of \$60,000 odd, and on this he had to pay some \$5,000 duty. Last summer, an American steamer was purchased in San Francisco for about \$100,000, and now she floated under the British flag. No duty was paid on that vessel, and it must strike every one that, if they wished to protect home industries, if they wished to build up their country by providing shipbuilding labour at home, they would have to shut down upon everything in the way of allowing foreign ships to be registered in the Dominion. Unless the United States and other countries admitted our ships to registration, we should prohibit their ships from registration in Canada. The statement of the hon. member for Montmorenci (Mr. Valin), that American vessels repaired abroad had to pay duty on the amount of the repairs on their return to the United

States showed how wise the American people were in protecting their own industries by every possible means. He also trusted that this matter would not be forgotten in the preparation of the National Policy.

MR. KILLAM said he was a little surprised that his hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) should have advocated the taxation of ships purchased by citizens of this country from other countries, while, at the same time, he had been using every exertion to get the duty taken off Canadian ships sold to France. He did not believe himself that any great benefit accrued to the people of France in imposing this duty. He thought it operated to their disadvantage. He believed that the prohibition which existed against Canadian-built vessels in the United States operated to the injury of the United States, and he believed that there was very little injurious competition, at all events, between the shipbuilders of Canada and the United States. In the case of vessels purchased in British Columbia, he felt confident they were so purchased on occasions when they were unable to build them themselves, and when they would have to be entirely without if they could not purchase them. He knew, in his own country, when a fishing vessel was wanted, in a case of emergency, a vessel might be bought in an American port, suitable for the business. If this were prohibited, the fisherman would be the sufferer. He never knew this was an injury to shipbuilders of Canada, and he thought the grievance was more imaginary than real. He desired to ask his hon. friend from Victoria why this rule of shutting down, as he called it, upon everything, should not be applied to machinery as well as shipping, and what possible benefit would result if his theory were adopted, that all these things should be taxed, and they should be entirely prevented from buying them from another country. He himself thought that the freer individuals were left to follow their own interest, by buying goods for shipbuilding or ships, in foreign markets, so much the better it would be for the general good, in the long run.

MR. DECOSMOS said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Killam) had referred to the

MR. DECOSMOS.

two workshops of Victoria. He assured the House that the city of Victoria, to which he belonged, could produce as fine a machine shop as could the Province of Nova Scotia, and it could turn out engines and boilers of almost any size. Victoria had as good shipwrights as could be found in any country; many came from his own Province, Nova Scotia. So far as machinery was concerned, he was in favour of imposing a heavy duty on machinery, so that our mechanics could find employment at home, and Canada might not be tributary, as to manufactures, to any foreign country.

MR. KILLAM: If that is the case, why cannot machines be built as well in British Columbia, with its advantages of cheap coal and Chinese and other cheap labour?

MR. DECOSMOS: For the simple reason that, in San Francisco, there are a number of ships, making them a drug in the market, and their proprietors find it necessary to sell them below cost, which forces neighbouring cities, like Victoria, wanting them, to buy them. Hence, it is made a slaughter market.

MR. MACKENZIE: In getting goods below cost?

MR. ANGLIN said, no doubt, in the opinion of a great many hon. gentlemen opposite, it was a great misfortune to be able to purchase steamboats at very much less than their original cost—to buy for \$100 an article that, were we excluded from places like San Francisco, would cost \$150. It was a great misfortune that the whole country should be permitted to buy any articles at reasonable prices. Their whole prosperity was to depend, in future, on the grand doctrine that, the higher prices they paid for the necessaries of life, the more wealthy they should be. He did not rise to discuss prematurely Free-trade and Protection, but to draw attention to the very extraordinary state of things developed on the Ministerial side. What meant those motions and speeches? Were the hon. members alarmed and rushing into insubordination? Were they threatening their leaders? Was the National Policy not to include ships, steamers, and every-

thing else, and to compel the people to pay for all things the highest possible prices? The Opposition were waiting, with all patience and equanimity, for the introduction of that wonderful National Policy,—that white elephant, as it had been called,—which was to do so much for the country. Though they had waited so long, doing so little, the Opposition did not repine; but hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side were showing symptoms of uneasiness. They had better, out of respect for their leaders, wait till they told them what they would deign to do for the country. If the National Policy meant anything, it was the exclusion of cheap ships, cheap cotton goods, cheap woollens and cheap goods of all sorts.

AN HON. MEMBER: And the Chinese.

MR. ANGLIN said he believed they would carry Protection so far as to exclude cheap labour, because the labouring man deserved as much protection as the manufacturer; and no cheap labour, Mongolian, German, Scotch or Irish, should be allowed to enter Canada. He approved of protecting the working men, the masses of the people of Canada. Were the few manufacturers, a good proportion of them wealthy men who had risen from humble positions, to be protected and made richer, and the working-man to receive no protection? The leaders of hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side were devoting their attention to two great objects—one the decapitation of civil servants, who happened to be on the wrong side of politics, and the other the maturing of a great National Policy, which, if it meant anything, would accomplish all that those hon. gentlemen seemed determined to have, but were very much afraid they would not get.

MR. MACMILLAN said he was exceedingly sorry to see the ex-Speaker occupying his present position. They had seen him occupying a very doubtful position, the Chair the hon. the Speaker now occupied. He (Mr. Macmillan) was one who believed the ex-Speaker had no right to his former position, yet he occupied it in the kindest, most generous, hospitable manner so far as he could. The member for Gloucester (Mr.

Anglin) asked hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side what they thought of the decapitation of certain civil servants; but what did he think when five of them went to the Province of Quebec at the last local elections, under his instructions, in relation to which he was not asked a solitary word before? He looked blandly at the departure and efforts of those officials for a party that, perhaps, ought not to occupy their present position to-day. The National Policy was one of those matters that required considerable time for development. He was glad to see such a child-like and bland smile on the countenance of the leader of the Opposition, being the first of the kind that had lighted it this Session, and since he left office. He (Mr. Macmillan) might be able, in a few days, to announce to the member for Gloucester decapitations of a kind that might not appear so pleasant as those he had mentioned. He was not one of those who desired the superannuation of officials not incapacitated by age or other causes.

MR. ANGLIN: I do not understand the hon. gentleman.

MR. MACMILLAN said there was an obtuseness about the party of the hon. gentleman since they went into Opposition. Within a couple of days, he would announce the names of officials who had been placed beyond the pale through their own fault, possibly, or incapacity, which might enable him to explain something in connection with the matter himself. With regard to the National Policy, it would be better to have it properly developed before submitting it, than to present such a hybrid as would come from the Opposition side, and require change from moment to moment thereafter.

MR. FORTIN, in answer to the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), said it was simply in the interest of shipowners, not shipbuilders, to buy ships as cheaply as they could. They must consider all the interests of the Dominion alike. If shipowners were to buy only English and American vessels, what would become of our shipbuilders, workmen, lumbermen and others connected with this industry? The shipbuilders,

as well as the shipowners, deserved consideration. His idea in supporting the motion of the member for Montmorenci (Mr. Valin) was to obtain reciprocity from the Americans. Both as to navigating our canals and selling vessels in our markets, we allowed them privileges not given to us, and our shipwrights and other artisans were left to starve. His view was to keep our workmen employed and retain them in the country. England did not build up her power and wealth by Free-trade, but adopted it only after, by Protection, she had become supreme as a manufacturing and naval power. If other countries followed her policy, she would be the only great manufacturing power in the world; but they, too, were learning to manufacture for themselves. He would never be hostile to the interests of Great Britain, as it was the Mother Country, and from her we received the blessing of Constitutional Government; but we must look to ourselves, and protect our interests and find employment for our starving people. We saw poverty all over the country. It was the duty of the Government to try to relieve our needy people, and to tax American vessels as they taxed ours, unless they gave us the same rights in their country as they had in our own.

Mr. SPROULE said he was surprised to see the course adopted by hon. gentlemen to defeat a motion which had for its object the giving of information, which ought to be desirable to every member of this House. It was evident that neither the majority of the House, nor of the country that elected it, considered it for the public interest to continue the policy of the past. He was surprised to see the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) following such a line of argument after the popular verdict of September last. Strange that no amount of experience would satisfy some that they were wrong. The popular verdict should suffice as to whether it would be better for Canadians to buy American machinery because cheaper; they should reflect that it meant paying out money our people would never handle again, but which, if spent among them, passing from one trade to another, would help

all, represent wealth in the country, and increase the means of employment. Another argument should satisfy the most sceptical—the Americans were practising abroad a system of trade they did not pursue at home—namely, throwing into our markets manufactured goods at lower than the home prices. Why? Because they wanted to kill off Canadian competition. This was notoriously the case with the salt manufacture. When Goderich salt was first introduced to the trade of Canada, American salt was sold here cheaper than in the States, so that they might effectually shut up the salt wells here, and still hold the trade in their own hands; but the Canadian Government rescued our salt trade from destruction by imposing a duty on the American article, thus also building up that interest, and enabling it afterwards to compete with the American trade when the duty against it was removed.

Mr. HESSON said it was not a good argument to say that, because goods could be purchased a little cheaper from manufacturers outside of this country, the workshops of the Dominion should be closed, and our workmen thrown out of employment simply for the benefits that might accrue to the consumer. The question of Free-trade and Protection had been freely discussed during the electioneering period previous to the 17th September, and the result of the elections on that day had proved conclusively that an immense majority of the people was in favour of Protection. He believed it was in the best interests of this country that they should have a system of Protection, and he thought if a proper system were adopted, prosperity would again return to every branch of industry; our workshops and factories would be running, and our mechanics and labourers would find employment. On the 17th September last they had nailed the motto "Protection to Our Canadian Industries" to their mast, and they were determined to stand or fall by it. He would support the motion of the hon. member for Montmorenci (Mr. Valin). He considered it his duty to do so, as it was of great importance to the Dominion that their shipping interests should be protected. He was amused at the remarks

of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), who seemed to insinuate that members on the Government side of the House were afraid of their leaders. He could tell him they were not afraid of their leaders, and they desired their leaders to understand they had nothing to fear from that side of the House, if they gave the country what its verdict demanded on the 17th of September last.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLIES FOR THE OLD WELLAND CANAL.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BUNTING moved for a return showing the names of all persons from whom supplies for the old Welland Canal have been purchased from the 4th November, 1873, to the 10th January, 1879; and also, showing the tenders, if any, on which such supplies have been furnished.

Motion agreed to.

LAND PATENTS IN MANITOBA.

MOTION FOR LIST.

MR. RYAN, in the absence of Mr. SCHULTZ, moved for copies of list of patents issued in the various parishes of the Province of Manitoba, for lands in the settlement belt, with the date of same, and the names of patentees to whom issued.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) moved for a return of all imports and exports by Provinces; the values, and duties collected under the several rates for the six months ending 31st December, 1878, similar to the returns made for the monthly statements in details; also, a return of the same kind for the months of January and February, 1879.

Motion agreed to.

MERCHANDISE IN BOND.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) moved for a return of all merchandise remaining in the bonded warehouses under bonds for

Customs, by Provinces, the quantity and several rates of duties, on the 31st December, 1878; also, a return of the same kind from the 1st January to the 31st March, 1879.

Motion agreed to.

SPIRITS, MALT, MALT LIQUOR AND TOBACCO.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) moved for a return of the quantity of spirits manufactured during the six months ending 31st December, 1878; the quantity taken for consumption, the quantity exported and used in bond, the quantity remaining in warehouse at that date, and the revenue accrued thereon; also, a similar return for the weight, that taken for consumption, amount exported and remaining in warehouse, and revenue accruing thereon, up to 31st December, 1878, on manufactured malt, malt liquor and tobacco; also, a similar return for the quantity of spirits, malt, malt liquor and tobacco, manufactured, taken for consumption, exported, used in bond, remaining in warehouse, and revenue accruing thereon, from the 1st January to the 31st March, 1879.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN SHIPS IN UNITED STATES WATERS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. ROCHESTER, in the absence of Mr. CURRIER, moved for copies of all correspondence with the Colonial Office or with the Government of the United States, subsequent to a return made on the 5th of April, 1876, respecting the action taken by that Government in denying to Canadians the free navigation of the United States or State Canals and the Hudson River, in accordance with the Treaty of Washington, together with all Orders in Council, or other papers connected therewith. He said he supposed the object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currier) who was to make this motion was to bring this matter once more before the House, as it had already been brought up on previous occasions, in order to induce the Government to try and get rid of the difficulties that existed in the carrying trade between the United States and

Canada. A great deal had been said this evening with regard to the shipping interest, and it was one that affected this section of the country, perhaps, more than any other. He would say that the carrying trade of this part of the country with the United States was now done entirely by American vessels. A few years ago, Canadians had something like 250 or 300 barges, and between thirty and forty steamers, engaged in this trade, and employing between 2,000 and 3,000 men. Now, if he said that one steamer and ten barges were employed for that purpose, it would be the extent to which that business was reduced, and the extent of the carrying trade of lumber into the United States by the people of this section of the country, or the people of Canada. The law was such that it was impossible to send our vessels across. The Government at Washington said that Canadian vessels had no right to pass beyond the first collateral district in the United States. That cut off our vessels this side of Albany, so that we could not reach the Hudson River nor go down to New York with our lumber. We had to send it all in American vessels. Now this was a great inconvenience, great loss to the carrying trade of this country, and to the manufacturers of this country. We had to pay frequently one and two dollars a thousand—which in itself would be very fair profit—more than what we should have to pay on our lumber if we could carry it to the United States in our own vessels. We had paid as high as nine dollars a thousand for lumber from here to New York, and the forwarding interests in this country would be glad to contract year in and year out to carry that lumber to New York for four dollars a thousand. This would give the House some idea of what the lumber interest suffered in the carrying trade between here and the markets in the United States. A great deal had been said on this subject in the House on previous occasions, and he did not think it necessary to reiterate it to-night. But he would say this, that he hoped the present Government would take this matter in hand and try to redress this grievous wrong—for it was a grievous wrong that we should be deprived of sending our lumber there while the Americans had free access to every port

MR. ROCHESTER.

in the Dominion of Canada. He thought he was correct in stating that an American barge coming into Canadian ports could register for something like two dollars—he supposed a steamer in comparison might range from ten to twelve dollars—while the same class of vessel going into the United States would cost the owner of that vessel from \$500 to \$600 to register her in a port in the United States.

MR. MACKENZIE: What does the hon. gentleman mean by registration—to make her an American vessel?

MR. ROCHESTER: No, Sir, but I mean that the vessel can go back to that port again during that year—for trade, of course.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is thirty cents per ton.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is a universal tax; it is not a special tax on Canadian vessels. It is the tonnage dues.

MR. ROCHESTER: I am not saying that it is. I do not know that they make any discriminating laws particularly against Canada. I am only stating that there is no comparison between the registry of our vessels and the registry of theirs.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not a registry at all.

MR. ROCHESTER said he thought he could show the hon. gentleman that he was right. There was no comparison between the laws, and the American laws utterly prohibited our people from doing any trade in the United States. As to the coasting trade or anything of that kind, we could not do it. No man could afford to pay \$500 or \$1,000, for he supposed it would cost \$1,000 to register a steamer on the other side. This was an abuse. His hon. friend the leader of the Opposition seemed to be a little nettled. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had once said, on the floor of this House, that negotiations were pending in regard to this same law between the Canadian and the Washington Governments. He (Mr. Rochester) believed the Government at Washington endeavoured, in the first place, to throw this back upon the Government of the State of New York, but

the honest truth was that it was the Washington and not the State Government that was to blame in the matter. The New York Government was perfectly satisfied to let no matter how many Canadian bottoms pass through their canals, the more the better. But it was the Washington Government that contended that no Canadian bottoms could pass the first collateral district in the United States, no matter what part of the United States it happened to be. This utterly prohibited Canadians from sending anything into the United States, whilst the American had free access to every port in the Dominion of Canada—not to one port alone. If one of our vessels, although recorded and registered in the United States, touched at an American port she could not touch at a second one, but had to come back to Canada again before she could touch at another. But an American vessel could come into Montreal loaded with coal or anything else, put off a portion in Montreal, a portion in Ottawa, then go on to Kingston and Toronto, unloading at each place. He knew of American boats that did this from time to time, some of them partly loaded here, and some loaded at Perth, twenty or fifty miles from here, and some in Montreal. They loaded anywhere they pleased, and discharged their cargoes in the same way. Had our vessels any such privilege? No, they had not. An instance of this happened a few years ago, when we thought we had everything all right for our trading vessels. We sent one steamer and ten barges through, which went down to New York and unloaded, and came back to Canada loaded with coal. Just before they reached Canada, and just after they had passed Rouse's Point, a telegram came from Washington: "Seize that steamer and ten barges." But, fortunately for the man who owned them, they had just got over the line before the telegram reached there, or else the American Government would have seized and sold them. This was no exaggeration. He was prepared to substantiate what he was stating now. Many of the gentlemen who had not previously been in the House might hardly believe what he was stating now; but it was true, and still this state of things existed. He had been listening to the remarks of

some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side this evening, and they were talking about what? About work for the labouring classes. It appeared to him most ridiculous for those hon. gentlemen to talk thus, as the course they had been pursuing for the last five years had done nothing but deprive the labouring classes of work, and shut up the manufactures of all kinds in the Dominion of Canada. He hoped the present Government would have some of these wrongs redressed, which ought to have been redressed long ago.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said he wished to correct a mistake which the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Rochester) had fallen into, and he (Mr. Burpee) believed the hon. the Minister of Customs would agree with him in what he was about to say. A vessel loaded with a cargo in Canada, could go to the States and discharge in twenty ports, if she liked; or a vessel, loaded in Canada, could discharge a part of her cargo in Portland, the second part in Boston, and the last in New York. A vessel loading in New York to come to Canada could do the same thing in Canadian ports. This was provided for in the British Merchant Shipping Act, and had been in existence for years. The same privileges of navigation and coasting extended to vessels in Canada going to the United States as were extended to vessels in the States coming to Canada. But a vessel could not come into Canada from the United States discharge part of the cargo and take another part in a Canadian port; neither could a vessel, going from Canada into the United States, discharge part of a cargo and take another part in, but she could go from one port to another until she got a full discharge. The laws were alike in both cases.

MR. ROCHESTER said what he had stated was, that an American vessel could go with her cargo from one port to another in Canada, until she discharged it all. She could start from here and go to any other port in Canada, and take in one part of her cargo here and another part in Montreal or anywhere else, and so pass on to the United States. A year ago last fall the trade was just in this state. They might have shipped from this section of the country millions and mil-

lions of feet of lumber, if they could have got vessels to do it with. The lumber was sold and was to have been delivered last fall, but it could not be delivered because they could not send it in Canadian bottoms.

MR. BURPEE (St. John): I beg your pardon; barges can load in Canada and then go to New York, but one difficulty is that our barges are too large to go through their canals, and another difficulty that the United States compel cargoes of our barges to be entered for Customs at the first port of entry in the United States, after crossing into United States waters, which is a grievance our people justly complain of.

MR. ROCHESTER: The hon. gentleman is wrong.

MR. MACKENZIE: When the papers come down, we can settle all these points.

MR. BURPEE: When I said that the navigation laws of the two countries are alike, I meant that there are no privileges granted to United States vessels, loading and discharging in Canada, that are not granted to Canadian vessels going there.

MR. McCALLUM said there seemed to be some misunderstanding about the matter. The fact he believed to be this: That American boats were allowed to go through Canadian canals, whereas the Americans would not allow our boats to go through their canals. The Americans would not allow our lumbermen to go down there and deliver their lumber whenever they wanted to, whilst our Government allowed American boats to take lumber here whenever they liked. The hon. leader of the Opposition seemed to be perfectly satisfied with the tonnage dues. In fact, he seemed to think it was quite right that we should give every privilege in the world to the Americans. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had said they did not charge our vessels any more than they did vessels of anybody else. How was this tax levied in the first place? The Americans, after the war, laid a tax at a certain percentage on the earnings of their own vessels. But they found by that they could not make Canadian vessels pay any portion

of that tax by this arrangement, and they put a tax of thirty cents a ton on all our vessels going into the United States, in order to make our vessels pay, and we had got to pay that yearly. He was satisfied the Canadian Government could not put any such tax on American shipping, without putting the same on Canadians; that matter was subject to a treaty made with Great Britain by the United States. But when we went there to report and clear, they charged us a large amount of money, and that was the way the question stood. Many men in Canada wanted to let the Americans come in here. Yes; and take the bread from our own children by doing all our work. He thought it was time now for the Government of this country to look after the interests of the people, and keep what belonged to us, unless the Americans would give us reciprocity and equal privileges to what they were receiving. It had been arranged, in the Treaty of Washington that the State of New York should give us the use of their canals, but the Government at Washington used their influence so as to prevent our using them, by their Customs legislation. That seemed to be the position of this question, and the position of many other questions. The moment we began to pinch the pockets of the Americans, then we could get reciprocity on equal terms from them, and not before.

Motion agreed to.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. MOUSSEAU, in the absence of Mr. BERGERON, moved for copies of all documents, reports of engineers, etc., connected with the selection of the site and the building of the Beauharnois Canal.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC HARBOUR WORKS AND LEVIS GRAVING DOCK.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for a return of the names of persons tendering, with the amount of their tenders, for the construction of the works in the Tidal Harbour at Quebec, and the Graving

MR. ROCHESTER.

Dock at Lévis, respectively, with all correspondence relating to the same between the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, or any of them, and the Government, and between any person who tendered for either of the said works and the Harbour Commissioners or the Government; together with statement of any changes made in the plans and specifications for the said works respectively, either between the first advertisement for tenders and the final letting of contracts respectively, or after the said contracts were let.

Motion agreed to.

TIMBER LEASES ON RED RIVER.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. DESJARDINS, in the absence of Mr. DUBUC, moved for a statement showing the number of leases granted by the Government to cut timber on the public land of the Dominion within the settlement belt on the Red River; the dates of said leases and period for which they are granted; the particular lots on which said wood lots are situated, and the area covered by each lease; also, for a copy of the instructions given to the Dominion Land Agent in Winnipeg in reference to the leasing of said wooded lands, and of the form of said lease; and also, a copy of all or any correspondence relating to the same.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 7th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 29) To amend the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Act, and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Coteau and Province Line Railway and Bridge Act, and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 32) To amend an Act to provide for more effectual inquiry into the existence of corrupt practices at elections of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Ives.)

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

(Mr. Baby.)

FIRST READING.

MR. BABY introduced a Bill (No. 31) To amend and consolidate the Acts respecting duties imposed on bills of exchange and promissory notes. He said the Bill was a mere consolidation of the existing laws, with only one amendment. By the existing laws the use of stamped paper was permissive, but it was said last year, when a Bill was introduced by his predecessor to make the use of stamped paper compulsory, that the country would not view the proposal with satisfaction. He had introduced a small amendment to the present law, providing that, whenever a party employed stamped paper which was not up to the amount of the note itself, the maker would have the right of putting on an additional stamp to fill up the amount due.

Bill read the first time.

INSOLVENT LAWS.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) moved:

“That a Select Committee of fifteen members be appointed to enquire into and consider the questions of Insolvency and Bankruptcy, the working of the Insolvent Laws of Canada, as well as the expediency of continuing, amending, or repealing such Laws; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report by Bill or otherwise; said Committee to be composed of Messrs. McDonald (Pictou), McCarthy, McLennan, Cartwright, Domville, Brecken, Holton, Cimon, Colby, Girouard (Jacques Cartier), Robertson (Hamilton), Weldon, Laurier, Longley, and Sir A. J. Smith.”

MR. MILLS said this motion was, in principle, very like a motion made in 1875, which the hon. the leader of the Government characterised as a motion for taking into consideration the financial state of the nation, and the hon. gentleman quoted Hume to show that it was a vote of non-confidence. In this instance, however, he thought the Government practically declared their inability or want of courage to deal with

the subject, and sought to transfer the responsibility from the Treasury benches to Parliament. If they looked to the *Gazettes* which had been published during the last three months, they would see that a considerable part of them had been taken up with the appointments of official assignees. A thriving business had been done in the appointment of assignees by those gentlemen who had promised the country so much prosperity under the National Policy. They seemed to think these assignees were to have a large amount of business to do. He did not believe there was a constituency from the Detroit River to Halifax in which assignees had not been appointed. This did not indicate a confidence by the prophets of the Ministerial benches in their own predictions. He had no doubt that the First Minister would be able to tell the House why this preliminary question, really a question of taking into consideration the state of the nation, had been transferred from the Treasury benches, where the consideration of the question properly belonged, to Parliament.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would be most happy to allay the laudable curiosity of his hon. friend from Bothwell. He (Mr. Mills) said the Government had been employed since they had been in power in appointing assignees for the purpose of looking after the insolvents. Whilst they must admit that there were a great many insolvents in the country, candour compelled them to state that they had become insolvent during the retention of power by his hon. friends opposite; and that they had appointed assignees for the purpose of winding up the estates driven to insolvency by the policy of the late Administration. It was much easier to destroy than construct, as no doubt his hon. friend had found out. It was true that the credit of the country had suffered,—under what influence or auspices it would be impolite to cross the floor of the House to say;—still there was no doubt that the work of destruction of the public credit and prosperity of the country had gone on with accelerated vigour for the last five years. They proposed to arrest that progress of destruc-

MR. MILLS.

tion, and alleviate the existing state of depression by a careful, not rash, moderate, and yet efficient, protection of the industries of the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) had said he was surprised they should move for a Committee to enquire into this matter. From the number of Bills and petitions on the subject presented to the House, he was afraid that the state of the nation was not in the most flourishing condition, and it did not rest with the hon. gentleman to complain, when they asked the assistance of men of experience, amongst whom were late Ministers, to consider this matter, which was, without jest, a matter of the most serious importance. They were merely pursuing the same course they pursued when they were a Government before. This measure was then sent to a Special Committee. The whole subject had been taken up by the then member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott). He was a professional gentleman who had practised largely in that branch of professional business. The result of the labours of that Committee was the measure, with some few amendments, which was the law of the land. There was, from one cause or another, from a very general state of depression, or, perhaps, from defects in the machinery in some respects, a general dissatisfaction with the working of the system as it then stood. He was not ashamed to confess, as the leader of the Government, that he desired, on this subject, the assistance of commercial and professional men, before it was dealt with. He thought it was a subject, as it was in 1871 or 1872, that ought to be fairly considered by a Committee of financial, commercial and legal men, in order that they might judge of the various arguments that could be used. It was assumed, by a large portion of the people, that no Insolvency Law could be a satisfactory law, while there were some who were in favour of some Insolvent Law which would relieve the honest but unfortunate trader from his difficulties, believing the law could be amended so as to work well. There were innumerable suggestions from Boards of Trade and Boards of Commerce on that subject. There were also petitions before the House, and several hon. members, he believed, had measures

before the House on this important subject. He thought it would be well that all the petitions on the subject, and all the Bills, should be referred to this Committee, that they should have a full opportunity, during the present Session, of studying out and coming to some final conclusion. His hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had stated that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had charged the late Government with giving up their powers by submitting to reference to Committees.

MR. MILLS: No; I referred to the appointment of the Committee on Financial Depression.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this was a financial depression resulting in insolvency, but the hon. member would remember the Cabinet was not a unit on that subject. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), then the leader of the Government, was personally against all insolvency laws, and before he was a Minister he said he would use all the means in his power to repeal the Insolvent Law. Personally, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was very much of the same opinion—but, not being a commercial man, he did not think he should be obstinate in his opinion—that there should be no Insolvent Laws, that the ordinary relations between debtor and creditor should be allowed to continue, that the liabilities for the fulfilment of contracts should be insisted upon as a general rule, and that occasionally, of which only Parliament should judge, when an inevitable crisis came round, there might be introduced an Insolvent Law for a limited period, to relieve the prudent creditor who suffered in the crash with the imprudent. It had always been his opinion, although he had never pressed that opinion authoritatively, as a member of a former Government, that this matter should be left to a Committee. He thought it was the proper course now. There was, beyond doubt, a great feeling of dissatisfaction in the country upon the subject, and a general call for it to be again dealt with. As had been expected, on so important a subject, there was a great diversity of opinion, and the various amendments proposed ought to be carefully considered by a Se-

lect Committee, and he thought the committee, as proposed by the hon. the Minister of Justice, was calculated to discuss the subject ably and fully.

Mr. HOLTON said that, notwithstanding the good natured badinage of his hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), he fancied there would be no serious opposition to the proposition of the hon. the Minister of Justice. He had no hesitation in saying that he thought that was the proper method of dealing with the subject, which could be considered in no sense a party question; nor was it a question on which he felt inclined to maintain his personal consistency. For many years he had been in favour, on the whole, of maintaining an Insolvency Law, but he admitted that opinion, long held, was very much shaken at this moment. He did not see his way clear to pronounce either way. He saw great difficulties in abolishing the law purely and simply, and he saw great difficulties, especially in view of the depressed condition of trade, and the state of opinion in the country in relation to the effects of this Insolvent Law, in maintaining the law as it was. He was clearly of opinion that it would be found inexpedient to abrogate the law purely and simply. The effect of repealing the law would be to superinduce consequences more inconvenient and more disastrous than those already flowing from the law. Therefore, he thought the only rational course had been taken in submitting the whole question to a Committee. It was the course taken in the old Provinces of Canada when the subject was first introduced. It was the course taken after Confederation by his hon. friend the leader of the Government, and it was the course taken at a later period, when his hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was leader of the Government, and he approved of the step taken upon this occasion.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he saw that his name was amongst those proposed to form the Committee, and, although he had not had the experience in this kind of work he could wish, he would not decline to act. As to who was responsible for the state of the trade of the country, he proposed to take the

opportunity of discussing at some length when the financial statement came down, and he thought the hon. gentleman would confess, after he said what he had to say, that at any rate he and his friends had not altered their views, and that they were fully prepared to justify all they said and did during their term of office. With reference to the appointment of official assignees, he noticed that many of the gentlemen who had been appointed by the present Government had been once or twice through the Bankruptcy Court themselves, and might, therefore, be supposed to know all about bankruptcy matters.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: *Experientia docet.*

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman opposite had not stated his position in this matter correctly in saying that he had been opposed to all Insolvency Laws. The ground he had taken was that an occasional law for a specific period might be almost a necessity, and that to have a standing measure on the Statute-book, subject only to repeal in the ordinary process, was not desirable. His impression was now confirmed by experience, that a continuous bankrupt law had a great tendency to demoralise the trade of the country. He also took the ground that he would not object to a Bill being in operation for a short time in order to clear up certain estates which were bankrupt by some inevitable and natural law operating on financial affairs which no person could possibly foresee. There were bankruptcies of a character in which no one doubted that the parties concerned should have relief. Sometimes there was a hardship in preventing them all their lives from obtaining release from obligations which had been incurred in good faith, and which resulted in great disaster to themselves. At the same time, while he held these views formerly in Opposition, he also always bound himself to a certain extent to the opinions of the mercantile and commercial men of the country. He did not think any public man was justified in such a matter as this in adhering too rigidly to the views which ultimately might become more or

less injurious to the commercial interests of the country, and, in assuming the leadership of the Government, he felt he should act upon this principle with even more generosity than he was prepared to act with while simply a member of the Opposition. He had, therefore, no hesitation in giving his best energies to the promotion of such a Bill as would, in the most effectual manner, serve the best interests of the country. To this principle he still adhered, and, while he believed his own views had received confirmation from the recent commercial history of the country, he was still prepared to consider what steps would be most advisable under the present disastrous circumstances. It was customary with hon. gentlemen opposite, principally at a time of political excitement, to use the commercial depression of the country as a political engine. He always deprecated that course. He never adopted that course himself when he might have adopted it. He never charged hon. gentlemen opposite who were in charge of the affairs of the country at a former general depression twenty years ago with dereliction of duty, merely because there was a depression in the country. He had always said, and he said it now, that there never was a more dishonest agitation on the part of public men than that which they witnessed during last year in this country. However, he would have an opportunity of dealing with this matter again. He merely made that remark then in pursuance of the exposition of his views which he was then making. He would not pursue the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, of depreciating the matter. But he might, fairly taking, on their own ground, gentlemen who alleged that the Government had it in their power, by legislation, to prevent commercial depression, exact and exact from them the fulfilment of the promises they made, and the equivalent of the boast that, if they had been in charge of the affairs of the country, we should have had no bankruptcies, no commercial depression, no failures of any kind. This was the ground taken by them, and he should be able, at the proper time, to show that hon. gentlemen did not hesitate to resort to such practices in order to

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

obtain temporary possession of the Government of this country. He had no doubt that such political wickedness would bring its own punishment in due time.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What as to the present?

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman looked simply at the present. Meantime they had, as a Parliament, to address themselves to the duty of making the best of the present commercial circumstances. He would, therefore, feel bound to render every possible assistance to the gentlemen on the Treasury benches in acquiring such knowledge as might be necessary in perfecting such legislation as the circumstances of the country demanded at present.

MR. MACDOUGALL said there was some convenience in referring a question of this kind to a Select Committee composed of gentlemen who, by previous pursuits, education and experience, might be qualified to deal with the subject, but, at the same time, there was some inconvenience in such a reference. In the present case they were dealing with a question upon which every hon. member must have formed an opinion, and most of them were ready, no doubt, to prescribe a remedy for the grievance or evil existing in the country. He (Mr. Macdougall) felt some apprehension that members would find themselves, to some extent, compromised or precluded from taking the course and expressing the opinions they honestly entertained, by the action of the Committee; because, though the report of the proposed Committee might be unanimous, or nearly so, its members would know very little more of the matter than the other members of the House. The Committee would be authorised to send for persons and papers, and it would be their duty to ascertain, from lawyers and merchants and experts in insolvency, the working of the law, and the results in the cases that came under their notice. The enquiry, if it was to be completed this Session, in time to become a basis for legislation, must be brief. He should be very glad to have the benefit of that enquiry, but it ought to be an exhaustive and complete one. This was not a new question in the Canadian Par-

liament. He had heard it discussed for many years, and he entirely agreed with the hon. gentleman opposite as to the best mode of dealing with insolvency, and that any law granting a discharge to insolvent debtors ought to be temporary, passed to meet a commercial exigency, and, after due notice, repealed. The normal rule or universal law should be that every man should pay his debts in full. That should be the rule, except during particular periods of distress, and after the special interference of Parliament. That was the true principle on which they ought to base their legislation. He had hoped there would have been a general discussion of this question, with reference to which, he believed, the House was sufficiently informed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is no better time for its discussion than now.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he hoped, then, that members who had formed opinions on the subject would express them, because they might be instructive to the Committee, and guide them in their researches. For his own part, as a member of this House, he was not prepared to place his franchise in the hands of any Committee, and should claim, when the Committee reported, the right to agree or disagree with its recommendations.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said he agreed with the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that it was undesirable that the Government should take its present course. He could not understand that the Minister of Justice could mean that this Committee should prosecute its labours with such diligence as to be able to report to the House so as to enable it to take definite action in the present Session. It was impossible that he should not know that it was, or had been the deliberate intention of the Government that the present Insolvent Law should remain in force. How could they explain otherwise the fact that, during the last three months, 83 additional official assignees were appointed, no less than 23 being required in Montreal alone. First, the Minister of Justice said they were required to clear up

cases of bankruptcy that accumulated owing to mismanagement under the late Government. He forgot the fact that, the moment a man became insolvent, his estate went into the hands of the official assignee. The number of assignees was sufficient, and they were dealing with all the cases previous to that hon. gentleman's advent to office. His appointments must have had reference to the parties that were yet to be thrown into insolvency by himself and colleagues. There could be no other logical conclusion. Now, what did they anticipate? Scarcely had they attained power, when they felt conscious that, deep and grave as had been the disasters of the commercial world, they were still to be intensified to a very great degree. On the 14th November they appointed two official assignees, giving an additional one to Montreal, and, one week after, they found the distress under their rule was becoming so much greater, that an additional one had to be named. Then they went on nine days; the country seemed to have recovered a little from the staggering blow they had given it, when they appointed another. Within six days after, they appointed fifteen more, five for Montreal, and thence at various periods of different length, all the rest were gazetted, while nothing was done in the way of mitigating or removing that commercial depression for which the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches boasted they possessed the panacea, which was to perform such marvels for the benefit of the people. He heard the member for Centre Huron say the Opposition were prepared to take a stand and adhere to their principles in the future as in the past. He heard, in a tone of boasting, a taunt thrown to that gentleman, that he was still adhering to his own policy, was still the fly on the wheel—a favourite taunt of the Conservative party during the late electoral campaign. Now there was fast growing an impression in the country that, instead of those hon. gentlemen being merely flies on the wheel, by some means or other the wheel had got on the top of them, the present flies, and crushed them, for they could not even buzz. He would like to know when their grand remedial policy was to come down. The

MR. PATERSON.

member for Shefford was necessarily severe when he called for an early delivery of the Budget speech. That hon. gentleman knew, or ought to know, that the Ministers and supporters were known as the N. P., or the great National Poultrice Party, pledged to bring in a remedy for all the woes of the country; and he must know it could not be prepared in a short time, and that, while the great medicine man said he was able to prescribe, nevertheless the great father was not willing to prepare it. The prescription was handed over to the great financial apothecary, who was working it up, and, in due time, it would be submitted to the House, which would derive from it all the benefit expected. Seriously, he rather anticipated evil consequences from the motion of the Minister of Justice, for this reason: It would only have one effect so far as the present Session was concerned, namely, leaving the Insolvent Law as it stood. Nevertheless, it was disastrous as regarded the interests of the country that the impression should go abroad that the abolition of the Insolvent Law was seriously meditated. Past experience taught them that, whenever there was serious talk of repealing that law, a frightful crop of failures followed. Business men knew very well that the shaky ones would hasten to take advantage of that law's provisions. He did not oppose the appointment of the Committee, but trusted that, if appointed, its labours would benefit the country. The question had been discussed sufficiently in the House. He agreed with the member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) that business men would not be willing to submit their views to those of any Committee. He thought it was the bounden duty of the Government, instead of merely proposing a discussion of this matter, and the appointment of a Committee, to have submitted a measure to the House; they should either have proposed an amendment to the law or signified their willingness to accept the Bill of some member on the subject. They had not hesitated to confess their fear to assume the responsibility. He hoped the Committee, if appointed, would show they meant business, and report in ample time, and that some definite action would be taken, either in amend-

ing or repealing the present law, or making the country understand that the law as it stood was to remain. Let whatever was to be done be done at once.

MR. GUTHRIE said he desired to call attention to one or two points in connection with the question. There seemed to be diversities of opinion which might be divided into two classes. A number of persons favoured the entire repeal of the Act, and the substitution therefor of what might be called the Lower Canada system. Another class thought its repeal would be a grave calamity, so far as Ontario was concerned, to its business men to whom money was due. The entire repeal of the Act would leave us within any law for the equal distribution of debtors' estates, and throw us back into the old system of preferential judgments, enabling also an insolvent to favour his relations. The House might consider whether they could adopt a better system than the present for securing the distribution of the estate equally among the creditors. Now, the Lower Canada system recommended was quite as cumbersome and expensive in its working as that of the existing law. Not only so, but he found the Lower Canada system not so complete or effective. For instance, in respect to book debts, they could not be reached under it, except by separate garnishee proceedings against each debtor. So far as the provisions of the Quebec law were concerned, they were quite as long, if not longer, than the provisions of the Insolvency Act. Under the Code of Civil Procedure of Lower Canada, that part of it that treated of compulsory executions and the distribution of the proceeds of the debtors' property, covered 229 sections. Then that part of the Code relating to privileges, or, as it was called in Ontario, securities held by creditors, covered 32 sections. The total number of sections occupied in dealing with the question of the equal distribution of property, in the Lower Canada Code, amounted to 330 separate sections. He would venture to say the provisions of the Insolvent Act, in that respect, were shorter, more complete, and less expensive, than the Lower Canada system. Moreover, in Ontario and other Provinces, they had the Insolvency Act

in operation, and knew how to work it. In Quebec, of course, it might suit professional and mercantile men there better to have their own special laws, but the people in the other Provinces were not familiar with them. They had become familiar, in the course of practice, with the provisions of the Insolvent Act, and these provisions, as far as they related to the equal distribution of debtors' property among the creditors, and the valuation of securities, were perfectly equitable and just, and the working of them was perfectly understood. The one question; therefore, that would come up for serious consideration was the question of the discharge of a debtor from his obligations. He thought the entire repeal of the Act was quite impossible at present, in view of the imperfect state of the local law of Ontario in making no provision for the equal distribution of assets, and they could not have a much better one for that purpose than they had now under the Insolvent Act. There remained the question, therefore, should they continue to grant a debtor his discharge or make any provision for it, except with the unanimous consent of the creditors? He noticed a new Bankruptcy Act had been introduced by the Lord Chancellor of England, and he, in introducing it, had observed that a grave evil had been felt in England as well as here—that arising from the too great facilities which debtors now had for securing private arrangements with their creditors. This was proposed to be met by saying that no such private arrangement or composition should be binding upon non-assenting creditors, unless it provided for the payment of 25 cents in the dollar. It would be worthy of the consideration of the House, whether they should not adopt some such enactment here. As they were aware, under the present law, creditors, by a majority in number, and three-fourths in value, could grant a discharge to a debtor whose estate paid not a single farthing. That was, no doubt, an evil, and he suggested, therefore, that they should endeavour to remove the dissatisfaction which rightly existed in regard to the present system of discharge under the Insolvency Act, by providing some limit, such as the one suggested in England; say twenty-five per cent., and that, if the

man's estate did not pay that, no decision of the majority of creditors, granting him a discharge, should be binding upon the minority. He thought, however, that they should not altogether take away the discharging sections of the Insolvent Act. If they had a measure by which they took a debtor's entire property from him, by course of law, and divided it amongst his creditors, there should be some provision for the debtor's discharge. If it was found that the estate, even in the hands of an assignee, paid fifty cents in the dollar, there was every reason to conclude that the debtor had not been guilty of any gross mismanagement or carelessness, for the estate that would pay, in the hands of the assignee, fifty cents in the dollar, clear of all expenses, could not have been a very bad estate. Moreover, it might be said, with regard to discharge by consent, that, if the majority of creditors in number representing three-fourths of the amount of indebtedness, were satisfied to grant a discharge, the minority must be presumed to be acting unreasonably in withholding it. He thought, therefore, the suggestion that an amount should be named, payment of which was necessary, even under deeds of composition, to bind non-assenting creditors, would perhaps be found to be the only material amendment to the Act which the Committee could, with advantage, make, because, he was satisfied, a better general scheme for the distribution of a debtor's property could not be prepared, although, perhaps, some amendments to the present Act might be desirable. Some scheme of distribution they must have, otherwise they would, in Ontario, perhaps in other Provinces, be in the unfortunate position which existed before the Insolvent Act came into force, when the game of grab was the rule, those who came first being first served, and generally, the debtor warning his friends or relatives of his approaching failure, they secured first possession of the estate, were paid in full, and nothing at all was left for outsiders.

MR. BOULTBEE said that, as the leader of the Government had indicated that this was the proper time to discuss this question, and as a great deal of interest was taken in the matter by his con-

MR. GUTHRIE.

stituents, he would give, briefly, his views on the subject. He did not think himself, nor did his constituents think, and they had considered this matter very carefully, that those evils would result from the doing away with the Act which seemed to be apprehended by many of the hon. gentlemen who had discussed it. His constituents thought, and he thought himself, from a long experience in the Courts, that a sound basis for commercial transactions could only be found in commercial honesty. Men could not be made honest by law; and, therefore, the insolvent laws, instead of doing good to any one class of men, in their operation, had been injurious to all classes. They had not promoted honesty, but dishonesty, they had not assisted, but had militated against, the honest trader, who was met on every hand, throughout the length and breadth of the land, by men who forced bankrupt stocks on the market at 30c. to 40c. on the dollar, frequently the result of fraudulent bankruptcies. So far as the evil likely to accrue through not having a proper mode of distributing the assets of insolvents was concerned, he questioned whether there was as much in that as people thought. In fact, at the time we had no Insolvent Act, there was not as much trouble among those engaged in commercial affairs as at present, because honesty was then more looked to. Men could not then get credit unless they had some character for honesty on which to base it. No Insolvent Act, however stringent its provisions, could prevent a man from making a fraudulent bankruptcy. If they did away with the Act, he did not know but that the old principle of "first come first served," was a good one. It worked more satisfactorily than did the present law. Many people said, if you do away with this Act, you must still leave the provision for the discharge of the debtor. Nothing could tend more to sap the foundation of trade and commerce in our country than this very provision to discharge an insolvent debtor. A man, no matter how fraudulent the insolvency, succeeded in having the matter glossed over; the indignation of his creditors, though strongly displayed at the first meeting, gradually wore away; and, after a few months, with the aid of some influential friends and liberal cred-

itors, the bankrupt procured his discharge. The only man who ought to be protected was the honest man, who was obliged to become insolvent through misfortunes in business which he could not prevent. He would leave it to the experience of every professional and mercantile man, every man connected with general business in this House, whether he ever knew an honest man who, through misfortune, had become insolvent, and who was refused a discharge by his creditors. As long as a man could show a proper, fair balance sheet, showing a long career of business in which he used every effort to pay his debts, but was finally dragged into insolvency, the occasion would never occur that he would be unable to procure a discharge. Any man who would consider this question calmly, would see the advantage of not having an enactment by which a man could procure his discharge by law, because then he would conduct his business honestly, so that, if he met with unavoidable losses, he could face his creditors honestly and get a release from them, for creditors were always willing to give it to an honest, if unfortunate man. He did not desire to occupy, at length, the time of the House on this occasion. He did not see that, because this Committee had been moved for by the Minister of Justice, it would interfere with the action of the House; but, on the contrary, it would furnish the House with useful information on which it could deal with the various measures now before it.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said, since an invitation had been given to discuss this question, he felt sufficient interest in it to say a few words now that it was before the House, although, in his opinion, it could be discussed with much more satisfaction and intelligence after the Committee had reported. He was in favour of this Committee being granted. He thought they could collect evidence, and put it in such a shape that this House afterwards could take up the question, and come to a more satisfactory conclusion than they could as the motion now stood. Although he had had considerable experience in the working of the Insolvent Law, yet he was not prepared to say that he had made up his

mind as to what would be the very best way to deal with the question, which was one, doubtless, of great importance. He sympathised with the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), but he thought that, after the Committee had heard the evidence and opinions of persons who understood the working of the law from different parts of the country, that Committee would be able to bring to the House such suggestions as would enable hon. members to discuss the question in a practical way, and the House would be able to come to a conclusion which would be satisfactory to all concerned when a discussion on the question was invited by the hon. the leader of the Government. He (Mr. Robertson) certainly did not suppose that hon. members, much less the hon. member for South Brant, would take advantage of the suggestion to travel out of the record, in order to make hostile remarks in reference to the late appointments of official assignees. He thought the hon. member should have considered the position that his party occupied in Ontario, before he launched out in that very eloquent and somewhat amusing style about these appointments. He should have looked a little nearer home, and considered, for instance, whether the appointments of official assignees—in themselves involving no expense to the country—were not something akin to the appointments of coroners in Ontario. If he had done that, he would have found some examples in that Province, and, in charity, he might have thought that there was no more reason to complain of the one than the other. This House must have been gratified, however, to learn that the hon. member for South Brant read another paper besides the *Globe*. He actually perused the *Canada Gazette*, and had been enabled, in going through that valuable official paper, week after week, to show this House that a great many appointments of assignees had been made by the present Government. He would like to direct the hon. member's attention to another important official journal, the *Ontario Gazette*. If he looked at the issue of a certain Saturday, some four years ago, he would find the Government of Ontario had appointed a number

of coroners. Not being satisfied with having appointed these (to use the words of the hon. member) in eight days after they appointed a number more, and, again, in another eight days, they appointed several more. If the hon. gentleman pursued the enquiry, he would find that this practice had been continued from week to week, almost without intermission, down to the present; the Ontario Government appointing coroners for the purpose of sitting upon dead bodies, as the present Dominion Government had appointed assignees to sit upon the defunct estates of men who had become insolvent. With reference to the difficulty which the hon. member suggested of every person taking advantage of the law, if it was to be repealed on a day to be named, he (Mr. Robertson) apprehended no inconvenience, because they knew very well that a trader could not go into insolvency now except by the will and action of his creditors. The insolvent could not now, as he could a few years ago, go to his creditors with an assignment in one hand and a few dollars in the other, and say "If you don't choose to take 10c. or 25c. on the dollar on what I owe you, I shall make an assignment, and what I have got will be dissipated in expenses in winding up my estate," thus leaving the creditor at the mercy of the dishonest debtor. With reference to the main question, he thought it was necessary to refer it to a Committee, that this House never could deal properly or sensibly with the question except a proper report was brought before it, which could only be obtained by practical and experienced men in Committee, sitting down and discussing the question from every standpoint, and in all its bearings, and by that means forming the best possible judgment as to what really were the requirements of the country, and bringing down suggestions which could then be considered by the House. In the city of Hamilton there was a great diversity of opinion. Some of his constituents were anxious that the law should be repealed *in toto*, while others were opposed to a total repeal, but were desirous of amending it in such a way as to make it as perfect as possible. He believed that, when the Act was first placed on the Statute-book, it was intended that it should

only remain in force for a certain time. The country had suffered previous to 1864, from the great depression which over ran it at that time, and there were a great many unfortunate but yet many honest debtors, who could not get their discharge because of the want of a proper Insolvency Law, and who were either expatriated or living a life of enforced idleness, because their creditors would not give them relief from the debts which they were unable to pay. There were no assets to distribute, it was true, but these unfortunate men were being kept down, and when they got their discharge they were able to go into business again, for the benefit of themselves and to the great advantage of the country. He regretted to see that there was a great deal of dishonesty practised, and the Act, no doubt, afforded a cloak to the dishonest trader, but that was attributable more to the way in which the creditors carried it out than to the Act itself. While he (Mr. Robertson) sympathised, to some extent, with the remarks of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) in reference to the honest debtor getting his discharge, his (Mr. Robertson's) experience was not of that happy character which his hon. friend's seemed to be. There was no reason under the sun why an honest debtor, who had been brought down to penury on account of circumstances over which he had no control, should not receive his discharge, and such a debtor should be protected against too exacting creditors. He quite agreed with hon. members who had preceded him, that it was a very great misfortune that it should be considered necessary to have such a machine as the Insolvency Law, opening, as it did, the door to fraud and speculation—inducing the people to go into speculations which they would not do if they did not know that they had a chance of getting their discharge from their liabilities in case they were unfortunate. There was no doubt of the general principle—and it ought to be well known in this country—that honesty was the best policy, and that it was only the honest trader who could succeed. He trusted that hon. members considering the subject would not fail to make provision for the relief of the un-

MR. ROBERTSON.

fortunate debtor when he was placed at the mercy of a grasping, uncompromising creditor. He trusted that the Committee would be granted, and that, when it brought down its report, the House would be put in possession of such information as would enable it to come to a conclusion which would be satisfactory to the country at large.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the last speaker had fallen into an error, which was very prevalent in a discussion of a question of this kind—the idea that Parliament could deal with a debtor, and go deeply into the question of the position of an unfortunate debtor, who had had the misfortune to fall into the hands of a grasping creditor. The first object of the Insolvent Act should be to enable a creditor to get possession of the property of a debtor. The reason why merchants were not in favour of the law was that it gave to the creditor an opportunity for the fair distribution of estates. While gentlemen from cities spoke in this sense—gentlemen whose experience of the Insolvency Law had been chiefly gained by a knowledge of its operation in cities—they must not lose sight of the fact that the Insolvency Law of the country was in operation in the rural districts. He admitted all that had been said by his hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie); also, very much of the reasonableness of what had been said by the hon. gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Robertson); but he thought the law still offered a considerable opening for dishonesty. He maintained that the bankruptcy laws had the effect of producing insolvents in the vast proportion of cases, where men, if they had known the risk when they were entering a business, would not have entered upon that business at all. Something had been said with regard to the appointment of official assignees. He was sure the House, which knew his opinions very well, would acquit him of any desire to allude to the subject in a party sense. Official assignees had a livelihood to make out of insolvents; and in many instances, he had no doubt, they had induced their friends to fail, by representing to them the advantages which might accrue to both assignee and

insolvent. He had seen the case of a man who had failed for \$300, who had never been in business at all. This was an instance, among many others to which he might allude, which had made this law very unpopular in the rural districts. He thought some alteration ought to be made, so that, when an estate was in the hands of creditors, a fair distribution should take place. With regard to the statement that the first come was first served, he would say that there were very many creditors who, under the present system, found they could not get served at all. So far as his personal experience went, there were a great many merchants who paid very little attention to the Bankruptcy Laws. Gentlemen who had experience of the law must remember that there was a large part of the community which suffered very materially from the operation of this unequal and unnecessarily unjust law, because every law was unjust which did not force a man to carry out a contract into which he had entered. He thought the hon. the Minister of Justice ought to give the House some very good reasons for the appointment of a Committee of this House. He saw no reason why there should be any necessity for a Committee of enquiry into the subject of insolvency. It was better that the details should be discussed in this House. They were not in want of much information on this subject. They had every branch of industry represented in the House. They were dealing with a law which had been in operation for years, and they understood all the circumstances relating to the pros and cons that might be urged for or against it. Therefore, he could see no reason why this Committee should be appointed. The Government would have done well to have looked carefully into the matter before they brought down the resolution under discussion, and have been prepared to let the country know what their policy on this subject was. It was of immense importance, considering the anxiety and disquietude existing in regard to this subject, that the people should know which course was to be pursued respecting it, and he thought that some immediate steps ought to be taken to allay this disquietude and remedy the evils complained of. He would be glad to know

that no delay fatal to legislation on this subject during the present Session was likely to occur.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said he was under the impression that this Committee had been moved for the purpose of collecting together the information that was necessary to present to the House, in order that they might form an intelligent opinion on the measure that was proposed to be introduced, and he apprehended that, that being the object of the Committee, the discussion now was premature; but, as it had been entered upon, he had no hesitation in saying that the question, which was very important, and was one of those large subjects that were reserved for the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, in connection with the commercial interests of the country, should not be looked at in the narrow light in which it had been presented to the House, merely as a question between the debtor and creditor. He believed it lay deeper than that. He thought it affected the whole trade interest of the country, and it was not merely a question as to the whitewashing process that this Insolvency Bill contained, and the advisability of continuing that system, or whether it was well to have these measures introduced at rare intervals, and thus have an occasional measure of relief for the insolvent debtor, or that the system should go on for all time. All these were questions which might be fairly considered by the Committee, and he had no doubt the gentlemen named would bring together all the information obtainable, and enable the House to form a just opinion on the subject. He would suggest, however, to the Committee, whether the sales of bankrupt stocks thrown on all sides upon the market did not have the effect of deranging trade to such a great extent that, if there were any advantages derived to individuals from an Insolvency Law, such as that now in operation, those individual benefits were not altogether lost in the general loss and distress that it produced throughout the commercial industries of the country. He thought it an important consideration for them to keep in mind the facility with which credit was given—a fact that was patent to all

—had caused trade to be overdone in all its branches in this country. All those effects and consequences from the present system had to be considered. Knowing, as he did, that these insolvent estates paid but trifling dividends, that a creditor derived little or no benefit from the Insolvency Law as it stood, the only advantage derived from the present law was the release of a few unfortunates who had been in business, and were overwhelmed with debt. The disadvantages were so far beyond the advantages, that, in his opinion, they could well afford to repeal the law altogether as to cases that might arise in the future.

MR. DOMVILLE said he regretted to see so few business men taking part in this discussion. In reply to his hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Huntington), he would say that business men were more afraid of lawyers than of insolvents. It was bad enough to have to deal with the insolvents, but worse still with the lawyers who had the estate in hand. His experience in trade in this country was that, when a man got into insolvency, the business men had more difficulty in getting him clear of those who had charge of him, that was, the assignees, than in getting hold of his estate. As had just been said, there was great competition among the lawyers as to who should get the body—not the coroner, but the lawyers. They must approach this difficulty with a great deal of hesitation, for if they did away with the Insolvency Law, and gave no relief to the debtor, what was to become of the honest debtor? They should look to the future of this country, and, if we were to have a happy and prosperous future, it was not by making laws for insolvents, nor by devoting all our energies to tinkering with an Insolvency Act. He had pointed out, two or three years ago, to the late Prime Minister, that the penal clause in this Act would not meet the requirements of the country, because it laid down the principle that thirty per cent. was enough for the insolvent to pay to get his discharge. He pointed out then that, if a man wanted to go through the Insolvent Court, all he had to do was to pay thirty cents on the dollar, and he could do his creditors out of the other seventy cents. His view

MR. HUNTINGTON.

was, unfortunately, not then regarded, but to-day he was able to say that those crude, but original, ideas of his were forcing themselves on the minds of many individuals. We must have some legislation to protect trade. He saw no argument in the fact of insolvent estates being forced on the market at reduced prices, to compete with the solvent trader, because the proposed law only dealt with the distribution of the estate and not the vital question at issue. It was merely a question of details as to who should have the estate in the event of insolvency, whether the lawyers, the insolvent or the merchants. He, as a merchant, would like to see the merchants get together and discuss this matter, and aid the proposed Committee to bring in a law that would put trade on a better basis. He did not care who got the estate, whether the assignee or the lawyer, but he did want to see the trade of this country placed in a position to prosper. He was not prepared to say that he should vote either for the abolition or the retention of the law, but would wait to hear the Committee's report, after it had taken evidence on the point from the merchants, manufacturers and trading community generally. They should either amend or put aside the existing law. They had too much law already. They were here each year some sixty or seventy days, making a law to-day and amending it to-morrow, and then they went back to their constituents, telling them what they had done, and all the while the trade of the country was being conducted in the same disastrous way. What he wanted to see was the country improving from year to year, and laws so framed, if possible, as to give honest intentions to men. In these days the question was generally one of going to a lawyer to see how he could pull you through scrapes. For his part, he hoped the Committee would be able to bring in a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. He was sorry to see any lawyers on the Committee at all; it would have been far better to have had none of them on it except the hon. the Minister of Justice. It should have on it more merchants, more manufacturers, who would be more likely to bring in a Bill based on common sense. The country ought to send men here who would do the work the country needed to

be done, and who would vote for cutting down the pay of the members of the House of Commons. He would be willing to propose such a motion although he did not get a seconder in the House. He had pointed out, on a previous occasion, that, if men were sent here who were not paid, or who received only a nominal sum, the country would then get men who were ready to serve for the honour of the position, and bring practical information in the House. But, at present, when the elections came round, the large indemnity caused many to seek the position who were often neither representative men nor qualified for the position. When he was on his last campaign the other day, he found five lawyers at one end of the string and two doctors at the other. He had not a chance to canvass the county as thoroughly as professional men who made it a business, and could live on the road for a year or two previous to an election for the purpose of securing the \$1,000 a year. It would almost appear as if a business man was out of place in the House. They did not seem to want a manufacturer or trader like himself, although this class of people needed more representation in Parliament than almost any other class. If he went to one end of his county he found a lawyer showing what to do with the laws; if he went to the other end, there was a doctor with his pills and his medicine. And so it was: the merchant, the manufacturer, the real bone and sinew of this country, could not afford to leave his business to be on the road all the time like the professional men. This was the reason they had so little practical legislation in the House. The question of amending the law or of repealing it was a secondary consideration; the great question for the moneyed interest, the lender and the borrower, was to have a practical law that would so work as to allow the business of this country to move along properly, in order that the unfortunate debtor, on the one hand, might not be harassed, and that, on the other hand, the creditor who was not disposed to do what was right might be controlled, but, at the same time, to afford every legitimate protection to capital.

MR. RYMAL said that, during some years past, this matter had been relegated to a Committee more than once. It was to be again referred to a Select Committee composed of gentlemen who were supposed to understand commercial transactions, and who could put this Bill into shape. He knew that many attempts at framing an Insolvent Act had been tried, but he did not think they were any nearer getting a proper and satisfactory law than they were the first time the matter was brought before the old Parliament of Canada. The treatment this Bill had received at the hands of Parliament reminded him of a saying attributed to a link boy who was in the habit of lighting people around the city, in England, many years ago. Pope, the poet, who was a very crooked little man, had engaged the boy, and, as he was going home of a dark night, he frequently stumbled, and every time he stumbled he ejaculated: "God mend me!" It attracted the attention of the link boy, who elevated his lantern and, after surveying him, said: "God mend you? why, it would be far easier for him to make half-a-dozen straight men than to mend a crooked man like you!" And so it was with this bankrupt law; the oftener it was doctored, the more crooked, apparently, it became. Last Session, when there was a motion to repeal the Insolvent Act, what was the reason alleged against it? It was said: This is the last Session of this Parliament; we are going home to face our people, we have got to run an election, and during the time we are canvassing, we can learn what the wishes of the people are. Now, they had come here fresh from the people; and, if there was any man here that would say that he did not know what the people desired in this respect, he (Mr. Rymal) would tell him it was a pity he was ever seen here. This was one of the questions that had agitated the people considerably. He knew what his people desired. He would not be bound by the action of the Committee, however influential it might be. If there was a motion made to repeal the law pure and simple, he would vote for it. He had heard it said that it was very desirable some means should be found by which the effects of an insolvent might be equally distributed amongst his creditors. He

MR. DONVILLE.

believed there was a possibility of effecting that object without discharging the men who had madly rushed into business and criminally rushed into insolvency. He believed the Insolvency Law had done more to debauch the moral sense of the commercial community than any and all the laws that had ever been placed on the Statute-book. He believed it was high time now, after twenty years' trial of a law that was conceived in sin, and whose fruits had been iniquity from first to last, that it should be once and for ever disposed of. He did not believe, as some had said, in a periodical Bankruptcy Law. If men were disposed to be dishonest, they would so shape their business that, at a certain time, when there might be depression and a general demand for a Bankruptcy Law, they would be exactly in a position to benefit by it. What a jubilee there would be among the criminal population at that time. They would look forward to it as a millenium. He did not wish that any opportunity should be afforded a man of being absolved from his obligations. What business had this Legislature to say to one man who had security against another: This security shall be confiscated for the benefit of the creditor? It was a species of confiscation. They had heard an anecdote of General Marion, who was the great champion of freedom in Kentucky during the American revolution. After it was over, some one proposed that the property of the Royalists should be confiscated for the benefit of the then infant Republic. At a convivial meeting, after this subject had been discussed, Gen. Marion was asked for a toast, and this was what he proposed, as he rose with the glass to his lips: "Damnation to that Confiscation Act!" And this was the sentiment that he (Mr. Rymal) would echo in reference to the Insolvent Act, the operation of which he had watched for many years.

MR. HESSON said he desired to express his views on this matter before the Committee was appointed. As the last speaker (Mr. Rymal) had said, there was not a member in the House to-day but ought to know the opinion of his constituents on this subject. If he did not know it, he had no right to be here.

It was a question of great importance to the country. He remembered that, when he became a merchant, some twenty-five years ago, he felt a pride in calling himself a commercial man, but that period had long since passed. The Insolvent Act, from the day it was passed, marked a period in this country not creditable to the commercial and business men of our land. The Act in itself was iniquitous and ought to be repealed, and, if it was necessary to go back to the old law, he was ready, for one, to accept it with all its injustice or its inequalities, as being more fair between man and man. Representing, as he did, a rural constituency, he was prepared to say that it was not in the interest of the people of this country that that Act should longer exist on the Statute-book. He would support any Bill for the repeal of that law, and he would state it now for the benefit of the Committee. All the members of the House should state their views in order that the Committee might understand thoroughly the opinion of the House. If the Committee did not bring in a Bill that would have the effect of repealing that law, or if they did not substitute something else better in its place, then he should feel at liberty to vote against it. He held in his hand the report of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, in which he saw that in the Province of Quebec, during the year 1878, there was paid out, as commissions to assignees in insolvency cases, the sum of \$33,850; as law expenses, \$25,141; and under the head of miscellaneous expenditure, \$119,217, or a total of \$178,208 in that Province alone. What did they find as the result of this expenditure? They found that something like \$696,786 had been secured as the results of the efforts of official assignees to collect six or seven millions of dollars out of estates that had become insolvent. Thus nearly one-third of the money went for their expenses. That state of affairs was not right. Complaints had been made by gentlemen opposite of the appointment of new assignees, and it had been stated that they were appointed because it was found that the office of assignee was a good thing. In Montreal city alone, \$23,143 was paid over to the assignees as commis-

sion, and the same state of affairs, he believed, existed all over the country. In the Province of Ontario, \$182,000 was the amount the assignees had cost insolvent estates during the past year, or about one half as much as they were able to collect in cash. He was altogether opposed to the present Insolvent Act, and, if the Committee did not bring in a better one, he would rather stand by the old Act than the present.

Mr. OLIVER said the policy of the late Government was, when there was a sheriff in a position to discharge the duties of official assignee, to appoint him. It did not matter to which party he belonged, if he was a competent man. The last speaker and the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Rymal) had given a sufficient reason why this Committee should not be appointed. Both gentlemen had stated that they would support the repeal of the Act, whatever might be the report of the Committee. Now, if they had all made up their minds to vote for or against the repeal of this Act, there was no necessity for the Committee, nor of their going to the expense which it would necessarily entail. He found himself in the same position as his hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Rymal). In his county, nineteen-twentieths of the people were in favour of the repeal of this Act, and that had been his feeling from the first day he entered the House, and it was his feeling at the present time. One of the reasons mentioned by his hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) why this Bill should not be repealed was that there should be some machinery whereby the assets of an unfortunate trader should be distributed. It had been stated by gentlemen opposite, and particularly by his hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville) that the whole of the assets had gone to the lawyers or the official assignees. They had had that experience in the West. The assets paid to creditors had been so small that they had not paid the creditors for the trouble taken. He held that it was better that one creditor should be paid than none at all, and it was far better that that creditor should be paid than that a staff of assignees, who had been

pronounced by gentlemen opposite as robbers, should be upheld. There were good reasons why the Bill should be repealed. One had been given by the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Ry-mal), and that was that the Legislature of any country should not step in and destroy the securities that were held by the people of the country. They found, by the returns of last year, that the people of this country had lost \$23,900,000 by failures, considerably more than the whole revenue of the Dominion. And those parties who had caused these losses had got a clear receipt for every cent of that money. He did not believe any Legislature should step in and destroy the securities as between the creditor and debtor. Another reason for the repeal of the Act was that it had induced a great many people to go into business who otherwise would not. It had been stated that there were more traders in Canada to the square acre than in any other country in the world. Another argument against the Bill was to be found in the fact that, in consequence of that Bill, wholesale merchants had forced their goods upon the retail traders of the country. They knew that, if they secured the services of a merchant in a rural district for five years, and if he failed at the end of that time, and they got five or ten per cent., they would make money by the operation. Another reason against the continuance of the Bill was that, in consequence of so many failures, there were numerous sales of bankrupt stocks. They had an instance in the city of Ottawa. There was one establishment in the city, he was told, where they were in the habit of buying up all the bankrupt stocks within a certain radius of the city. These stocks they brought to Ottawa, and sold at a lower rate than any other merchant could possibly sell them, who bought his goods in the regular way in the wholesale market. There could be only one result if this trade continued, and that was a general smash-up of all the other merchants in the city. Another objection to the Bill was that no one except traders was allowed to take advantage of the Act. They should avoid class legislation as much as possible, and he maintained that an Act of this kind should extend to all classes.

MR. OLIVER.

He regarded it as his duty, as representing an agricultural constituency, to state to the Committee that his mind was fully made up, and was in accordance with the opinions of his constituents, and that he would vote against the continuance of the Act upon the Statute-book.

MR. METHOT said that, as a representative of a rural district, he could not allow the motion that was before the Chair to pass without adding a few words to what had been said on the subject. The Insolvency Act had been passed in 1875, and everyone had witnessed the effects it had produced, and could appreciate them knowingly. From the very first, this law had shocked public feeling. In the first place, it bore upon its face the stamp of partiality in favour of the mercantile class, and to the detriment of the farmers and of the other classes of society, who were shut out from the privileges of the law. In the second place, this law violated the rights of creditors who had legitimate claims against debtors. Since then, an attempt had been made every year to improve the law; and, every year, the Government had said to those who wished to repeal the law: "Do not repeal; wait for the amendments that we are going to propose this year, in order to perfect it." What had resulted from this? Why, every year, the amendments, instead of improving the law, had made it worse. This law was again before the House. Hon. members were fresh from the people, and, during the late elections, the people had been consulted upon this question; and public opinion upon this matter was well known. During the last five years, many complaints had been heard against the law, and each time endeavours had been made to induce the people to believe that, at last, a good law would be made out of the Insolvency Act. Far from the people being satisfied with this, the general discontent was glaring; the complaints made this year were more numerous than those made heretofore; and, for his part, he had promised, and he intended to faithfully keep his word, that he would do all in his power to have this Insolvency Act repealed. It was now proposed to appoint a Committee to gather new infor-

mation upon the necessity of repealing this law. For his part he did not need any further information; he had seen the effects of the law, and he was ready to repeal it. Perhaps some hon. members wished for further information, and it was not his intention to prevent them from obtaining what information they chose, but he would never consent to vote for the motion appointing a Committee unless the hon. the Minister of Justice could assure him that the Government would bring down, before the close of the Session, a law that would relieve the uneasiness that existed in commercial circles, and that was, in part, due to the Insolvency Act. It was of the greatest importance to strike this immoral law off our Statute-book. Farmers, who had not the right to go into insolvency, were heard to say: "Why have we laws that permit people to rob us? We send members to the House in order to protect us, and when they once arrive there they pass laws to protect fraud." He believed that this feeling would cease to exist, that the people would regain confidence in their representatives if all these laws, allowing one class to defraud another, were done away with. He would say no more for the moment on this subject. He had only desired to state the position he intended to take upon this question. He would consent to vote for the Committee, but upon the express condition that a Bill should be brought down for the purpose of changing the present state of affairs.

MR. HOUDE said that he did not rise to make an appeal to prejudices, nor to speak against a profession that might be largely represented in this House. Especially with regard to a question of this kind, he thought there should be no such appeal. He had not the honour of belonging to the noble legal profession, but he did not think that lawyers were entirely useless, especially when laws were to be framed for the country. If we were obliged to have recourse to the lawyers to interpret our laws, it was still more necessary to have lawyers to make laws. He believed that it was always dangerous to appeal to prejudices, and especially so in this House, for such

appeals would find a vast echo in the country. Certain politicians seemed to believe that they could do without any indemnity for their services, and considered themselves recompensed by the satisfaction they experienced when they devoted themselves to the service of their country. But these model men were so scarce that, if this House was to be composed only of them, there would be a great many less members than there were now. He would not reproach the Government, as some hon. members had done, for having moved for this Committee that was to look into the working of the Insolvency Act. This Committee might be useful in furnishing the House with information, or rather, he thought, that the mission of this Committee was to give body, as it were, to the diverse opinions entertained by members of this House. He believed that these opinions might be divided into two classes: those favourable to the maintenance of the law, and those favourable to its repeal or to amendments so radical that they would be equal to its repeal. The Committee might embody these different ideas, and give to the proposed measure more completeness than it could otherwise acquire. But he wished it well understood that he would not be bound to approve the report that this Committee would make. As a journalist, he had had occasion to study this Insolvency Law, not from the manufacturers standpoint, nor from the standpoint of any particular class, but from the standpoint of the general interests of the country. He thought the House was called upon to make laws not only for one class of the community, but for all classes, and especially for the three classes that composed the social body—the farmers, the mechanics, and the merchants. He believed that, although this law had been passed in order to protect the commercial class, it should not favour this class to the detriment of others. His mind was well made up on that point, and, if it was impossible to amend the law in this way, he would vote for its repeal. But he thought it could be amended so as to render it acceptable, for there was no doubt but that an insolvency law of some kind was required. His opinion was, and he thought that this opinion was entertained by a great number of the inhabitants of this country, that

he who owed should pay his debts. But, seeing that the commercial class was exposed to uncertainties and risks that other classes of society were not exposed to, it was but reasonable to pass laws for the protection of those interests. As he understood it, the intent of an insolvency law should be to make regulations respecting the distribution of the debts of a man who was not able to meet his liabilities in an equitable manner for all his creditors, and especially to cut down, as much as possible, the cost of winding up the affairs of an insolvent. He thought that, if it were possible to frame such a law, the country would be better off. Much sympathy had been expressed for unfortunate merchants. It was always painful to see a man in easy circumstances, sometimes opulent, suddenly thrown out of his home and brought down to poverty and want. But merchants were not the only persons subjected to these vicissitudes—to these reverses of fortune. Other classes of society—the majority—the farmers, the workingmen, and professional men were also exposed to these changes, and had to suffer as well as the merchant. Nevertheless, no one had ever thought of passing laws to dispense them from paying their debts. If it was painful for an honest merchant to suddenly lose the means he had of earning his livelihood, was it not just as painful to see an honest workingman lose, by fire or by some other misfortune, the little property he possessed, or to see a farmer lose, in one moment, the fruit of a whole year's labour. That was not all. The law now under discussion was an experiment. He thought it strange that hon. members should blame one particular class, and the Government for having tried this law, or allowed it to be tried. Man was not perfect, and he could create nothing perfect. All laws seemed good when they were passed, but often their effects did not satisfy the expectations of the public. The Insolvency Law belonged to this class. It had answered to their expectations. Now that the country saw that; now that they saw the ruins heaped up and the disastrous effects produced by this law, this House was called upon to change it or to repeal it. If the Committee asked for did not bestir themselves and bring down

their report in time to allow the House to pass a law during the present Session, it would be the duty of the House to adopt some measure as required by the circumstances and the interests of the country. But he was sure that the report of the Committee would be brought down early enough to allow the House to take it into consideration and mature it in a suitable manner. As some hon. members had remarked, the Insolvency Law had had a demoralising effect upon the people. The House had had an example of this when an hon. member had stated, this afternoon that a merchant who paid fifty cents on the dollar should be considered as having made a very reasonable payment. That was one of those ideas that this unfortunate law had propagated throughout the country. That was the effect that it had had upon the people, whose moral sense it had blunted. This law had led many people, otherwise honest, to believe that when a man fell into misfortune he was no longer obliged to pay all his debts. Even if this House should pass a law allowing a man to pay only one cent in the dollar, that would not dispense him in conscience and in morality from paying his debts when he was able to do so. He thought that it was always dangerous to create exceptional laws in the interest of one particular class, and this Insolvency Law was certainly such a one, for it had been framed in favour of one class, and to the detriment of all others. This law had drawn into business a large number of incompetent persons who had not the qualifications required to carry on business, and this had been disastrous for honest trade. Formerly, intelligence, capacity, competency, integrity and capital were required to enter on a commercial career. Now, it was quite different. When a man knew that, if, at the end of a year or two, he could not pay his debts, he had always the means of getting out of difficulty, he was tempted to go into trade without having the required capacities. And that was why so many incompetent persons were seen in trade; so many young men, especially, without experience and without capital, who lived upon the earnings of honest and industrious people. Some one had to pay these debts in one way or another, directly or indirectly. If a man engaged

in commerce paid only 20c. or 30c. or 50c. in the dollar, the remainder must be paid in the long-run by those who worked. That was what occurred, for the wholesale merchant was obliged to calculate every year the losses he had experienced during the preceding years, and the risks that he was running with the retail merchants. And who was it that paid for the balance? It was the purchaser; it was the consumer; that was to say, the working class, the men who earned their bread by the sweat of their brow. He did not wish to belittle any class of society; but it was well known, and honest merchants would be the first to admit it, the mercantile class often gave painful examples to look upon. He maintained that protection should be extended to honest merchants against the dishonest. He did not wish to say that all those who went into insolvency were dishonest; but the greater number of them were either imprudent or incompetent persons who should never have gone into business, and a great many of whom would not have done so, had not they had the prospect held out to them by this insolvency law, of getting easily out of the difficulties into which they ran so thoughtlessly. He had no idea that this question would have come before the House to-day. When it came up again he would have some additional remarks to make. He would say nothing more for the present, because he thought that the Committee would understand that this House was strongly in favour, if not of the repeal of the law, at least of its amendment in such a manner as to take from it the odious character it now had.

MR. RYKERT said he had no doubt the House would approve of the action of the Government in endeavouring to elicit information by a Committee. He was surprised that his hon. friend from South Brant had attempted to catechise this side of the House on the appointment of a Committee. It would be far better for the hon. gentleman, in view of the opinion expressed by one of his leaders in favour of the Committee, to see that there was some kind of a re-construction of the Opposition. It certainly seemed very odd that his leader, a gentleman well versed in commercial transactions,

should approve of the appointment of the Committee, and he take the very opposite view and taunt gentlemen on the Government side of the House. The hon. gentleman charged the Ministry with wishing to shirk their proper responsibility on this question, and throw the onus on a Committee. He knew very well that his own party had heretofore been in the habit of shirking responsibility in these important questions, by appointing Committees of the House. In the Ontario Legislature the hon. gentleman would see that his friends in authority had appointed a Committee on one of the most important questions ever discussed by the people of Ontario, in connection with the Assessment Law—the exemption of property from taxation. The hon. gentlemen, whom he so much admired, had shirked the responsibility of their positions as members of the Government, and that, too, when the Parliament was on the eve of a dissolution. It was a somewhat extraordinary thing that the opposition to the Insolvency Law came entirely from Lower Canada. He was not aware of the cause of this feeling in Lower Canada. In reference to the statement of the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Rymal), he desired to say that he believed the great majority of the people of Ontario were opposed to going back to the old system by repealing the law. He was not aware of any constituency in Ontario where the feeling prevailed, spoken of by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver). He (Mr. Rykert) represented a constituency largely rural, with a large city in its centre, and up to the present hour he had not heard a single person advocate the abrogation of the Act. He felt persuaded that their hon. friends from Lower Canada would not force upon Upper Canada a change of the law simply because it did not work harmoniously in their own country, without providing some remedy to prevent the evil which must follow from a repeal. He was satisfied that it was not in consequence of the dishonest trader that persons were now trying to repeal the Insolvency Act. He knew many honest traders who, after surrendering everything which they possessed, had endeavoured to get their discharge, but were prevented by some creditor who

thought he ought to have his account paid in full. In every estate, they would find some person who would oppose a discharge unless he got 100 cents on the dollar. He would venture to say that there were hundreds of instances on record where honest traders had applied for a discharge, but were opposed by exacting creditors who wished to force the payment of their claims in full.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

The following Bills were severally read the second time :—

Bill (No. 23) To incorporate the *Gazette* Printing Company.—(Mr. *Ryan*, Montreal Centre.)

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and to extend the time for the completion of the said Railway.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*.)

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Williams*.)

INSOLVENT LAWS.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the Debate on the motion of Mr. McDonald (Pictou) for the appointment of a Select Committee respecting Insolvency and Bankruptcy.

MR. RYKERT said, that, when the House adjourned, he was contending they ought to support the motion of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDonald.) He thought it desirable they should obtain every information possible to qualify them to deal properly with the Bill, when it came up before the House. A great deal of important information might be gained by the Committee, although members might not be bound by its conclusions. The result of the Committee's proceedings would be to inform the House of the working of the law in the different Provinces, and the probable result of its repeal in each. He could fully understand hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada favouring its repeal in

view of its enormous expense; because Quebec had an Act enabling a creditor to hold an Insolvent's property for the benefit of all the creditors. It was not so in Ontario. Repeal the Act there, and they would be placed in the position which they were some years ago, when preferential assignments were the order of the day, and actions in Chancery for frauds against creditors were then of almost daily occurrence. He was not in favour of the absolute repeal of the Act. There might be some remedy by means of which the goods of an insolvent trader should be placed in the hands of a third party for the benefit of all. They knew that, in consequence of the improper working of this Act, and through the extraordinary expense of its operations, the creditor whose claim was not large, saw very little of the proceeds of the estate. No insolvent could voluntarily take the benefit of the Act; an assignment must follow the act of one or more creditors. He was much struck with the remark of the member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) with reference to the late Government's appointment of assignees. They were, he says, solicitors for the appointment of the best men in every county, and in every instance where the sheriff was well qualified they appointed him assignee. But there was an exception in Lincoln, where, instead of appointing the sheriff, who was in every way qualified, they chose a discharged banker from Windsor, imported for the very purpose. If the Insolvent Law were repealed, the effects to Ontario would be disastrous. The unpopularity of the Act was largely due to the results of overtrading. Unqualified parties rushed into all kinds of business, being encouraged by wholesale merchants, who worked off their surplus stocks upon them, the result being frequent insolvencies. One reason for the unpopularity of the Act, was the enormous cost of each proceeding. Another was the absence of proper supervision by the assignees. Were there a Government Inspector to supervise all the acts of the agents, there would be less complaint than at present. Assignees were appointed over large estates, their individual security being only \$2,000. In St. Catharines, one appointed by the late Government became indebted in \$20,000, which,

MR. RYKERT.

with proper supervision, would have been impossible. Another reason for the unpopularity of the Act in Ontario, was the permission to creditors to name an assignee outside the Province while there was no power to bring one, who acted dishonestly, to this Province, and make him disgorge; the law did not reach him in Lower Canada. That was one reason why his hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Hesson) and others advocated total repeal of the Act. He (Mr. Rykert) approved of some remedy. If the law be repealed, let them have one like that of Lower Canada, by which one judgment creditor should hold the property for all. If an estate went into the hands of the Sheriff in behalf of one creditor, the only persons to benefit by it would be that officer and the lawyers. He hoped the result of the labours of the Committee would be the placing before the House of information enabling them to ascertain the working of the law in the different Provinces, in which case he believed few in Ontario would ask for repeal. They would go for the old Act, or some other by which every creditor might receive his share of the estate. He was sure no hon. member would desire to see them in the same unfortunate position as a few years ago.

MR. MCCALLUM said he would like to deal with some of the remarks of his hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson). He spoke of the appointment of official assignees by the late Government, and predicted that, if the law were repealed in the interim, official assignees would have any amount of business. If so, this was a strong argument for the repeal of the law; for those who would then take advantage of that law, were now putting their houses in order to take advantage of their fellow men, while they had this bad law to assist them in doing so. If there was one thing more than another that would induce him to support a repeal of the law, it had been the argument of the hon. gentleman. His hon. friend from Lincoln had said there was no feeling in the Province of Ontario in favour of the repeal of this law, but he differed from him entirely. He knew there was a strong feeling in Ontario, and in this House, and that if the matter

was left to the members of this House, they would make short work of it. He remembered when his hon. friend from Stanstead, a few years ago, brought a Bill into this House to repeal this Insolvent Law, that it passed a second reading by a large majority, and when the hon. member withdrew the Bill he had to pledge himself to the House that he would introduce it at another Session. But there had been a change of Government since that time, and he was satisfied if the Government then had not interfered, the feeling in this House and the country was such that the House would have wiped out that law from the Statute-book. It was a premium for wrong doing and for rascality, one which had cast a cloud on the fair fame of Canada, and we would be doing wrong to allow the sweeping assertion of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) to go uncontradicted, for there was a strong feeling in Ontario in favour of the repeal of the law. He (Mr. McCallum) had, on one occasion, an opportunity of doing so; he had voted as a representative of Monck, in favour of its repeal, and he still represented Monck, and would still record his vote against this obnoxious and iniquitous law. They had been favoured with a great deal of sympathy for the unfortunate trader. He contended that if an honest man was unfortunate, and failed in business, and could show that he had lost his money by fair means, none of his creditors would object to give him a discharge. Another argument introduced was, that if we went back to the old system, it would be ruinous, because the first judgment obtained would hold the property. Under the old system one man got his pay; did one man get it now? Nobody got paid. They had raised a class of official assignees who took it all. He did not intend to further occupy the time of the House, but would say to the Government that they very much mistook the feeling of the country if they thought it was not in favour of a repeal. If they left it an open question, to be dealt with by members of the House, they would make short work of the law. He might add that the country pronounced in favour of this repeal on the 17th September. In many counties of Ontario

that was spoken of at the elections, particularly in the rural constituencies which looked to this Government to carry out the repeal of this law which they looked upon as class legislation. It was a law introduced in favour of a certain class. A trader got a non-trader to endorse his note, and after a while got into difficulties. He could call his creditors together and could get relief from his creditors, but the non-trader who had endorsed this paper must pay up to the last farthing, and might be ruined by it. The sooner the Government did away with this law, the better for the commercial morality of the country.

MR. HAY said he had had considerable experience in the working of this law, perhaps no member of the House had so much to do with it as he had; still he did not want to see it done away with, but modified and made cheaper in its working. He was quite certain that, if the Committee were composed of men representing all the different interests, something would be arrived at to suit the merchants. It would be madness to do away with the Bill at present, but a Committee properly selected could, no doubt, arrive at a satisfactory solution of the difficulty.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said there was a fitness and an unfitness in the proposition the Government had made in regard to this Insolvent Act. The fitness of the proposition was the desirability at all times that all the information possible should be elicited, and that, from experts, either in the form of official assignees or otherwise, the House, through the Committee, should be put in possession of all the information necessary to clearly understand a question of this kind. Every person accustomed to parliamentary usage would notice there was a gross impropriety in the course the Government proposed to pursue. In 1875, when the House proposed to legislate upon insolvency, the course taken by the Government at that time was different to the one pursued at present. They had a policy; they brought down an Insolvent Act which, after it passed its second reading, was referred to a Committee of the House. In the present case, they had no expression of opinion whatever

MR. McCALLUM.

from the Government, as to whether they believed the Act should be continued or repealed. The House was asked to appoint a Committee, not to give information to the House, but to the Government itself, who should have a settled policy on a measure involving so many interests as were contained in this Act. In watching the discussion which had taken place on the resolution of the hon. the Minister of Justice, he noticed a mistaken opinion which seemed to rule as to who was the guilty party in all the trouble which the Insolvent Act was proposed to remedy. Some hon. gentlemen blamed the official assignee as a recipient of the goods which he absorbed in the management of an estate, the unfortunate creditor, as he was often called, receiving nothing out of it. He could not understand how the official assignee was so much to blame. He was regulated in his charges by statutory fees, and, of course, if the estate was a small one, those fees would absorb it, but if the assets were large, he could not exceed a certain limit of fees, and, if there was anything in the estate, it must yield some little return. If the Insolvent Act were repealed, he could not understand how an estate which would then pass into the hands of the Sheriff could yield any greater return than the same estate would at present in the hands of an assignee. Another class of gentlemen who had taken part in the discussion had blamed the Insolvent Act itself for all the evils arising from the depression of business. He thought that those who blamed the Insolvent Act for the difficulties which had arisen from bankrupt estates, blamed the effect, not the cause. The cause of the present trouble, and of the difficulties in connection with bankruptcy, was unlimited credit, the consequence or the effect of which was unlimited bankruptcy. If they could find out who was to blame for the unlimited credit which prevailed in Canada at present, they would solve the whole difficulty. The debtor was not to blame. He was interested in getting credit, in order to engage in business, if he saw any probability of achieving success. Who was the guilty party, if it was not the wholesale dealer, who, in his ardent desire for profit, imported too largely, sent his travellers to

every village in the country, who prevailed on the small dealer to order a consignment, and then forced on him a larger consignment than he bargained for. In this way the retailers became overloaded with goods. Insolvency resulted, and the Act was blamed. He did not understand how the repeal of the Insolvency Act could remedy these evils. He believed the present time was very unfavourable for the repeal of this Act. Hon. gentlemen opposite had promised that, if they got possession of the Treasury benches, immediately good times would come. He had no doubt many honest men had been painfully hanging on to a remnant of a declining business, in the expectation that the advent of these gentlemen to power and the introduction of the National Policy would bring back the good times. Were they going to be disappointed? Were the efforts they had put forth to maintain their declining credit going to be blasted by the repeal of the Insolvency Act? Were hon. gentlemen opposite going to tell them that they had no policy in regard to a matter of this importance, to the best interests of the country, than to appoint a Committee to fish for a policy which they were not prepared to enunciate? Under these circumstances, with the roseate prospect which hon. gentlemen opposite said there was, of an advance in all the business interests of the country, they should not rapidly shake the credit of men who had been straining every nerve to maintain themselves against reverses, and place them in a position in which the only resource that would be left to them would be immediate bankruptcy. If it was proposed by this House that this Act should be repealed in a fixed time in the future, the amount of bankrupt goods which would be thrown on the market would have a ruinous effect on legitimate business. He held that any repeal or amendment of this Insolvent Act should contain provision, as had been remarked by several hon. gentlemen, for a discharge of the honest debtor. There was no advantage to be gained in restraining a man from embarking in business, or in not relieving him from the incubus of a debt he was utterly unable to pay. There was a time when a man, unable to meet his obligations, was

imprisoned in the city gaol, until he discharged his financial obligations; as if by remaining in prison he could succeed in paying his debts. To repeal the present law would place a man at this disadvantage: the finger of scorn would afterwards be pointed at him, as a man who had been deprived of the full rights of citizenship. He remembered, when there was no insolvency law in existence, that many of our prominent men, who had been dragged into bankruptcy, went to the other side of the line, and there helped to build up the business institutions of that country, instead of building those of their own. The hon. member for Stanstead had on the paper a Bill which proposed to deal with bankrupt estates. Before this House repealed the present Act, it would be well to profit by his experience. We should advance cautiously in regard to a measure of this magnitude, one which interfered with all the business transacted within the extent of this Dominion. He had already said that this was an inopportune moment for the repeal of this Act. It was inopportune for another reason; apart altogether from the political change which has taken place, the present depression of trade would not continue a great while. He noticed by the returns from the American side, that there was evidence of an upward tendency in business there, and our intimate commercial relations with the United States might cause this tendency to be reflected justly on the business of the country. He did not know that we could expect, at a very early date, a return of that business prosperity with which we were favoured a few years ago. But he felt sure that a return to that condition of affairs which existed previous to the passage of the Insolvent Act, would not contribute to that prosperity we were all so anxious to enjoy.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas) said he would not have risen to make any remarks upon the important question had it not been for the fact that whenever there was occasion to do so he had considered it his duty to vote for a repeal of the Insolvency Law. The proposition now before the House was that the question should be referred to a Committee. He did not consider it his duty, because he had always

heretofore voted for the repeal of the Insolvent Act, that he should refuse that this important question should be submitted to the consideration of a Committee. He would only be too glad if its labours would result in bringing forth a measure which could be substituted for the one now in force, which would really give relief to that blessed portion of our community called honest traders. If this could be accomplished, it would be a source of gratification to the Dominion. In the meantime he would wait, and reserve to himself the right of accepting or rejecting any measure which might be recommended by the Committee. But if he felt that no action would be taken this Session, he would deem it his duty to oppose the resolution for a Committee. As the law now stood, it was really detrimental to the interest of the country. It opened the door to people to become dishonest. He thought a great mistake had been made by the former Government in appointing so many official assignees, and that the same mistake had been committed by the present Government. He had it from reliable information that there were many of those men who managed by some means to find out the affairs of persons in business, and facilitated their bankruptcy. He thought that a very unwholesome state of things to exist in this country, and some measure should be at once taken to remedy the evil. He hoped the Committee would report on the subject, and that their report would take effect some time not later than the end of September next. They expected more from this Government and greater improvements than from the late Government. There was another question which was of great importance in connection with the trade and commerce of this country—because it has had very damaging influence, and rendered so many persons helpless and deprived of an honest livelihood—that was free trade in money. It had added a great many loaning institutions to our country, which had done more to damage the prosperity and progress of this country than anything else he knew of. He hoped that before another Session passed he would have an opportunity of testing the sense of the House, and ascertain

whether some restraints could not be put on that mad creation. He would vote for the Committee, and if they could hit upon a measure which would commend itself to the best sense of the House, he would only be too glad to support it; but if it was not better than the present, he would have to vote against it.

Mr. HOOPER said he thought the Government deserved the thanks of the House for allowing this discussion to take place. Some hon. gentleman had referred to the 17th September, as though this question of the repeal of the Insolvency Law had been the principal question then before the electors. He could assure them that in the constituency he represented, the only question was Protection to our industries, because Protection would give employment to the people. The question to be discussed here was a more important one than the repeal of the Bill. It was what was best to be done in the interests of the trade and commerce of this country. He had no doubt that eminent gentlemen who had been named by the Government to constitute the Committee proposed, will do every thing in their power to bring a Bill into the House that would give every satisfaction. They should consider what was the cause of so much depression and so many cases of bankruptcy in the country. There were two sides to this question. They ought to consider first the wholesale merchants who sold the goods in the first place, and then the retail men who re-sold them. He could speak of this matter from personal knowledge. He knew that, as a rule, the wholesale merchants of this country were very liberal, but, on certain occasions, they might over-import goods; hence there was a great anxiety to sell those goods. It was well known to any man of business, that the system of commercial travellers was often very prejudicial to trade, as they forced goods upon everybody without discrimination. It was also known that there were a great many young men who were fond of leaving their farms and entering into business, on account of the facility with which they could obtain goods from

wholesale men. They bought the goods on credit, and after living extravagantly, and the time came for meeting payments, they sold their goods at a sacrifice, and then tried to effect a compromise with their creditors. The very men who should have put down that trade, were the very men who encouraged such proceedings. He would ask what chance honest traders had in competition with such men? If the wholesale merchants would frown down such operations, there would be very few of those sacrifices made, and very few bankrupt stocks thrown upon the market. The Committee should so frame their measures that no man in trade should be allowed to compromise with his creditors unless he could show from his books that he had not willingly allowed his business to become involved. He would ask the House if the insolvent laws created insolvents, or whether the insolvents caused the creation of these laws. His own impression was that if the country was in the state it ought to be in, there would be no need whatever of an insolvent law. He would ask the House and the Government to frame the laws of this country in such a way that they would have the effect of placing traders, commercial men, farmers, labourers and mechanics in such a position that there would be employment for every one, and give such encouragement to the manufacturing industries, that not only would employment be given to every man in the country, but would bring our absent French-Canadians back. When that state of affairs had been arrived at, he was of opinion that the Insolvent Law on the Statute-book, would be little or seldom used.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said that before the question was put he would like to make one or two observations in regard to remarks which had been made during the course of the debate. He ought to say, perhaps, that when he moved the resolution he did not anticipate any debate until the results of the consideration to be given to the question by the Committee should have come down; still, after listening to the discussion to-night, he thought it was well that the Committee should have the

benefit of the views so ably expressed by members on both sides of the House. He thought the result of the debate had shown the propriety and wisdom of the course pursued, for although he could easily understand the anxiety of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite that the Government should compromise themselves on a question of that character, he thought the House on both sides, as a whole, would appreciate the course that it was thought best to pursue on a question of such universal interest to us, affecting, as the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) had said, the most intimate business relations of every business man in the country. It was better, therefore, in every form in which it should be viewed, and the House would feel that it was well that a Committee, composed of some of the ablest and most experienced men of both sides of the House, should have due deliberation of the subject, and be able to present, for the consideration of the House, a mode of freeing itself from the difficulty which now existed. There was no doubt that a strong feeling existed against the present Act, and he was quite correct in saying that gentlemen on both sides of the House would co-operate in the endeavour to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the question. He had arrived at the conclusion that public feeling was not so much against the Bankruptcy Act or the Insolvent Act as against some of the provisions of the present Act; because, as he understood the debate, scarcely any gentleman who had spoken had declared that he was not willing to assent to the principle upon which this Act was based. He apprehended that the principle on which this Act was based was such as would recommend itself to the mind of every honourable person, and every man who respected the interests of his neighbour, while he was careful of his own. This Bill was based on two principles of a very important character. One was, that when any man who, from fraud on the part of others, misfortune, or accident, shall become insolvent, his estate shall be distributed among his creditors in equal proportions; he shall not be allowed to appropriate to one individual what ought in justice to be distributed amongst the whole. He had been surprised to

hear one gentleman say he would sooner one creditor got the whole than that no creditor should get any. He would inform that hon. gentleman that it was not the fault of the Act, but that of its administration; and, therefore, it would be unwise and unstatesman-like to refuse to give relief in a case like this merely because the administration of the Act had ceased to be useful. The second principle upon which he apprehended this Act was based, was the relief of the unfortunate debtor. He could hardly fancy that any member of this House would assert or maintain the contention that a man who, through no fault of his own; a man who, having devoted his whole life to an honest and fair business, and who by accident, fraud or misfortune became an insolvent, that such a man should remain for the rest of his lifetime in jail. That would be the result of the repeal of the Bankruptcy law, unless it were replaced by another having these fundamental principles to rest upon and afford relief in these several cases. He need not give any opinion with reference to this law, because he thought it was in the hands of a body of men who had more experience in a practical business point of view than he had. While he intended, as he stated before, to give no opinion of his own, except to make an observation or two regarding what he apprehended was the difficulty in the working of this law. It was a very curious illustration of the mode in which laws are sometimes carried out. If his idea be correct, the difficulty of this law was that the very men on whom the greatest part of the real administration of this Act was conferred, are the very men who made the worst use of it. He would undertake to say that in every instance the cause of complaint was contained in some clause of the Act in which the creditors were allowed to deal themselves with the affairs of the estate. It would be asked who had a better right to administer the estate than the creditor, the sufferer from the insolvency. It would appear to be an injustice to take away from them the right of administering the estate. Still they found that this administration by the creditors was the cause of the very evils complained of. Who discharged the fraudulent debtor?—the creditors of course;

who executed the composition and discharge for 10 or 15 cents on the dollar?—the creditors; who authorized the sale of the stock at slaughtering prices?—the creditors, not the Court; who appointed the assignees?—the creditors, not the Court. The official assignee was merely the temporary custodian of the property. The man who administered the estate was not an official assignee but the assignee appointed by the creditors themselves. If they looked at the whole administration of the Act they would find wherever there was a fault or wrong, or what some hon. gentleman called rascality, it was while the control of the estate was in the hands of the creditors or the assignees appointed by them. A very serious matter for them to consider would be the mode in which they proposed to remedy the evils of the Act. His humble opinion was that at present no remedy would meet it except by removing the evil complained of by taking the affairs of the estate out of the hands of the creditors if a better tribunal could be found in their place. With regard to the observation of an hon. member in reference to the time when this law should be changed, he quite agreed that legislation ought to take place this Session. It was the desire of the Government, although they did not control it; and he was quite sure it would be the desire of the Committee, which he hoped would be appointed, that their report should come down in time to enable the House to determine the course of action in reference to this matter, during the present Session. He trusted, therefore, that members of the House would appoint a Committee and reserve their official decision until they ascertained from the report, after full consideration, whether means could be ascertained of meeting the admitted wants and just rights of a large section of the community.

MR. HAGGART said it was not his intention to have taken any part in this debate, had it not been for some remarks which fell from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and especially from the hon. the Minister of Justice who, he thought, mistook the sentiment of the country. He (Mr. Haggart) spoke for a constituency largely manufacturing

and rural, and he had yet failed to find a single man, no matter on what side of politics, in his constituency, but who was entirely opposed to the Insolvency Act, as at present in force. They had been tinkering at that law continuously for a number of years, and he was of opinion, and he thought it was the opinion of the majority of the House, that no further tinkering would better it. The Act was at present as perfect as it was possible to make it. The feeling in their section of the country, he thought in the whole of Eastern Ontario, was opposed entirely to the Act. He must also differ from the hon. the Minister of Justice, when he said that the foundation of this Act was laid in morality. He (Mr. Haggart) maintained the foundation was not a moral one, that enabled a debtor to deprive a creditor of money honestly due to him. They had the experience of Great Britain and the United States to guide them, and in Great Britain the feeling of leading commercial people was entirely opposed to the Act. The hon. gentleman further said, that the discharge of a fraudulent insolvent debtor depended entirely upon the creditors. The fact was a majority of creditors ruled, in the face of whom one man could not get his money if he wanted it. His opinion was that the country was at present prepared to vote upon that Act. He was aware that the feeling in large cities was in favour of some Insolvency Act. That sentiment was founded on the difficulties which arose in the distribution of estates in country districts and of preventing the making of preferential assignments, or something of that kind. There was no doubt the feeling in the community was opposed to the Act, as one dangerous to the moral sentiment of the community. He would be prepared to vote against any report of the Committee, except one for the equitable distribution of the estate for the relief of the insolvent.

Mr. MACMILLAN said the legal fraternity having entered so strongly into the debate, he was glad his hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) had spoken so determinedly as he had done. As regarded the immorality of this measure, he thought there was no

Statute on the Statute-books more degrading to the commercial interests of the country than this Act. It was true that, in the first instance, when it was placed there it was very desirable, because there were a great many in the country utterly unable to get relief from the position in which they had unfortunately been placed through speculation or otherwise. It was then stated that the Act should terminate at a certain time, but, instead of it being terminated, it was re-enacted. Amendments were brought forward, and it had been continued up to the present time. He, for one, was desirous that that Act should be absolutely repealed. If he could not succeed in getting it repealed, he was also desirous of having the Act materially changed. The hon. the Minister of Justice had said that the official assignees were merely the temporary custodians of the assets of the insolvent. He had found it act differently, and that the assignees were the absolute custodians. In many instances, after a dollar got into their fingers, they never gave it up again.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) : That is the fault of the creditors.

Mr. MACMILLAN said it was not necessarily the fault of the creditors. If he remembered the Act aright, the assets were placed in the custody of the assignee, by a writ of attachment. In the late Act, it was true, an amendment had been made, by which the assets could be placed there by the creditors, and that was the state of the law at the present time. He suggested last Session that they should extend the Absconding Debtors' Act and make it applicable to all debtors in this country. They then would have in place of the official assignee, an officer of the Court, whose bills could be taxed, and who had the amount set down which he was to receive in connection with the distribution of the assets that came into his hands. They found so few creditors who cared to look into these matters that they never had the assets distributed properly. He believed that last Session an amendment was brought into the House of an extraordinary character, requiring a debtor to pay so many cents on the dollar before he could get a discharge

from his indebtedness, and it seemed to him as absurd an amendment as any put upon the Statute-book of the country. Three-fourths of the people of this country had no right to take advantage of the Act under any circumstances, and this was a gross injustice to those non-traders. An hon. member from the Province of Quebec had brought in a Bill providing that, inasmuch as non-traders were not allowed to take advantage of the Act, therefore they should not be governed by it. This Act was introduced last Session, and he supported it as strongly as he possibly could. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had called their attention to the roseate times they were promised under the present Administration. Roseate times, he thought, had passed away from the hon. gentleman, and he was of opinion that it would be a few years before he got back to the roseate position he once occupied. Hon. gentlemen wondered why benefits had not arisen to the country before they knew what change was going to be made. He was prepared to wait a little time and hear what hon. gentlemen proposed, before he expected a beneficial change. He was prepared to oppose continuously this Insolvency Act. If they were to have it continuously, he wanted it administered justly and fairly to the whole people of the country, instead of the class legislation which at present existed. It must be universal, if they had it at all.

MR. LANDRY said that he had not intended to speak on the question, but the remarks that had just fallen from the lips of the hon. the Minister of Justice had made it his duty to express his opinion. According to the hon. Minister, this House was not opposed to the Insolvency Act, but to certain details in its working. He (Mr. Landry) was under quite a different impression. He had listened attentively to all that had been said on this subject, and, if he could believe his ears and the declarations he had heard, he was forced to the conclusion that the time had arrived to repeal the Insolvency Act. This House, by the voice of several speakers, had strongly protested against the maintenance of such a law, and he would add that the opinion just ex-

MR. MACMILLAN.

pressed was but the opinion of the people. During the late elections this question of the Insolvency Act had been tried before the electors. Several important votes had been taken upon the subject, at different times, during the last Parliament, and these votes, he remembered, had given the Conservatives the opportunity of shooting many well-aimed arrows at their opponents. The people had approved of the action of the Conservative party, and he had no doubt that, if hon. members took up the same position as that which had gained general approbation during the contest, they would obtain still greater applause. He did not intend to enter into an examination of this Act; the Committee that was to be appointed would study the question, but what he could do, with all independence, was to answer an observation made by the hon. the Minister of Justice, an observation that he did not believe to be founded in fact. The hon. the Minister of Justice had said that, according to the principle of the Insolvency Act, it was the creditors themselves who had the utmost authority in putting the law into operation, and that they could do as they pleased. It was to them that the debtor made his assignment; it was they who settled the affairs of the estate and who chose the assignee; in short, the law put every thing into their hands, and they had not the right to complain. That might be possible in theory, but practically speaking, what was seen? The creditors were the third on the list, and, in order to fully understand the part they were made to play, it might be well to recall the charming fable of Lafontaine entitled, he believed, "The Oyster and the Litigants." Whilst the creditor and the debtor were disputing over their respective interests, along came the lawyers and the assignees and gobbled up quickly all the dividends, leaving the creditors and the debtors to settle before the courts some point of law. That was what happened. The hon. member for Kings (Mr. Domville) had said, during the afternoon sitting, that lawyers were to be distrusted, and that for one he was afraid of meeting them in the settlement of questions respecting insolvency, and in the Committee that was to examine

this question. The hon. gentleman was, to a certain extent right, but he would add that, in this Committee, the House should beware of too many merchants, as this Act had been especially passed to forward their interests alone. And that was the second objection urged against this Insolvency Act. Wherefore this exceptional legislation? Why favour one class in particular, and refuse the same advantages to other classes of society? He represented in this House more particularly the agricultural class. He was himself a farmer, he exercised no liberal profession, and had no direct interest in trade. He could, therefore, in all sincerity, and not in order to strike an attitude before his electors, ask himself, and ask this honourable House, why it was that the agricultural class did not enjoy the same advantages as the commercial class. It had been said that the risks of the commercial man were greater, and it was for that reason this exceptional legislation had been granted to the trade. Was that a sufficient reason? The farmer, like every one else, was subject to the uncertainties of life; storms and hail could, in an instant, destroy his crops, and blast his hopes; disease could carry off his flocks, lightning could lay his dwelling and his firm buildings in ashes. What could the farmer do to ward off misfortune? He would have to borrow, he would have to discount the future, mortgage his property, but when his notes fell due, he would have to pay to the last farthing. If he had no money, his property would be sold at a sacrifice, and he, the unfortunate man, would be cast without help on the public highway. He would not, like the merchant, have the advantage of obtaining from his creditors his discharge after having paid 30, 20 or 10 cents on the dollar. No, no, but the law, merciless for him, would pursue him until he had paid the last farthing of his debt. And, meanwhile, the lucky, but often not over-scrupulous, merchant, would have found the means of growing rich after having gone into insolvency two, three or four times. That was a fatal discrimination that the law sanctioned. Clause 766 and following in the code of Civil Procedure, were much more simple, much more expeditious and especially much less unjust, according to

his humble opinion, and they had the great advantage of protecting the unfortunate debtors against the lites or the embrace of the official assignee. Why was not recourse taken to this legislation? As for himself, he would state sincerely, and he wished his statement to be heard by the hon. the Minister of Justice, he was opposed to the Insolvency Act, because this Act was based upon an unsound principle. If nothing better could be found to bring before the House, then, whatever might be the report of the Committee about to be appointed, he would vote—and he had reason to believe several of his colleagues would vote also—for the repeal of the present Insolvency Act.

MR. VALLEE said that the hon. the Minister of Justice had stated, a few moments ago, that he hoped the Committee appointed would go promptly to work, in order to find some means of improving or modifying the present law—which ought, however, to be maintained, or, at least, the principle of the law ought to be preserved. He would admit that he could not agree with him, and he, moreover, thought that this opinion was unadvised. The Committee, as it was now composed, was not a political Committee that could be controlled by the friends of the Administration, but it was composed of members chosen from both sides of the House, of members who were against the repeal of the law, and of those who were anxious to repudiate the principle of the law. He remarked that amongst those who were opposed to the repeal of the law there were a certain number of Conservatives on the Committee, and he believed, indeed, that the majority of the members of this Committee had, in the former Parliament, declared themselves hostile to the repeal of the Insolvency Act. By referring to the votes taken during the last Parliament, it would be seen that the majority of the present Committee had pronounced against Mr. Barthe's Bill asking for the repeal of the law. He did not know whether these gentlemen had changed their minds since the late elections, but he was afraid lest the Committee, composed as it was, should do all that could be done to hinder the repeal of the Insolvency

Act by delaying the report of the Committee until such an advanced stage of the Session that it would be too late to legislate on the matter. He was afraid that the Committee would entertain the same opinions that were entertained last year. He believed that the country asked for the repeal of this law. For his part he had pledged himself to his electors to ask for its repeal. By referring the whole question to a Committee he had been prevented from introducing a Bill asking for the repeal of the law, and he, consequently, found himself unable to do his duty as a member. That was why he considered the opinion expressed by the hon. the Minister of Justice rather hazardous. The hon. Minister had stated that the law did not work well, and he admitted that, under cover of this law, certain persons had gone into business because they were certain that the Insolvency Act would furnish them the means of retiring from business profitably. It was, therefore, a bad principle upon which this law was based, and yet the hon. Minister seemed in favour of maintaining it. This expression of opinion, on the part of the hon. the Minister of Justice, had greatly surprised him, for the Insolvency Law was, certainly based upon an unsound principle. Honesty and morality required that he who owed should pay. The Insolvency Law makes an exception to this principle, for it says that he who owes is not obliged to pay, provided he could find a sufficient number of creditors to grant him his discharge. That was why he said that this law was based upon an entirely immoral principle, for it destroys the very foundation of commerce, and of society itself. If the principle of the law was not immoral, it would not have brought about the results that we now see, and trade would not have fallen into the deplorable state it is now in. If a Committee was appointed to consider this subject, the opinion opposed to this law, so vigorously expressed in this House by a great many members, should be carefully weighed. He supposed that this Committee would collect documents and take evidence. Would they call the official assignees? All the official assignees had declared that the law was excellent. Would the

wholesale merchants be called? The majority of these merchants have the means of protecting themselves, and are not well acquainted with the working of the law. They would say to the Committee: "The law is a good one, and we hope that it will be maintained." But there was another class besides the wholesale merchants, the creditors; all those who do business with the merchants: the mechanic, the working man, the professional man, all those who work. Would these persons be called before the Committee to give their opinion upon the justice of the Insolvency Act? He was certain that the Committee would not call these persons. No; the Committee would only call those persons who were supposed to occupy the most important positions in the commercial world; and it was well known beforehand that they would be in favour of the maintenance of the Insolvency Act. And why? Because these persons were generally creditors, who could protect themselves. At a meeting of creditors, one or two of those who held the heaviest claims were appointed inspectors, and they took good care of their own interests. They come to an understanding among themselves, whilst the less fortunate suffer. He believed that the composition of this Committee was dangerous for the interests of those who were opposed to the law; and he believed it his duty to ask that the names of other members, who had pronounced themselves against the law, and who were of opinion that the Act does not render justice to all classes of society, should be added to the Committee. There were certainly members in this House who were perfectly free to act in the interests of the majority, and who had not pronounced themselves in favour of the maintenance of the Insolvency Law. The opinion had been expressed that the Government did not dare to introduce a law upon this matter. He did not believe so, but it would be better that the House should not be controlled by political ambitions, so that the question might be brought up in an independent manner, and in order that party aspirations might cover up the voice of justice. He would, therefore, propose to add to the Committee the names of a few of the new members.

Thirteen members had been appointed; he would suggest the appointment of four others. By adding these names the House would be more certain that the views expressed to-day would be overlooked by the Committee, which, as now composed, seemed to be hostile to the repeal of the law.

Mr. SPROULE heartily endorsed the position taken by the Government on this important question. It was certainly the best plan that could be adopted to refer the matter to a Committee chosen from both sides of the House, and which, after hearing the discussion that had taken place in this House, and gathering such other information as it could from individuals outside the House, ought to be able to devise some satisfactory measure. Consequently, he, for one, desired to see the fullest discussion on this matter at the present time, in order that the Committee might perfectly understand the views of the House. He believed it was the general opinion of those men, and would be of the House, that some kind of Insolvent Act was desirable. They should have one of the right kind, however. The present Act was not held in high esteem in the rural constituencies, because the majority of their inhabitants, the farmers, mechanics and professional men, received no benefit therefrom, while compelled to bear their share of the losses resultant. This injustice should prompt efforts for a better Act. An hon. gentleman stated the experience of the United States taught them the necessity of repealing their Act; but he forgot to say that almost every State had an Act of its own which enabled it to dispense with the general Act. The appointment of a number of assignees, or more than one, for a place had been complained of; but he knew instances of estates being largely reduced by the expenses where they had to trust to but one such official, and the property would have been swallowed up altogether had there been much longer delay in the settlements. He had advised the appointment of a second assignee in one instance. One debtor had offered 40c. or 50c. in the dollar for a settlement, saying, if they delayed a week or two longer, with the expenses, he could not pay more than 25c. It was

generally admitted some kind of Insolvency Law was essentially necessary to the well-being of those engaged in trade. He hoped the Committee would also consider the necessity of making the law universal, to suit poor and rich alike. To-day a man in trade owing \$20,000 might go free from liability on payment of 20c. or 30c. in the dollar, while the poor man, owing \$100 or \$200, would be hauled up on a judgment summons, and sent to jail because not able to pay a certain amount every month. No doubt the poor felt keenly such an unjust Statute. It was time for a law that would provide for the same treatment of all, include or exclude all alike.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he hoped his hon friend (Mr. Vallée) would withdraw his amendment. The Committee had been carefully selected, by conference, from both sides of the House; if, on consideration, they found it should be increased, it could be done by conference of both sides.

Amendment, with leave of the House, *withdrawn.*

MR. BÉCHARD said when the Insolvent Act passed in 1875, they were told the law was called for by the commercial classes, because it provided means for a good and equitable distribution of the insolvent debtor's assets among the creditors, and for the relief of the honest and unfortunate debtor. Our attention was also directed to the example of England, France and the United States, which all had then such a law. Some of us thought that if such a law were passed, it ought to be limited to the case of those who called for it, that the interests of the non-trader should be exempt from its operation. In that view, the hon. member for St. John's (Mr. Bourassa) offered an amendment, providing that, in no case of an insolvent, should he get his discharge from the non-trader till his claim were paid in full. That amendment, however reasonable it appeared, did not meet the favour of the House. The lack of such discrimination between the interests of the traders and non-traders, rendered the Act most unpopular in the rural districts. He did not think this law had responded to the expectations of its promoters. After it

had been in operation about a year, it was found necessary to amend it by raising, from 33 cents to 50 cents, the percentage to be paid by the debtor to entitle him to his discharge. He would like to know in how many of the numerous cases of insolvency within the past few years, had 50 cents in the dollar been paid; in how many had 30 cents been given? He believed the average amount from the great proportion of insolvents was much lower. Hence he thought he was right in saying that, in this respect, the Act had not met the expectations of its promoters. In fact, its working was found so expensive that, in most of cases, we found creditors accepting deeds of composition with their debtors in order to get anything at all. Had it afforded relief to the honest debtor? He was ready to admit that, in a few cases, it had, but it had also increased rascality, and proved an instrument, a lever in the hands of rascals for the perpetration of fraud. It had opened the door to insolvency by inducing unqualified, inexperienced men, without sufficient capital, to enter business, whose operations had disturbed the honest, genuine, competent trader. One of his greatest objections to the law was its demoralising effect on our population. It seemed as if the time was far past when men unfortunately falling in insolvency suffered under the stroke of humiliation. It appeared now fashionable to become a bankrupt. Some acted so as to be set up again, styled clever, and receive approbation. If they obtained money by defrauding their creditors, they were considered to have proved their qualification for business, and were styled smart fellows. He had no admiration for a law that made smart fellows of that kind. The sooner it was blotted out of the Statute-book the better for the morality of the people, and the good fame of the country. The United States had repealed their Insolvent Law, and he believed no one was prepared to say business was worse there than before. Hon. members of this Parliament had recently the opportunity of discussing the Canadian Act before the country, and he thought the House was prepared to act in accordance with the will of the people. It was but a few weeks ago that

he noticed in the papers that a petition was sent by merchants of Montreal to this Government, praying for its repeal; and during the past few days, petitions to the same effect were pouring into the House from all quarters. In the rural districts, the people were clamorous for its repeal. They could not tolerate a law enacted by their representatives in Parliament in virtue of which a man was allowed to avoid paying all his debts; in which discrimination was made between different classes of society whereby some were allowed to become clear of their indebtedness by paying 30c. to 50c. in the dollar, while other classes were bound to pay 100 cents. They could not support that discrimination, and were willing, and, he thought, rightly willing, that they should return to the good sound principle which bound every man to pay his legitimate debts. He thought the House was prepared for the repeal of that obnoxious law, and was very glad to have had the opportunity of hearing so many hon. members in this House express their views in favour of its repeal. Therefore he hoped that, when the proper time came for the second reading of his Bill, it would meet the approbation of the House.

MR. BUNTER said it was not his intention to take up the time of the House on this question; but as there was no one on that Committee from British Columbia, and as it was a question which seriously concerned British Columbia, he considered it his bounden duty to speak in relation to it. He looked upon the Dominion as being bankrupt to British Columbia, in not having carried out the contract entered into with her. When this Act was introduced last year, he had then said it would be a dead letter. The country had pronounced against it. The farmers got no protection from it. They could not get a discharge under this Act, if they should be unfortunate enough to get into financial difficulties by getting in debt, for their stock, farm and farm implements would be sold. The Act was, therefore, an unjust one; and he, having confidence in the present Government, that they would bring in all measures for the benefit of the country, was in favour of its repeal. If the Minister

MR. BÉCHARD.

of Justice had left the Act to be dealt with by this House, and not sent it to a Committee, it would have been better, without having this discussion upon it. However, the discussion had been a very interesting one, and no doubt would facilitate the speedy repeal of the Act.

Motion agreed to.

MOUNTED POLICE FORCE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL—[BILL 13.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee on Bill (No. 13) To amend and consolidate as amended the several Acts relating to the Mounted Police Force.

(In the Committee).

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said clause No. 10, in the Bill, provided that the Governor in Council could make a grant of 160 acres to any member of the force on completion of his five years' term. He moved that this clause be amended, to read that men entering the force after the 1st July next would not be entitled to receive this grant at the expiration of their term. Men could be had easily without this inducement, and experience had proved that those men who had served their term and received the grant, did not settle on the land, but sold their scrip.

Section, as amended, *agreed to.*

Bill, as amended, *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported.*

Amendments *read the first and second times* and *agreed to.*

Bill *read the third time* and *passed.*

House adjourned at

Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 10th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and *read the first time* :—

Bill (No. 33) To amend an Act to extend certain provisions of the Seaman's Act, 1873, to vessels employed in navigating the Inland Waters of Canada.—(Mr. *Rykert.*)

Bill (No. 34) To repeal the Act 40 Victoria, Chapter 21, to establish a Court of Maritime Jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. *McCuaig.*)

Bill (No. 35) Fixing the rate of interest in Canada, and prohibiting usury.—(Mr. *Méthot.*)

Bill (No. 36) To revive and amend the Acts relating to the Union Assurance Company of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the Crown Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Kilvert.*)

INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY COMMITTEE.

MOTION TO ADD NAMES.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the following members be added to the Select Committee on Insolvency and Bankruptcy :—Messrs. Bourassa, Gault, Guthrie, Caron, Ba-pee (St. John), Doull, Jackson, Charlton, Hay, Bunting, Vallée, Malouin.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS.

EXTENSION OF TIME.

MR. ROBINSON moved that the time for receiving petitions and the presenting of Private Bills, be extended for ten days, in conformity with the recommendation of the Standing Orders Committee.

Motion agreed to.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) PREVENTION BILL.

(*Mr Pope, Compton.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. POPE (Compton) introduced a Bill (No. 37) To provide against contagious diseases affecting animals. He said that, under the present Act, the provision only came into operation by proclamation of the Governor in Council. The first six sections of this Bill would be permanent and always in operation. It was provided in these six sections, that if disease was discovered in any part of the country, or if an individual knew that cattle were diseased, he was bound to give notice to the Department. Another provision was simi-

lar to that of the English Bill for payment to the owner in case of cattle being slaughtered. In case, however, a party knew that his cattle were diseased, and did not give notice, he would not be entitled to pay. Another section provided that, in the case of cattle coming from a foreign country, if the party himself could not be got hold of, the railway should be liable to a penalty if it did not provide sufficient accommodation, and knew the cattle to be diseased. In almost all other respects the Bill was the same as the present law.

Bill read the first time.

POOL-SELLING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) introduced a Bill (No. 38) To amend the Act for the repression of betting and pool-selling. He said the object of the Bill was to provide that it should not be unlawful to register bets, or to make bets, or to sell pools on race courses that were under the provision of properly authorised racing associations.

Bill read the first time.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Langevin.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. LANGEVIN introduced a Bill (No. 39) To amend the Post Office Act, 1875. He said the object of the Bill was just to give the Governor in Council the right to name inspectors and sub-inspectors of post-offices, and also to give to inspectors, acting as such, the right to examine witnesses under oath under the machinery provided by the Bill.

Bill read the first time.

RECRUITING FOR MOUNTED POLICE.

QUESTION.

MR. SCHULTZ enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to recruit in Manitoba for any portion of the number of men required for the Mounted Police.

MR. POPE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Commissioner of Mounted Police, Colonel McLeod, has received instructions to recruit the best men, without reference to what Province they come from.

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER.

QUESTION.

MR. WELDON enquired, Whether the Government intend to proceed at once with the repair of the breakwater at Negro Point, in the Harbour of St. John, N.B., and what steps, if any, have been taken for that purpose.

MR. TUPPER: The Government have already taken steps to protect that breakwater.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY REPORTS.

QUESTION.

MR. DECOSMOS enquired, When will the latest unpublished reports of the Engineer in Chief and Assistant Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway be laid before this House.

MR. TUPPER: The latest reports of the Engineer in Chief and Assistant Engineers of the Canada Pacific Railway have already been laid before the House.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES ACCOMMODATION IN STRATFORD.

QUESTION.

MR. HESSON enquired, Whether there are any grounds for the rumour in Stratford, that in consequence of the large sums now paid for rent by the Government for Post Office, Customs, Inland Revenue, and Weights and Measures Offices, and the very imperfect and inconvenient accommodation now afforded by the same, it is the intention to include an amount in the Estimates for the year 1879, for the purpose of purchasing land and erecting suitable buildings thereon for the use of said offices.

MR. TUPPER: The Government are not able, at present, to proceed with the works referred to in the enquiry.

DREDGING OF THE NORTH RIVER.

QUESTION.

MR. OLIVER in the absence of Mr. CHRISTIE, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates a sufficient sum to complete the dredging of the North River, so as to make it navigable to St. Andrew's, during low water; and, if so, whether the work will be prosecuted during the ensuing summer.

MR. TUPPER: The Government do not expect to go on with that work at present.

CODIFICATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to codify the Criminal Laws, following the example set by England in that respect.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): It is not the intention of the Government.

CODIFICATION OF THE COMMERCIAL LAWS.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to codify the Commercial Laws, in order to make them uniform throughout the Dominion; and to assimilate them, as much as possible, with those of England and the United States of America.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): It is not the intention of the Government, at present, to codify the Commercial Laws.

WITHDRAWAL OF COPPER COIN.

QUESTION.

MR. BOLDUC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to withdraw from circulation all penny and half-penny copper coin, and to substitute therefor coin of the value of one cent.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is a legal coin of the value of one cent issued by the Government, and also a great deal of illegal copper floating about, used as counters or markers, but the public are not obliged to take this copper. They could refuse it.

APPROPRIATION FOR WOODWARD'S COVE, N.B.

QUESTION.

MR. GILLMOR enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to re-vote the appropriation of last year of \$2,500 for Woodward's Cove, Grand Manan, Charlotte County, N.B.

MR. TUPPER: It is not the intention of the Government to re-vote the appropriation of last year, as they are under the impression a much larger expenditure would be required did they propose a re-vote.

DREDGING OF TRACADIE HARBOUR.

QUESTION.

MR. McISAAC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to finish, next season, the dredging of Tracadie Harbour, Nova Scotia, commenced, but not finished, last summer.

MR. TUPPER: The mode of expenditure is still under the consideration of the Government, who will not be able to answer the question till the latter part of the Session.

MAIL SERVICE IN NORTH BRUCE.

QUESTION.

MR. GILLIES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the current year, to extend the mail service twice a day by the Wellington, Grey and Bruce Railway, to Paisley, Port Elgin and Southampton, in the North Riding of Bruce, the same as at present enjoyed at Walkerton, in the South Riding of that county.

MR. LANGEVIN: The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

INSPECTION OF BANKS.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring forward, this Session, any measure providing for the inspection, by officers of the Government, of banks; and to enforce the observance of the conditions on which their charters were granted.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : It is not the intention of the Government to bring forward, this Session, any Bill providing for the inspection of Banks by Government officers. The Government will enforce, so far as their power enables them to do, the observance of the conditions on which the charters of the banks were granted.

MACKEREL SEINING IN THE GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) moved for copies of all correspondence, reports and all papers, relating to the practice of mackerel seining in the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. He said it had been the practice of the American fishermen, for the last three or four years, to fish on the shores of the Lower Provinces with seines, where they formerly used only hooks. The use of seines was well known to be very destructive to the mackerel fishery, and also to other kinds of fish. Scarcely a vessel now entering the Gulf was without those mischievous seines, which were thrown and drawn around, catching not only the coveted mackerel, but large quantities of the smaller sizes, herring, and other fish. Perhaps 300 to 400 barrels would be taken, for from 10 to 50 barrels of serviceable fish; the remainder was cast overboard dead. The result was, not only the loss of this large quantity of fish, but the frightening away of good fish from the usual grounds. If these evils were not stopped, the valuable fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence would, in a few years, be totally destroyed. The dead fish thrown back into the sea had a most injurious effect, as it was generally understood that fish would not frequent places where they found their own dead. They also made feed for other fish, and prevented them from taking the bait furnished by the fishermen in the regular way. He trusted the Government would see its way clearly to the adoption of such measures as would save from ruin one of the most valuable fisheries of the Dominion.

MR. FORTIN said those destructive seines were also used along the north and south shores of the Gulf of St. Lawrence,

MR. CASGRAIN.

and to catch not only mackerel but cod. He knew, by his own experience of twenty, and many fishermen's experience of thirty years, that, should the subject not be taken up by the Government promptly, and a stop put to the present destruction of those valuable fish, before many years the American fishermen would, with their seines, some of them 1,500 feet long and 60 in depth, have destroyed completely the mackerel, and, in a great measure, the cod-fisheries of Labrador. He spoke on the authority of hundreds who had seen waters, now deserted, teeming with fish. Not many years ago, mackerel was so abundant in Gaspé Bay that the fishermen could take as much as they liked. Then came the Americans with seines, by which they took whole shoals at a draught, half or three-fourths of which, being fish of all kinds and sizes, were not wanted, and were destroyed. Thus, the mackerel had vastly decreased. He hoped the Government would take this important matter into consideration, as the departure of the fish would compel the people of the Lower St. Lawrence to seek a living elsewhere.

MR. MUTTART said that, just now, while the various industries of the Dominion were seeking protection, it was proper that so large and important an industry as the fisheries should be fully protected. It was a matter of the utmost importance to the people of the Maritime Provinces—especially the people of Prince Edward Island—that the practice of purse-seining should be prevented if possible. For the last few years American fishing crews, with boats and seines, annually visited our coasts for the purpose of destroying fish by hook or by crook. Any one at all acquainted with the practice of purse-seining knew the evil effects of this mode of fishing. In the evidence given before the Halifax Fishery Commission, the witnesses all agreed as to the desirability of putting a stop to seining along the shores. One witness stated, on oath, as follows:—

"Seining destroys the fishing as it breaks up the schools of mackerel. Seiners take all kinds of fish, big and small, and they only save the good mackerel. Herrings, small mackerel and other fish are all killed in the seines and these are thrown away."

Another witness stated :

"After fifteen years of experience in the fishing business, I am convinced that seining is ruinous to fishing. Large quantities of fish are killed in the seine. I have known vessels to take two or three hundred barrels more than could be saved, and these had to be tripped out and went to the bottom."

Another witness stated :

"I have been seine-master of American fishing vessels, both in American and Canadian waters, and I perfectly understand fishing with seines. The American mackerel fishing has been almost destroyed by using these seines, and it will not take long to ruin our fisheries if the Americans are allowed to use them here. It is only within the last two or three years these purse-seines, as they are called, have been used in our waters. Fish are uselessly destroyed and the schools broken up and driven away by this practice."

And so the statements ran through the whole evidence given on oath before the Commission. A few year years ago, a British Fishery Commission was appointed. The Commissioners were Mr. Baird, Mr. LeFevre and Professor Huxley—men of the highest repute. One of the topics which engaged their attention was whether any of the methods of catching fish in use in British fisheries involves a wasteful destruction of fish, and if so whether it was probable that any legislative restriction upon such method of fishing would result in an increase of the supply of fish. In reply to this query, the Commissioners stated that "It may be laid down on a broad principle that the produce of the sea is the property of the people in common, and that methods of fishing are fitting subjects for legislation, so far as such legislation can be shown to be necessary to secure the greatest possible advantage to the whole nation by suppressing wasteful or uselessly destructive modes of fishing." Now, here was a case in point. The practice of mackerel-seining was most wasteful, and uselessly destructive. Legislation with the view of preventing it was loudly called for, and, representing, as he did, a constituency largely interested in the fishing business, he hoped that something would be done during the present Session to remedy the evil complained of. The American fishermen themselves admitted that their own fishing grounds had been almost ruined by seining, and it appeared that they were now determined

to ruin ours if possible. He was aware that, under the terms of the Washington Treaty, there was no provision made against seining. He believed, nevertheless, that, if the proper steps were taken by the present Administration, the United States Government might be induced to reciprocate—if not in trade—in this matter of vital importance to both countries, the protection and preservation of the fisheries.

MR. BRECKEN said, before the question was disposed of, he would like to address a few words to the House on the subject now under consideration. The fishery question was one of great importance to the Dominion, and of vital importance to the Lower Provinces. It appeared that under the fishery article of the Treaty of Washington, Article 18, the Americans were admitted within the three-mile boundary, to fish in common with British subjects. Under the Fishery Act, passed 31 Vic., chapter 60, sub-section 7, section 13, drag nets, trap nets and fishponds, were prohibited, except under special license. It would appear that these purse-seines did not come within the category of either drag nets, trap nets or fishponds. His apology for occupying a few moments of the valuable time of the House, was that, since the Washington Treaty, these seine nets had been used by Americans on our coasts. It was looked upon as such a destructive mode of fishing that the fishermen of Prince Edward Island would rather see the fishery award thrown into the sea than that the Americans should be permitted to fish with these purse-seines, within the three-mile limit as the boundary, as this House was well aware, from which the Americans were excluded under the Treaty of 1818, and where lay the most valuable portions of the fisheries. He had under his hand evidence, taken before the Halifax Commission, of American fishermen who acknowledged that this mode of fishing with purse-seines was most destructive. The Americans had almost destroyed, through this means, their own mackerel fisheries. The French had greatly injured their cod-fisheries by the use of these seines, which were thrown around a school of fish, then drawn up, and

sometimes there would be hundreds of barrels of fish taken in the nets in one haul, and probably not twenty barrels utilised. One reason, he understood, why these purse-seines were so destructive was that, as they were trawled, the meshes became taut, and there was no escape for the smaller fish. Large and small were alike killed, the small fish were thrown overboard, and, becoming decomposed, they poisoned the waters. He had conversed with men who were engaged in the fisheries, and they had assured him that, unless some steps were taken to prohibit the use of purse-seines, in five or six years these fisheries, now a mine of wealth to us, would be comparatively valueless. Whether, under this treaty which had been entered into, we could legislate or not, it was not for him to say; or whether the proper course would be to open up negotiations with the Washington Government. But this was certain—that it was one of the most important questions that could possibly engage the attention of the House. The export of fish now from the Dominion was to be counted by millions of dollars, and that great source of wealth, properly fostered, would rank foremost among the resources of our Dominion.

Mr. FLYNN said there was no question of greater importance, to the Maritime Provinces especially, than the one introduced by his hon. friend from King's. Ample evidence, a portion of which had been read by that hon. gentleman, had been given before the Fishery Commission to show the destructive character of purse-seines. The Americans had destroyed their own fishing on their own coasts, and if these purse-seines were continued to be used in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, our fisheries would be completely destroyed. Several of the fishing vessels belonging to the eastern portion of Nova Scotia which were in the habit of going into the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the summer months, reported that for miles around the sea was strewn with dead fish, small mackerel and other small fish, thrown out of the purse-seines. These purse-seines were thrown out, not knowing the kinds of fish that would be caught in them, and all the fish not wanted were, on the

seine being hauled up, thrown away, thus destroying them by thousands of barrels at a time, and these fish going to the bottom became decomposed, and consequently prevented other fish from going to their usual haunts on these banks. There were other injurious modes of catching fish besides the purse-seines. There were the trawls and trap nets, which, in his opinion, were equally destructive. While it was not within the province of the Government to prevent the use of purse-seines, it was within their province to prevent the use of the two latter. Under the Washington Treaty, the Americans had the right to use purse-seines inside of the three-mile limit, while the injury effected by these nets was as great outside the limit as inside it. The question could be opened by negotiations between the two Governments, and it was probable that the American Government would get their fishermen to abandon the use of purse-seines. If he were to believe all the information he daily received, during the last fishing season, from a large number of his constituents who were engaged in the fisheries, he must come to the conclusion that the continued use of these seines would destroy that branch of our industry. If the Americans were permitted to continue the use of purse-seines, another half a dozen years would not pass over our heads before our fisheries would be a thing of the past. He would urge upon the Government to do all in their power to stop the evil, which could only be done by negotiations between both Governments, and it would be found that the Americans were quite as anxious as ourselves to have this means of destroying fish put an end to.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the importance of this question could hardly be overestimated. His attention had been called to it several years ago, but the Government were not then in a position to take any action in the matter, particularly when the arbitration under the Treaty of Washington was pending between the Governments. The weight of evidence before the Commission abundantly proved that the practice of purse-seine fishing was highly destructive to the fishing interest. Under the Treaty of Washington, we had power to make

rules and regulations within the three-mile limit, to which our own fishermen were subject. It could not be contended that Americans would not be amenable to the same regulations within these limits. The great trouble they had felt was this: the Americans had the right to fish outside the three-mile limit, and, if he were not mistaken, purse-seines, though cast outside, yet drew fish from inside the limit. Now that the fishery award was disposed of, the way was open for this Government to negotiate with the Washington Government, and he hoped their efforts would be made in this direction and prove successful. The Americans were interested in the fishing on our coasts as well as on their own, since, by the convention, they had the right to fish within a three-mile limit of our shores.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said he had noticed, during the past summer, a statement in a Cape Breton journal referring to the enormous destruction of fish by Americans in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This statement had been amply corroborated by the hon. gentlemen who had spoken on the subject to-day. As had been said by the hon. member for Queen's, these purse-seines were generally located in the three-mile limit, and the fish destroyed would otherwise belong to our own fishermen. The trawling system was equally injurious, and along the coasts of Nova Scotia, several fisheries that four or five years ago yielded large incomes, had been almost completely destroyed. Before the Government took action in this matter, the proper course would be to institute an enquiry into the different methods of catching fish practised along the shores. A congress of the French, British and American Governments could effectually settle the matter, by uniting in a common legislative action, as the interests of each were deeply involved in preventing the fish from being destroyed.

MR. ROBTAILLE said there was no doubt the use of seines in the Baie des Chaleurs waters was very injurious to our fisheries. The moment the Americans, who came to the Bay in large numbers, commenced to use seines, they found that, not only the mackerel, but also the cod-fish diminished very much in quantity, and our own fishermen suffered in con-

sequence. Thus it was that our fishing grounds were, from year to year, being exhausted and ruined, and he hoped the Government would do everything in its power to prevent the continuation of the use of such destructive instruments.

MR. HACKETT said the use of the purse-seine had been brought about by Americans, and had proved a commercial success. The fishermen themselves, however, were opposed to this mode of fishing. He thought that, in speaking of the value of the fisheries, they need not refer to the intrinsic value of the fish. In the Province of Prince Edward Island, there were 8,000 or 10,000 persons engaged in the fisheries, and somewhere about 30,000 persons were dependent for their support upon this calling. Then, the fisheries of the Gulf must be the means of supplying the people of the Dominion of Canada with fish for a number of years. Having such valuable fisheries in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, it was the duty of the Government to use every means to preserve them intact, so that they should remain, not only a means of bringing wealth into the country, but also a means of supplying a very important article to our people. He considered it was also the duty of the Government to preserve the means of training our young fishermen for the mercantile marine. The people of Prince Edward Island were opposed to purse-seine fishing which was of a most destructive character, and it had been proved by experienced men that the fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence would be rendered unprofitable if this continued. He trusted, if the Government could not introduce any legislation on the subject, that they would enter into negotiations at once with the Washington Government, with a view to bring about measures that would prevent this mode of fishing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Other industries were asking for protection, and what the fishermen wanted was a fair field and no favour.

MR. ANGLIN said that, as the representative of a county in which there was a very large number of fishermen, he thought he should add his voice to those of the gentlemen who had already spoken upon the subject. It was important that they, who represented men engaged in the

fisheries of the Dominion, should impress upon the Government the necessity of doing anything within their power to put an end to this great and very serious evil. He thought that they might, perhaps, strengthen the hands of the Government, and enable them to approach the subject with a better chance of success. He was not himself prepared to suggest what course would be best to pursue. He believed a great deal of damage had been done by this mode of fishing, but it was a very serious question as to whether they had a right to legislate in regard to fishing, even within the three-mile limit, so as to restrict, even in appearance, the rights conferred on the Americans by treaty. His impression was that they had the right, but he thought that the people of the United States would question it, and that an attempt to enforce our right would lead to just such troublesome complications as they hoped to avoid when the Washington Treaty was made. The question was an exceedingly delicate one, and he rose to join the gentlemen representing counties in which there were large numbers of fishermen in the representations made, and in entreating that the Government would do whatever they found possible for the purpose of remedying this very serious evil.

MR. RICHEY said that this was a subject of the greatest importance. The facts lay within a very small compass, and had been efficiently presented to the consideration of the House. There were two points fully demonstrated by the evidence given before the Commission which sat in Halifax, namely, the exceeding great value of the fisheries around the Canadian coast, and the rapidity with which that value was being reduced, while this mode of gathering fish was permitted to continue. The evil was apparent; the question which remained was the remedy to be applied. They were told that, within the three-mile limit, American fishermen must submit to the local regulations. The difficulty, however, remained that, just immediately beyond that limit, they would continue this mode of gathering fish. He thought that even treaties must be subject to some reasonable interpretation, and the *maxim sic utere tuo ut alienum non*

laedus applied to rights thus obtained as well as under municipal law, and, if it was proved that this mode of catching fish was detrimental to the interests of all employed in the trade, a case might be fully and fairly made. For this reason he felt disposed so strongly to support this application, in order that further negotiations might be carried on, through the Imperial Government, with our neighbouring nation, and, if necessary, with the Government of France, to the end that some principle might be arrived at by which, in the future, this mode of destroying the North American Fisheries should be effectually prevented.

MR. MACDONNELL said he rose to endorse all that previous speakers had said, as to the destructiveness to our fisheries, of the contrivances referred to. He came from a portion of the Dominion, the Island of Cape Breton, in which the fisheries were most valuable. He considered that our most important fisheries were those around the two Islands of Cape Breton and Prince Edward. It had been said that, within the last two years, the value of our fisheries had suffered much by the methods of fishing complained of. It was, therefore, a matter of great importance that the Government should give the subject not only their serious, but their immediate attention, in order, if possible, that some preventive measure might be adopted to put an end to the evil during the coming season. The fishermen of the Island of Cape Breton were very outspoken and loud in their complaints as to the injurious and destructive effects of the mode of fishing pursued by the Americans.

MR. GILLMOR said he also represented a very considerable population engaged in fishing, and he could endorse what had been said by hon. gentlemen who had preceded him. In his constituency, 4,000 to 5,000 men were engaged in the fishery, and, although complaints against troll-fishing were numerous, a difference of opinion existed among the fishermen themselves. Those of the fishermen who were as well equipped as the Americans, did not wish to be deprived of this mode of fishing outside of the three-mile limit. Many claimed that this was the most profitable

MR. ANGLIN.

business, and was not injurious to the fisheries. He desired to draw attention to a communication he had just received respecting troll-fishing in the Quoddy River, that was the water between the American shore and Campobello. Here there were a great number of boats fishing with the hand-line, and he thought it would be advisable for the Government to take steps to prevent troll-fishing in that locality, but in outside waters, where American fishermen, in their large vessels were fishing with trolls just outside the three-mile limit, and could not be prevented, it would be unfair to our fishermen to prevent them from trolling just inside the three-mile line. If trolling was to be prevented, it must be general, and apply as well to Americans as to our own people. There was a great difference of opinion about the injury done to fishing by trolls, but a large majority, he thought, were opposed to it; but, as our fisheries were now situated, he thought the Government would find it a difficult matter to adjust satisfactorily. He trusted, however, that they would make the effort.

Mr. Fiset said that, as he had the honour to represent a county where a certain number of persons made fishing their principal occupation, he thought it his duty to say a few words upon the question now before the Chair. What struck him most forcibly was the want of discretion shown by fishermen who made use of seines in catching fish. They paid no attention to the quantity they took, which was sometimes twice or three times more than they could cure; but, like the Indians, they took as great a quantity as possible, at the risk of not being able to keep half, or even quarter, of what they had caught. What was the consequence? It was that these fishermen, after having taken from their nets the best fish, and having loaded their schooners or vessels, left the remainder of the fish, which were dead, and which often exceeded in quantity the amount kept. This quantity of dead fish was, in itself, an enormous loss; but there was another disadvantage, and that was that the dead fish prevented the live fish from frequenting their favourite haunts. It

was, no doubt, for this reason that the banks, that were for a number of years regarded as excellent fishing grounds, had now become abandoned and unprofitable. Moreover, it was not only in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence that this destruction was carried on; unfortunately, the same privilege had been granted to fish in the Bay of Seven Islands. In that beautiful bay, where the fish went to spawn in such great quantities, Mr. Cunningham, of the county of Shelburne, had enjoyed last year, the exclusive right of using seines in these waters, and had taken a considerable quantity of fish; whilst the inhabitants of the place, and our own poor Canadian fishermen, were obliged to look on, without being able to obtain from the Fisheries Department the permission to make use of the same kind of seines. That was a grave injustice. It had been stated that it was an experiment. That was true, but it was an experiment that had cost dear to the inhabitants of the locality, for it had deprived them of their only means of earning a living; and it was very probable that, if the experiment was tried again, this bay would become unproductive in a few years. At all events, if the right to use nets was again granted, he trusted it would not be given to a single person, but to all the inhabitants of the place, and to the inhabitants of the county of Rimouski. He, therefore, joined all the hon. members who had spoken before him, in order to urge upon the Government the necessity of taking any steps they might think proper to prevent this destruction of fish by the Americans, which was hurtful to our commerce, and so detrimental to our poor fishermen, who had not the means of procuring these costly apparatus.

Mr. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he was not aware that there was not any correspondence in the hands of the Government to bring down, but there was plenty of evidence given before the Halifax Commission, to prove the statements made by the gentlemen who had spoken upon the subject, particularly those from the Maritime Provinces. It was, however, a very important subject, and had been, and still was, under the serious consideration of the Government, who appreciated the value of the fisheries,

and would do all in its power to protect them. The Commission had established the fact that the practice now prevailing of using the seines would, if persevered in, entirely destroy the fisheries. It was not the quantity of marketable mackerel caught by the Americans that the people complained of so much as the number of fish destroyed by the use of the seines. It was true they were often used in deep water outside the three-mile limit, and over this we could exercise no control; but this did not affect us so seriously, because the fish killed and thrown over would not, to the same extent, poison the water of the inshore fisheries. If the indiscriminate use of these nets were continued, the inshore fisheries would, in a very short time, be entirely destroyed. Some of these nets were 250 fathoms long; with them they surrounded and caught all kinds of fish in large quantities, including the small and coarser fish which usually supplied food to our valuable cod-fishery. Hundreds of barrels of valuable herring were often taken by American schooners, but, not being valued, were thrown over and wasted, together with all the other fish taken in the nets, with the exception of the very small proportion of merchantable mackerel. The evils resulting from this practice could be well understood. To show the great value of these fisheries, he would state that for the last few years the quantity of mackerel annually caught on the coast of Nova Scotia was valued at \$1,307,000; on the coast of New Brunswick, \$97,000; of Quebec, \$87,000; of Prince Edward Island, \$291,000, making altogether \$1,782,000, and the yield had been about the same for some years past. If these fisheries were destroyed—as they certainly would be if this practice continued—the \$5,000,000 would be no compensation for their loss to the Maritime Provinces. In addition to the values just given, the Americans caught from 150,000 to 250,000 barrels of mackerel principally in our waters, making altogether some three or four million dollars per year as the value of the fisheries. Since these seines were being used, particularly along the shores of Prince Edward Island, many fishermen who had a number of boats fitted out for mackerel fishing, were now ruined, and the fisheries

were being destroyed. He could only say, in conclusion, that anything the Government could do to put a stop to this waste would be done.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNDARY OF ALASKA.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a copy of a memorandum of the circumstances that led to the conclusion of the Convention between Great Britain and Russia, of February, 1825; also, a copy of the Convention, if any, between Great Britain and the United States, of February, 1825, mentioned in Sessional Papers, 1878, 125, pages 27 and 30; also, a copy of the most reliable maps and charts of the Territory of Alaska, that existed in 1825, and that have been made since, including Russian, British and American maps and charts; and also, any reports that may have been made to the Government respecting the Alaskan boundary, that have not yet been published. He said that, as it had been suggested, by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that some reports had been made respecting the Alaskan boundary, it would be as well to include them in the return. He had heard it stated that the United States Government intended to make some provision for the government of Alaska, and to ask our Government to join them in defining the boundary between Alaska and British Columbia. Unfortunately for our country, the Imperial Government had neglected taking care of the interests of the western portions of this Dominion. When the Treaty of Washington was negotiated, in 1871, we were only allowed the right of free navigation in two or three of the rivers flowing from British Columbia through Alaska. Under the Convention of 1825 with Russia, we had the right to navigate all the rivers that ran out of our territory and through Alaska, but by the act of Russia in 1867, in transferring the territory of Alaska to the United States, we lost the right of navigating the rivers. He thought the Joint High Commission at Washington might have included all the rivers the same as the Convention of 1825, although he did not blame the Commission for not having done so, because any nation might abro-

MR. POPE.

grate a treaty by its own act, or by a new treaty. But Alaska was now becoming of some importance from its furs and minerals. Several steamers were running between Stikine, British Columbia and Alaska, conveying from 2,000 to 3,000 passengers yearly. Consequently, they ought to have all the information they could get respecting this boundary question. He had found that the maps published with regard to Alaska were very imperfect. Some time ago he had seen a map in the office of the Minister of Public Works, which showed that the River Yukon ran into the Arctic Ocean, whereas it discharged into Behring's Sea, an arm of the Pacific Ocean. He asked, in his motion, that the Russian maps, as well as the British and American, should be brought down. He believed that the Western Union Telegraph Company, when exploring that country for telegraph purposes, had published a map giving a great deal more correct information respecting the geography of the country than the other maps, and he believed that the interior of Northern British Columbia, as well as Alaska, would be found much better laid down by the topographical staff of the Western Union Company than by anybody else. However, he asked that the papers might be brought down, and the information placed before the House in advance of any negotiations that might take place with the United States Government with respect to Alaska.

MR. MILLS said he had no doubt the hon. the Minister of the Interior had looked into this question, and was able to say if it was possible to bring down the maps that had been asked for. He (Mr. Mills) believed it would take a good deal of time, and some expense would be incurred in preparing all that the motion asked for, nor did he think the documents would throw any additional light upon the subject. He supposed the correspondence would include the memorandum of Sir Charles Napier, relating to the Treaty of 1825, between Great Britain and Russia. There was no treaty, he believed, concluded between the United States and Great Britain, at that time. However, there was correspondence between the Ameri-

can Government and that of St. Petersburg, upon this subject, because the Territory upon the Pacific coast at that point was claimed by the three Powers, Great Britain, America and Russia. If the hon. gentleman obtained the correspondence, he would see that negotiations had taken place, in the first instance, between the Governments of St. Petersburg and Great Britain, who failed to arrive at any settlement of the matter; that ultimately the points in dispute between the two Governments were disposed of in the Treaty of 1825, which gave to Russia a narrow strip of territory upon the coast south of Mount St. Elias, extending as far south as Portland Channel, upon the express condition that all the rivers flowing through this Russian territory should be open to navigation by Great Britain, for all purposes whatsoever. It would be seen, by the correspondence, that both Governments claimed the sovereignty of the soil, that Great Britain ceded to Russia the territory which she claimed, but, at the same time, retaining an equal right, or an equal sovereignty, in the rivers flowing through this relinquished territory to the ocean; so that these rivers were not only open to Great Britain for the purposes of ordinary commercial navigation, but were open to the people of Great Britain, and to any persons who might settle in the interior country, subjects of Her Majesty, for any purposes of navigation whatsoever. It was under this treaty that the British Columbian authorities undertook to take Mr. Martin from the northern part of British Columbia down to Stikine River, with the view of imprisoning him at Victoria for the offence for which he had been convicted. The correspondence would also show that the Law Officers of the Crown had, in answer to a communication dated the 16th August last, from the Colonial Secretary, Lord Carnarvon, expressed the opinion that the people of Canada had lost the rights which they possessed under the Treaty of St. Petersburg, by the negotiations which took place at Washington in 1871, and by the treaty by which those negotiations were concluded. The hon. gentleman (Mr. DeCromos) would see that statement given in a communication by the Law Officers of the Crown, and quoted

by the then Minister of Justice. They said that, although Great Britain did not withdraw any right, nor could she have lost any right, by any negotiations between Russia and the United States in 1867, because Russia, in conveying the territory of Alaska to the United States, could not convey to the United States any greater interest than she actually possessed, and she could not convey to the United States the interest that the Government or the Crown of Great Britain had in the navigation of these rivers, because they stated that that could not be done without the consent of Great Britain. But they further advised, upon this ground, that, because the Treaty of St. Petersburg had been abrogated by the Treaty of Washington, the Government of Canada should, at the earliest moment, release Mr. Martin. The hon. gentleman would see, therefore, that, if the people on the western coast were now in a worse position than they were before, it was due to the negotiations which took place at Washington, and which were consummated by the celebrated treaty known as the Treaty of Washington.

MR. DECOSMOS said he could not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) when he said that the people of the Pacific coast were not in as good a position now as formerly; and that it was due to the Treaty of Washington of 1871. The Russian Government, in 1867, by selling the Territory of Alaska to the United States, abrogated the Convention of 1825. So far as the objection raised by the hon. gentleman, even supposing the Convention negotiated in 1825 still existed, it would be a matter of doubt whether it would be within the terms of that treaty to use the Stikine and other rivers except for purposes of commerce. He contended that the negotiators of the Washington Treaty, 1871, neglected their duty.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there were two opinions on that subject. Perhaps the best international lawyer in England, Mr. Montague Barnard, a member of the Commission at Washington, and Lord Tenterden, who had taken part in some of the most important treaties that England had negotiated,

MR. MILLS.

both were united in the opinion that, by the transfer of Alaska, the effect of the treaty of 1825 was gone. It was also the opinion of Mr. Gladstone's Government, and if that opinion were correct, the fact that the three rivers had been put into the treaty could do no harm. If the papers could be brought down within a reasonable time, they would be brought down.

MR. MILLS said he had observed that it was very strange these opinions were not communicated to the British Ambassador at Washington. He had met Sir Edward Thornton, who, he knew, was not aware of the existence of any such opinions.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could not tell what conversation the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had with Sir Edward Thornton; but it was a matter for him whether he should repeat that conversation or not.

Motion agreed to.

MAILS IN THE PARISH OF ST. FABIEN.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. FISET moved for all correspondence since the 10th of October, 1873, between the Post Office Department, or any officer thereof, and any person or persons whatsoever of the parish of St. Fabien, respecting the contract for carrying the mail between the railway station and the post-office of the said parish.

Motion agreed to.

RESERVATION OF LOTS ON RED RIVER, MANITOBA.

MOTION FOR ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

MR. DUBUC moved for a copy of the Order or Orders in Council by which certain lots of land on the Red River, in Manitoba, were reserved for settlement, as it appears by a notice published by the Surveyor-General, and dated the 14th November, 1877. He said that the lands mentioned in this motion were situated along the Red River, in the parishes of St. Agathe and St. Norbert, in the county of Provencher. Before the Province of Manitoba had been annexed to Canada, there existed a custom by which each inhabit-

ant could take up a lot of land in the uninhabited parts, and become the proprietor of the same. By this taking up of the land, the settler was regarded as having acquired certain rights, the right of the first occupier. This custom had been observed by the whole population, and recognised by the Council of Assiniboia, which was at that time the constituted authority. This custom was respected as law. A certain number of settlers, taking advantage of the custom referred to, had taken up lands along the Red River. Later on, several of them settled down there with their families; others sold their right to new settlers who had bought in good faith, paying the ordinary price for land in that locality, and who had settled on these lands. All these settlers had much improved their farms. He knew of some who had spent upon their land all they had, who had built nice houses, and who had now establishments worth from twelve to fifteen hundred dollars. What had not been the surprise of these settlers when they had seen, in the fall of 1877, an official notice, bearing the signature of the Surveyor-General of the Dominion, Lieutenant-Colonel Dennis, and dated November 14th, 1877, stating that a certain number of these lots, designated in the notice, had been reserved and withdrawn from settlement; and that the settlement thereon would not be recognised by the Government. This news spread consternation among them. According to the wording of the notice, they had not even the right to acquire from the Government these lands that they had already bought, paid for, and improved. After having spent all their money and built up fine settlements, at the price of three or four years of hard labour and privations, they saw themselves suddenly threatened with being driven out of their homes and cast upon the highway. This was enough to dishearten them; they did not, however, allow themselves to be cast down, nor did they abandon all hope. They had gone, in the first place, to the offices of the Dominion Lands, at Winnipeg, in order to learn the reasons that had been assigned for this withdrawal from settlement of lots occupied by them. They received answer that these reasons had not been transmitted from Ottawa, and that

they were entirely unknown. His aim in asking for these Orders in Council respecting this withdrawal, was to endeavour to ascertain, if it were possible, the motives that had actuated the late Government in making this reserve, and the purposes for which these lands had been so withdrawn. The House would, perhaps, be then able to see what remedy could be applied, and how these settlers could be prevented from being deprived of their property.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there could be no objection to these papers being brought down, but he was not at all sure whether the Order in Council would give the necessary information. If the hon. gentleman would do him the favour of going to his (Sir John's A. Macdonald's) office, he would have an opportunity of examining all the papers, and all the reasons why the Government had passed those Orders in Council referred to in this motion. There could be no objection to the motion passing now.

Motion agreed to.

NEW BRUNSWICK ELECTION PETITIONS.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. DOMVILLE moved for returns in reference to election petitions filed in New Brunswick; when they were filed; what progress has been made in reference to the trial of the petitions; in what cases preliminary objections were filed to the petitions; when these objections were argued; before what Judges; what judgments were given, and in what cases.

MR. ANGLIN said that the motion of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), was a repetition in another way of a statement made by that gentleman the other day, and was, he thought, an attack upon the Judiciary of the Province of New Brunswick. It seemed, at least, to suggest that the Judges of that Province had been remiss in their duty. He believed that was not a fact. In a large number of election petitions that had been presented there,—he thought there were ten of them—preliminary objections had been raised. The arguments in those cases

had occupied a great deal of time, and the Judges had taken, in some cases, time for consideration before giving their decision. The Judges had had several other matters of public importance to attend to. The Chief Justice, for instance, was occupied in an important murder trial for several weeks, and, of course, could not interrupt that trial to attend to election cases. The hon. gentleman, too, was one of those against whom a petition had been filed. He (Mr. Anglin) had heard it said that the Judge before whom that petition would be heard, had had ample leisure to attend to it, but he had not been moved on the behalf of the hon. member to any action in the matter. It might be that the petitioners had been remiss; they, perhaps, caused some delay in the trial of the case of which he supposed the hon. gentleman was desirous to get rid as soon as possible. He believed it was in his (Mr. Domville's) power, if he chose, to take the necessary steps to force an early trial of that petition. He thought it was absurd for him (Mr. Domville) to ask the interposition of the Dominion Government in the matter at all; nor did he think it necessary to throw any suspicion upon the character and conduct of gentlemen who, he thought, were ornaments to the Bench. He thought that it was not, to any extent, or in any degree, their fault that decisions had not been obtained with regard to these election petitions. The hon. gentleman would wish them to entertain the idea that the petition against him was a great grievance; that the conduct of his election had been perfectly pure; that he stood ready in his seat to hurl defiance at all who brought against him such charges of corrupt practices. It was a high position for him to take, and, if he maintained it, it would be an honourable position, but he would not gain anything by attacking the Judges against whom those charges had been made, as they had always performed their duties fairly.

MR. DOMVILLE said his object in moving for these papers was not to cast any reflection on the Judges of New Brunswick, but to show the public of Canada that, whatever the cause might be, they could not get the election petitions

tried in New Brunswick, and, with the exception of Judge Wetmore, who had acted promptly, no decisions had been given, even on the preliminary objections, which was outrageous, as almost six months had elapsed since the elections. His hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) had remarked that they had to try a murder case in Moncton, and had other work to do of equal magnitude. This might be the case, but then it only went to prove what he stated, and there was no guarantee that these trials would take place for another twelve months, unless the Government stepped in and compelled the Judges to try the cause referred to. If those petitions had been tried, and decisions given, it would be found several gentlemen, now in the House would not be entitled to the seats they occupied, and it was defeating the object of the Election Act to allow persons accused of corrupt acts to hold their seats for want of a proper trial as laid down by the law. The country expected the law to be carried out without respect to persons. It must seem manifestly unjust to delay, without necessity, the trial of election petitions. If there was any necessity—if, as the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) said, there was no time for the trials, the House should make some regulation that would enable them to be tried. It was on that ground he (Mr. Domville) complained. He cast no suspicion on the Judges. His hon. friend said he stood here above suspicion. He hoped so. But, if he Mr. (Domville) should be unseated, he would not be any worse than many of his fellow-members, but, at any rate, his conduct would not disqualify him, as some of them had been disqualified. His hon. friend (Sir A. J. Smith) had said "hear, hear." Perhaps he (Mr. Domville) had not spent so much money as that hon. gentleman at election time, but money was not as plentiful with him as the hon. gentleman at that time, and therefore he had had a double reason in not breaking the law. The hon. member for Gloucester said he (Mr. Domville) could have brought his trial on. Was it worth his while or necessary for him to ask for the trial of his case? Did he put in any preliminary objection, however? No. When the hon. gentleman's political friends telegraphed from

MR. ANGLIN.

Fredericton that they would withdraw their opposition to him (Mr. Domville), if his friends would do so in their case; his answer was: No; go on. He would not connive at any breach of the law. Consequently he put in no preliminary objection, but said: Try the case out. He did not, then, think that anybody would have expected him to call upon people to try his case, which it was for his accusers to do. If his (Mr. Domville's) party had had any power in the matter, they would have had the petition tried. His object in making his motion was to call attention to the fact that New Brunswick, having returned four or five supporters of the present Government, and a majority on the other, or Opposition side, they could not get tried the cases of the hon. gentlemen against whom there were petitions. That was the plain English of the matter. If his friends said this was because the judges had too much work, let the fact be known. If the hon. gentlemen wished to insinuate that he wanted to throw suspicion on them, it was quite immaterial to him; he had not made such a statement. Unless these cases were tried soon, the people of New Brunswick would begin to view the matter with suspicion.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he trusted that his hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville), having expressed his views on this subject, would withdraw his motion, inasmuch as the papers asked for, were not under the control of the Government, and therefore could not be brought down.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

MR. HAGGART moved for a detailed statement of all moneys and for what paid, on the following Public Works, up to the 1st March, 1879:—Those portions of the Pacific Railway called the Pembina Branch Extension; the part from Fort William to Sunshine Creek; the part from Sunshine Creek to English River; the part from Rat Portage to Cross Lake, and the expenditure at Thunder Bay; and the expenditure on the Fort Frances Canal.

Motion *agreed to*.

MR. CARON moved for a return of all tenders containing schedules of quantities and prices at the letting of contracts Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 25, Canadian Pacific Railway; contracts made on same; schedule of quantities actually paid for, and estimate of quantities and cost of work to be done on each of these contracts; also, all correspondence or instructions relative to any changes in the character or construction of the said works.

Motion *agreed to*.

THE "NORTHERN LIGHT."

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. VALIN moved for copies of the tenders received for the building of the steamboat *Northern Light*; the names of the parties tendering, and the price agreed upon in the contract, and all the papers connected with her construction; the names of the inspectors employed during the construction of that vessel, and the salary paid to such inspectors; the amount expended for repairs effected on this boat since it began to run; and also, the sum paid to keep it running between Pictou and Georgetown up to the 1st January, 1879. He said two years ago, when tenders were called for the building of the *Northern Light*, he met on board train a party who told him that he had a model for the Public Works Department, upon which the steamer for the ferry service between Pictou and Johnstown was to be built. He found, on enquiry, that no tender had been called for, and that the contract had been let without it. It astonished him (Mr. Valin), a practical shipbuilder, that the Government would accept a vessel of the kind in question for such a trying and difficult service. The *Northern Light* was every way unsuitable for it. She was too short, her frame was too light, she was not sufficiently raised at the bow and was built of soft wood instead of hard wood; she was not cased as required. She was launched and christened the *Northern Light*, but, under all the circumstances of her construction, should have been called the Political Light. Tenders should have been called for and the vessel built in a suitable manner. She was unfit for running into, breaking through and

clearing away the ice ; being also too high and narrow, and too slim. On one occasion, he was personally aware that her passengers, taken on at Georgetown, were anxious to get off her. The very first year of her service, her builder was compelled to go down and help to push her through the ice.

MR. HOLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYÉS.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

MR. MILLS, in the absence of Mr. HUNTINGTON, moved for a copy of all reports, papers, and documents relating to the employment of W. F. Forsyth in the Post Office Department ; and all correspondence connected therewith.

Motion agreed to.

MR. MILLS, in the absence of Mr. HUNTINGTON, moved for a copy of all reports, papers, and documents relating to the superannuation of Mr. LeSueur, formerly of the Post Office Department ; and all correspondence connected therewith.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS.

MOTION FOR TENDERS.

MR. BERGIN moved for copies of all tenders received by the Department of Public Works for the construction, enlargement or renewal of all canals, railways, piers, docks and harbours in the Dominion, from the 1st day of May, 1873, to the 1st of March, 1879, giving the names of the tenderers, the schedule prices accompanying, or forming part of, each tender, the estimated quantities in detail on which the aggregate sum of each tender was ascertained ; specifying the lowest tender in each case ; the names of the parties to whom each contract was awarded ; the engineer's estimate in detail of the cost of each con-

MR. VALIN.

tract ; the time at which each contract stipulated the work should be completed, and the time at which, if finished, it was actually completed ; the gross amount paid each contractor in fulfilment of his contract, and the actual quantities in which such gross sum was computed as compared with the estimated quantities ; specifying the contracts still incomplete, the percentage of each kind of work remaining undone, the percentage or gross sum of contract paid, and the percentage which should have been paid in proportion to the amount of work performed ; the amount paid on each contract unfinished on account of progress estimates, and the amount of deductions remaining on the hands of the Government ; the nature, character, and amount of deposit for security on each contract in the hands of the Government ; the names of any contractors who have failed in fulfilling their contract, and the amount of the deposits and deductions from progress estimates forfeited on account of such failure or non-fulfilment of the contract ; all contracts of the above kind of works awarded without calling for tenders ; all changes made by Order in Council, or otherwise, in any such contracts, whether in prices or in any other manner, relieving the contractor of his obligations, with a full detail of such changes.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said, in the absence of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that a large portion of the information asked for had been already furnished in returns laid on the table of the House, but that whatever remained to be furnished would be sent down.

Motion agreed to.

SOUTH GRENVILLE ELECTION.

MOTION FOR ENQUIRY.

MR. MCCARTHY moved :

"That the petition of George C. Longley, and others, praying that an enquiry may be made, as provided by 39 Victoria, chapter 10, Sections 9 and 10, into certain alleged corrupt practices in the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Grenville, be read at the Table of this House."

Motion agreed to, and petition read accordingly.

MR. McCARTHY moved :

"That an Address be voted to His Excellency the Governor General, representing to His Excellency that a petition has, within fourteen days from the opening of Parliament, being the first meeting of Parliament subsequent to the holding of the election hereinafter referred to, been presented to this House, signed by more than twenty-five electors of the Electoral District of the South Riding of Grenville, in the Province of Ontario, in which petition it is alleged that no petition charging the existence of corrupt practices has been presented under the Act for the trial of Controverted Elections against the return of the member elected for the said electoral division to this House, at the election holden on the tenth and seventeenth days of September, 1878, and in which petition it is further alleged that corrupt practices have, or that there is reason to believe corrupt practices have, extensively prevailed at the said election holden on the said tenth and seventeenth days of September, of a member for this House for the said electoral division; and further, representing to His Excellency that annexed to the said petition is a solemn declaration made under the Statute in that behalf, signed by the petitioners, stating that they are such electors, and that the allegations of the petition are true to the best of their knowledge and belief; and praying that His Excellency the Governor-General do cause enquiry to be made under the Act of Parliament of Canada passed in the thirty-ninth year of the reign of Her present Majesty, intitled: An Act to provide for more effectual enquiry into the existence of corrupt practices at elections of members of the House of Commons by one or more of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, or by one or more of the Judges competent under the Dominion Controverted Election Act, 1874, to try an election petition for any District of the Province of Ontario, into the alleged existence of such alleged corrupt practices in the electoral district of the South Riding of Grenville, and for that purpose do appoint a Commissioner or Commissioners under the said Act."

He said the object was to have an enquiry made into the alleged existence of corrupt practices in the South Riding of Grenville. His hon friend opposite (Mr. Holton) had suggested, and he (Mr. M. Carthy) thought very properly, that this, being the first application of this kind under the Statute, it was but right that they should be careful in their procedure, as they were about to establish a precedent. The matter, he thought, should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. As far as he saw, the petition was in proper form. It purported to be signed by twenty-five electors of the electoral division. He supposed it would still be

a matter within the discretion of the House whether an Address would or would not be presented, and it was necessary they should proceed carefully in the matter, which was not so much for the purpose of punishing parties as it was for disfranchising a constituency, if it was proved that corrupt practices existed to the extent alleged in the petition.

MR. HOLTON moved, in amendment :

"That the said petition be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, with instructions to enquire and report as to the sufficiency and regularity thereof; and also to report as to the expediency of passing the Address prayed for, and that the said Committee have power to report an Address, or otherwise, as they may think fit."

He said there were obviously two branches of this subject. The first was the examination of the regularity of the petition, and the verification of its allegations as far as possible, and the obtaining of the report of the Committee on the facts; secondly, to advise the House as to the exercise of its discretion in passing the Address which was prayed for. That was the whole purport of the amendment which remitted the whole subject to the Judicial Committee of the House, in order that any precedent that might be established might be carefully considered. This appeared to him to be the proper mode of dealing with this subject on this occasion. No one proposed to protest against a proper enquiry into the subject by recommending this course. There was no precisely similar case on the books in England, and, therefore, he had concluded to move this amendment.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) asked whether the last clause of the amendment was in form. The Statute said that, on the presentation of the petition, the House should pass the Address.

MR. HOLTON said the Statute provided that it should be lawful for the House to pass the Address. It was a matter within the discretion of the House. The sufficiency and regularity of the petition might be established before the Committee, but before the House proceeded to exercise its discretion

in putting a constituency upon its trial, he thought it eminently proper that they should have the deliverance on the point of that Judicial Committee which was composed of the leading lawyers and most experienced parliamentarians.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said it did not strike him that it was within the functions of the Committee to recommend the propriety or non-propriety of passing the Address. It seemed to him to be arrogating to the Committee the power of the whole House.

MR. MILLS said he did not see what other course could be taken, under the circumstances. At present there was no such Statute on the Statute-books of England. Before the adoption of the Controverted Elections Act, similar petitions were left to the Attorney-General to enquire into the sufficiency of the evidence upon which the petition rested, and to advise the House. Now, in this case, they had no evidence before them as to the accuracy of these allegations. They did not even know whether the petitioners themselves were genuine *bond fide* voters. Beyond the allegation thus made they had no means of judging as to how far they were right, supposing the petition to have been made in good faith and signed by *bond fide* voters. They had no means of correctly forming opinions as to the applicability of the law to the facts on which the petition was based. In England the Attorney-General made the necessary enquiries and the House ruled on his representations as to whether a commission should issue in compliance with the prayer of the petition or not. Here they had no officer of the Crown to advise them; and he was of opinion that there was nothing else for the House to do than to refer the petition and the motion for an Address to the Committee on Privileges and Elections as recommended in the motion of his hon. friend beside him. That Committee was possessed to some extent of judicial functions, and could perform those duties which, in England, were performed by the Law Officers of the Crown; they could report to this House whether the evidence upon which these

MR. HOLTON.

petitioners had prayed for a Commission was sufficient to justify the House in complying with the prayer of the petition which had been presented to the House.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he thought his hon. friend was entirely mistaken as to the position in which this petition stood, because the Statute had provided the evidence upon which the House should act. He admitted that the petition properly went before the Committee to enquire into its validity, if necessary, and the sufficiency of the allegation it contained. The only doubt which he entertained was, whether it would be within the functions of the Committee to express any opinion to the House as to the propriety of the course which the House should pursue on finding the petition sufficient. He desired to ask his hon. friend whether—and his acquaintance with the rules of the House would relieve him at once—the Committee was competent to report in favour of an Address, or otherwise, because this being an amendment to his hon. friend's motion, that an Address be passed, it appeared to him a difficulty might occur.

MR. HOLTON: No, I do not think there can be any difficulty in that regard.

MR. McCARTHY said the same difficulty had occurred to him. If the Committee reported in favour of an Address, then it might be urged that the House had disposed of the matter by the amendment.

MR. MILLS said there was a similar motion last Session to expel the Speaker. The amendment carried, but it did not override the motion.

MR. HOLTON said there was no objection to adding to the amendment, "and, if they saw fit, to report an Address."

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): Very well.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

HYDRAULIC LEASES ON THE CORN- WALL CANAL.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BERGIN moved for copy of a return of all hydraulic leases on the Cornwall Canal, showing whether any of such leases had expired, and if so, whether any such leases, and in whose favour, had been renewed previous to the 17th September last, and all correspondence in connection therewith.

Motion agreed to.

ST. JOHN PENITENTIARY.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. WELDON moved for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Justice and the Local Government of New Brunswick relating to the claims of the city and county of St. John, and the other counties in that Province, to send prisoners under sentence for less than two years to the St. John Penitentiary, and all other correspondence on the subject; together with any representations and memorials from the Government of New Brunswick and the General Sessions of the city and county of St. John, and any reports made upon the subject; and all minutes in Council relating thereto. He said that in 1838 the city and county of St. John erected a House of Correction for the confinement of prisoners sent from the sessions of the city and county courts. In 1841, the Province, seeing the benefits of the institution, asked that the privilege of confining prisoners therein be extended to the whole Province, and an arrangement was accordingly made with the city and county of St. John by which the Province offered to contribute certain amounts, and from that time prisoners were sent there from all over the Province to the House of Correction, which was thereafter called the Provincial Penitentiary. Certain monies were paid by the Province to reimburse the county; but, by the Act which was passed, transferring it, it was provided that all vagabonds, rogues, and others convicted of minor offences, for a term not exceeding forty days, should be sent to the Penitentiary. There had been some difficulty in finding out what arrangement had been made, as most of

the parties who had taken an active part in the matter had departed this life. In the year 1852, the city and county of St. John applied to the Legislature for power to make an assessment for £2,000, which was owing by the city and county, and which had not been provided for by the Province or reimbursed the county. This £2,000 was paid by the city and county of St. John, and, at the same time, it was a part of the contract that this Penitentiary should be made use of as formerly. He found that the same provision was made by chapter 91 of the Revised Statutes, and it existed until the time of the union of the Provinces. By the Act of Union, this Penitentiary came into the possession of the Dominion Government, and, by the same Act, the debts and liabilities of the Province were assumed by the Dominion of Canada. By the Act of 1868, and the subsequent Act of 1869, it was provided that no prisoners should be imprisoned in the Penitentiary for less than two years. Exception, however, was made in regard to the Province of New Brunswick from the operation of the Act, in regard to this class of prisoners up to 1874. In 1874, that time was extended to 1876; and, in 1876, the exception was continued to 1878. During the last Session, an Act was passed by which that was extended to 1879. He presumed the Penitentiary which was being erected at Dorchester, N. B., for the three Maritime Provinces, would soon be finished, and the prisoners transferred to that institution, and then the question would arise as to what course the Government would take regarding the short-term prisoners. Of course, it was contended, on behalf of the city and county, that this was a contract between the Province of New Brunswick and the county, and it was a liability which, in point of equity, the Dominion had a right to assume, and for which the city and county had a right to receive payment. It was a matter which, he believed, ought to be looked into. It was a matter of reciprocity as between the two parties, which might be referred to the Supreme Court, if the Dominion Government should not feel themselves at liberty to act until the legal rights in the case, between the city and county of St. John, could be ascertained. As the

time when the present Act expired was fast approaching, he hoped some immediate action would be taken in the matter.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said there could be no objection to bringing down the papers asked for by his hon. friend. He would, however, suggest to him whether, in order to obtain all the papers which might perhaps be necessary to effect his object, he ought not to have amended his motion by adding "reports and minutes of Council," because his apprehension, from the slight knowledge he had of the facts of the case, was that one or more representations of the case had been made by parties representing the city of St. John and by the Dominion Government, and, if he recollected rightly, a minute or minutes of Council respecting the relation of the parties to each other were on file, and, perhaps, it would be better for his hon. friend to amend his motion so as to get all the information. He believed his hon. friend had stated the facts of the case correctly. It had grown out of the fact that at a very early period of the history of St. John, what was now the Penitentiary was the common jail; and, instead of the higher class of long-term criminals only being imprisoned, as in Penitentiaries in the other Provinces, it had been made the receptacle for all classes of prisoners. St. John now claimed that the Dominion should maintain in the Penitentiary, as criminals maintained by the Dominion, those that, in other Provinces, were maintained in jails, as municipal prisoners, by the Provinces themselves, or by the municipalities in which the prisoners were placed. The question had been very fully discussed by the representatives of St. John, and by the Department of Justice, on the part of the Dominion Government. His apprehension was, that, if his hon. friend would amend his motion in the way he (Mr. McDonald) suggested the information would be more explicit than by simply bringing down the correspondence on the subject.

Mr. WELDON said he had no objection to amending the motion as suggested.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

MR. WELDON.

MIDDLESEX INSPECTOR OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. MACMILLAN moved for copies of all correspondence in connection with the suspending of J. J. Spettigue, Inspector of Weights and Measures for the city of London and the East Riding of Middlesex, the District Inspector's Report, and all, if any, correspondence as to his re-instatement.

Motion *agreed to*.

KINCARDINE HARBOUR WORKS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. FARROW moved for a return of all expenditure in the town of Kincardine, county of Bruce, in connection with harbour work from the 1st of May, 1873, to the last of October, 1878; return to include all wages paid to dredge and tug crews, to tradesmen for repairs and provisions; also, any further amounts paid to tradesmen elsewhere in connection with the dredge; also, the proportion of Mr. Kingsford's salary and travelling expenses fairly chargeable to this work.

Motion *agreed to*.

REPAIRS TO BERTHIER WHARF.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

Mr. LANDRY moved for a statement showing:—1st. The number of men employed in repairing the wharf at Berthier, in the county of Montmagny, in each year since 1874; 2nd. The names of the superintendents of such works; 3rd. The names of the persons to whom the money was remitted; 4th. The amounts remitted each year to such persons; together with copies of all documents, correspondence and pay-lists connected with the said work.

Motion *agreed to*.

CLAIM FOR GOODS LOST AT AUSTRALIAN EXHIBITION.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. HOOPER, in the absence of Mr. KILVERT, moved for copies of all correspondence and papers relating to a claim made by one Samuel J. Moore, of the city of Hamilton, against the Government for the value of certain goods

exhibited at the Australian Exhibition in 1877, which goods were lost while under Government control.

MR. POPE (Compton) said he would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion, as the matter had been settled. His attention had been called to it last week, and he was sure Mr. Moore was quite satisfied with the settlement that had been made.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

SUPERANNUATION OF MIDDLESEX INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. MACMILLAN moved for copies of all correspondence or reports which led to the superannuation of Peter McClary, Collector of Inland Revenue, for the city of London and East Riding of Middlesex.

Motion *agreed to*.

VACCINATION OF THE CHICOUTIMI INDIANS.

MOTION FOR INSTRUCTIONS.

MR. CIMON moved for copies of instructions given to Dr. Lacombe, of Chicoutimi, as to the vaccinating of the Indians of the county of Chicoutimi; of all reports and correspondence on the subject, and of the accounts furnished by Dr. Lacombe, with a statement showing the items of the accounts paid; the whole from 1st January, 1874, to date.

Motion *agreed to*.

VACCINATING SAGUENAY INDIANS.

MOTION FOR INSTRUCTIONS.

MR. CIMON moved for copies of all instructions given to Dr. F. X. Laterriere of Chicoutimi, as to vaccinating the Indians of the county of Saguenay; of all reports and correspondence on the subject, and of the accounts furnished by Dr. Laterriere, with a statement showing the items of the accounts paid; the whole from 1st January, 1874, to date.

Motion *agreed to*.

WORKS AT GROSSE ISLE.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANDRY moved for a statement showing:—1st. The number and the names of all persons employed each year, since 1874, upon the different works at Grosse Isle; 2nd. The nature of the work on which each man was employed during that period; 3rd. The sums paid out to each person as salary; 4th. The names of the superintendents of the different works; 5th. The sums of money entrusted to those superintendents; also, for copies of all instructions, correspondence, pay-lists and all documents whatsoever respecting the said works.

Motion *agreed to*.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE FISHERIES AWARD.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. YEO moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Prince Edward Island, and other local Governments in the Dominion, and the Dominion Government, relative to the appropriation and distribution of the fishery award. He said that the Imperial Government had paid Newfoundland nearly a million of dollars of the fishery award; and the people of Prince Edward Island, he contended, had as good a right to a portion of that award as Newfoundland. Their inshore and coast fisheries were quite as good as those of Newfoundland, and, in some respects, better, as the Halifax Commission had ascertained. Their coasts were the best fishing-grounds in the Dominion. The assent of Prince Edward Island was required to the fishery provisions of the Washington Treaty, by Article XXXIII of that Treaty. The Island was, therefore, an independent Province at the time, and a party to the treaty. The Province did assent to it, by an Act of its Legislature, passed in 1872, and was clearly entitled to a proportion of the money awarded as compensation for its fisheries. It would have had its share of the award, if the Commission had adjudicated, as it ought to have done, before the Island entered the Dominion. The people of the Island asked no more than their rights in this matter,

rights which they had not given up when they consented to join the Dominion. It had been stated that they would get their share in breakwaters, lighthouses, harbour improvements and public works of this sort. This, the people of the Island were opposed to, for they knew that by the terms of Confederation it was stipulated that all such works should be constructed and maintained by the general Government. It was understood and desired that Prince Edward Island's share of the award should be set apart for the benefit of its inhabitants. The people of the Island had been told by the present Minister of Marine that they never would get justice done them until the Island had a representative in the Cabinet. He was now a member of the Government, and it was to be hoped that he would use his influence and exert himself to have justice done them in this matter of the fishery award with as little delay as possible. With regard to the question of the mode of fishing in the waters of the Maritime Provinces, he agreed with what had been said in the early part of the day on that subject. He considered that the use of seines was ruinous to our fisheries. If not prohibited, the fishermen of Prince Edward Island might as well leave the country. Considering the disadvantages they lay under from their isolated position, being almost cut off from the rest of the world for six months of the year, and the great loss they sustained by the surrender of their fishing interests to the Americans, he hoped that the Government would look favourably on their claims and accord to them their rights.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne), in seconding the resolution, said that he hoped any correspondence with the other Maritime Provinces on this subject might also be brought down. This was a question of great importance to the people of those Provinces. The Washington Treaty had given away the people's rights to the fisheries along 3,000 miles of coast line, and, in the speeches made here to-day, members had learned the result of that treaty to those fisheries, that the Americans were destroying them wholesale. Those fisheries had already done something for the Dominion. Before the present First Minister arrived

MR. YEO.

from Washington, many hon. members would recollect the opposition that arose to this treaty, and that it had been difficult to pass the fishery clauses through the House; and not until the Imperial Parliament had guaranteed the interest on a loan of two and half millions sterling, were they agreed to. That guarantee saved for the Dominion, calculating the thirty years of the loan, \$2,300,000, which had not been expended for the benefit of the fishermen of the Lower Provinces, but for the people of the west, in the enlargement of the canals along the St. Lawrence, and on the Pacific Railroad. Under the treaty, the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces were given away, while the western or inland and British Columbia fisheries still belonged to the Dominion. Now, for the next ten or fifteen years as during the past five, the larger proportion of expenditure for Public Works would be in the west. It seemed the desire of successive Governments to develop the west, from which the eastern Provinces were receiving no benefit, while the money paid over for their fisheries, they were told, was not to be divided among them, while, at the expiration of the treaty, the fisheries would be almost destroyed. They of the Lower Provinces claimed, therefore, that this money should be expended in a general way for the benefit of the fishermen and their resources. This was not a sectional but a national desire, because, if their fisheries were destroyed, one of the most important national industries would be exhausted. As to the mode of expending the award, he did not take the view of the last speaker (Mr. Yeo) in favour of outlays on breakwaters, harbours and so forth. A certain portion should be funded, and the interest kept, in case the Washington Treaty was extended ten years, and the fisheries clauses continued, for the benefit of the fishermen who would be injured by them; this money might be used in the protection of our fish, and the improvement of our river fisheries, a most important interest in Nova Scotia. Along its coast those fisheries were destroyed, particularly in his, the Shelburne, district. A portion of the money spent in the improvement of the river fisheries, would benefit the deep sea fisheries also, which

depended largely upon them. He hoped the Government would expend this money for the benefit of the Lower Provinces, which, he had reason to believe, it was the desire of the late Government to do.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) : There is no correspondence between the Local Government of the Lower Provinces and the Dominion Government, with respect to the distribution of this award.

MR. FORTIN said he thought the question was very important, since it meant the disposal of \$5,500,000. By the action of the Government on this matter, the people would be able to judge whether the money was justly or unjustly disposed of. He did not entirely agree with the hon. gentlemen who had just spoken as regarded the manner in which the money should be distributed. Before stating his opinion on the question, he would read a few remarks which he had addressed some months ago to a large audience in Quebec, and which were a *resumé* of his ideas and opinions on the subject. He had said, in speaking of the telegraph system and the semaphore system :—

“With regard to the ways and means, he would say that part of the expense of the scheme could be taken from the fishery award, meaning that portion of it intended to benefit the fisheries. That award, he must say, for the twelve years' lease by the Americans of our fisheries, over an extent of 3,160 miles of coast, represented the dearest interests of the fishery population of the Dominion, and should be applied for the encouragement and development of the fisheries in the manner best suited to supply the pressing needs of those engaged in that important industry, such as an effective system of protection of the fisheries, the building of piers, breakwaters, and other important improvements to benefit the fisheries and the fishermen. He would not recommend the laying out of the capital, but the sum might go into the Treasury as a special fund, and the interest applied to the object above stated. The Americans do not seem very much inclined to renew a lease of our fisheries under the same conditions since they paid under protest, and it might be that no treaty would be hereafter made for granting permission to the Americans to use our fisheries. In that case we would require a number of steamers to protect our fisheries by excluding the Americans from our municipal waters, and a large amount of money would be required for that object. It is, therefore, a wise precaution to have the means in readiness. It must be remembered

that it was the giving up to the Americans of Canadian fisheries from 1854 to 1866, that secured their Reciprocity Treaty which was so profitable to the commercial and agricultural portions of the population of the Dominion, while the Canadian fishermen received nothing in return, but the contested advantage of selling their fish in the States.”

He held the same opinions and advanced the same pretensions still. From 1854 to 1866, there was a treaty, which gave permission to the American fishermen to fish in British waters in common with our fishermen. This giving away of the fisheries of Canada secured for the agricultural and commercial population of this country extensive advantages, which already brought into the country a large amount of prosperity, and this prosperity was bought from the Americans at the price, he might say, of the rights and privileges of our fishermen. What had the fishermen received in exchange for this twelve years' prosperity acquired by the other portions of the population at their expense? They got nothing at all but abuse; not a cent to erect a lighthouse, or breakwater, or pier, or to help them in any way; whilst the farmers, the merchants and manufacturers were making large profits. The poor fisherman had to carry on his arduous labours in the midst of danger, without a helping hand to come to his succour. He (Dr. Fortin) knew that very well. He was then protecting the fisheries of Canada, and could speak well of what was taking place. True, there existed a protection to the fisheries, but that was before the Reciprocity Treaty came into force. Along the coast of Gaspé, from Bic to Gaspé Basin, a distance of about 150 miles, there was not a port or harbour; then from Gaspé Basin to Paspébiac, there was not a harbour for the poor fisherman. When the wind blew on shore, he was obliged to draw his heavy boat ashore in the midst of pouring rain on many a stormy night, while the Government, by building breakwaters or piers, could afford him shelter. It was quite true that, during these twelve years, during which the fisheries were given away to the Americans to procure advantage for other portions of the population, the fisheries received nothing in return; but, on the contrary, had to suffer the destruction of their most precious fisheries.

The treaty then became abrogated, and by and by, difficulties arose between England and the United States, and to settle them, this question of fisheries was brought up, and helped very much to arrange the larger matters in dispute. Every one knew that this treaty, even with the award of four and a half millions, could not be of any advantage to the regular fisherman, nor to the advantage of our fisheries at present, much less in the future. If this money were not spent to repair the injury done our fisheries, and to help our fishermen, whose arduous occupation was still more difficult now than formerly, who were obliged to go longer distances, to leave earlier in the spring and later in the fall, the fish being less plentiful than formerly, great injustice would be done. He would not want the capital of this money to be spent, but it might be set apart as a special fund, the interest to be expended yearly for the benefit of the fisheries. They knew that this treaty would be abrogated; the Americans had signified their willingness to abrogate it. What would be the duty of Canada afterwards? It would be to protect the fisheries which had never yet been efficiently protected; and, in order to do so, the Government would have to get a certain number of steamers fitted for that service. It would easily be understood that a large number would be required, when the extent of coast to be protected was taken into consideration, no less than 3,160 miles, greater than from Montreal to Liverpool. Either our fisheries had to be given to the Americans as before 1854, our fishermen ruined and obliged to leave the country, or they must be protected efficiently, and to do so the interest of the whole money would be required. He did not claim that as an absolute right, but was it not equitable and just that men who came to settle on those coasts, believing the surrounding waters were to remain British waters forever, who had built their houses and fishing establishments there, who had put a large capital in the fishing industry, and who sold their rights, he should say their birthrights, to the Americans, who would enjoy the same rights as they did, should be compensated? He would like to know how the people of the Ottawa region would like the Government to

give to the Americans the liberty to cut timber in our forests at the same time as British lumbermen here. There would be a rebellion in the Ottawa region if such a thing were attempted; yet the giving up of our fisheries involved exactly the same principle. These waters were supposed to be British, and, if people came and settled by them, bought farms, erected buildings and establishments, and some of those had been erected at a cost of half a million dollars, and then Americans were allowed to compete with them, these people became ruined, and were obliged to go to the States and be the servants of the Americans. He expected our present Government would do them justice, and see that the money which came from the fisheries would return to the fisheries.

MR. BUNSTER said he would not have detained this House a moment, but, hearing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries state there had been no correspondence on the subject, he rose to protest against the injustice done to British Columbia. They were informed by the hon. member for Shelburne that the money had been expended in building the Pacific Railway. That was news to him so far as British Columbia was concerned, for, in British Columbia, he might tell the hon. gentleman, not a single sod had yet been turned. Notwithstanding all the promises made, and the talk that British Columbia had received some of her dues, not a single advantage, but rather disadvantages, had resulted to that Province from the treaty. He hoped the Minister of Marine would take the matter into serious consideration, and send them out a gentleman capable of taking care of their fisheries, and not foist on them another man from Ontario, as the late Government did, who knew nothing about fish, the ways of the Indians, or the interests of the Province.

MR. FLYNN said the question involved in the motion made by the hon. member for Prince, was of very great importance to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, whose interests were alone affected by American citizens having the right, under the Washington Treaty, to fish in our inshore waters. Under that treaty, the same rights and

privileges were granted to them as our own fishermen enjoyed. It was considered at the time that this arrangement would work unfairly and unequally; that, in giving away our valuable inshore fisheries, we were not getting an equivalent for them; that the free admission of fish and fish-oil into the American market, and the right given to us of fishing in American waters, was not an equivalent. The latter was of no advantage whatever to our population, as it was well known the American inshore fisheries had been for a long time valueless. It was not expected that our fishermen would leave their valuable fisheries to go where fish were very scarce. In that view it was considered that the fishermen of this Dominion were entitled to compensation, and the matter was left to arbitration. The questions came before the Fishery Commission which sat at Halifax last summer twelvemonths, our claim for compensation being \$12,000,000, and that of Newfoundland \$2,800,000, or a total of \$14,800,000. In the discussion before the Commission, the other advantages besides the outshore fishing enjoyed by the Americans, such as getting bait, and other things, were excluded from consideration, and the award was made entirely on the value of giving the right to fish within the three-mile limit. The amount awarded, \$5,500,000, proved conclusively the value of our inshore fisheries to Americans, and it also afforded undeniable proof of their importance to our own fishermen. If these fisheries were exclusively our own, the great quantity caught in these waters by American fishermen would not enter into competition with our fish, we would, to a great extent, control the American markets, particularly in the better qualities of mackerel, because a sufficiency of these fish could not be taken in American waters, or outside the three-mile limit, to supply the American people. It was, therefore, quite evident that the equal privileges given by the treaty to American citizens must interfere very materially with our fishermen. Much of our inshore fishery was prosecuted in boats. As a rule, they were not well fitted out, and were quite unable to successfully compete with the superior craft and outfit

of the American fishermen. If this award was a just one—and he had not the slightest doubt that it was—then it was given in compensation for loss sustained by the Dominion. The question naturally arose, who was it that sustained this loss? What class, what industry was affected by the rights conceded to American fishermen under the Washington Treaty? Somebody must have sustained loss, and he could not see what class it was, unless it was the fishermen. It was certainly not the farmers, mechanics or manufacturers, or any other class in the Province of Ontario. They had no interest in the fisheries of the Dominion. They had neither capital, men nor vessels engaged in it, and they were not in any way affected by the granting or withholding the privilege the American fishermen now enjoyed. It was, therefore, quite clear to him that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces should get the benefit of this award. It was their industry that suffered by the equal privileges given to American fishermen. He was apprehensive that this privilege would eventually be the means of destroying their valuable inshore fisheries. They had already destroyed an important fishery in the Gulf, between Cape Chatte and Gaspé. The halibut fishery was a profitable one to the inhabitants of that district, but it had been completely destroyed by the American fishermen. Ample evidence was given before the Fishery Commission to prove this fact. The mackerel fishing in the fall was one of our most valuable fisheries, and it had also been injured. These fish left the North Bay early in October, trimming the shores of Cape Breton before going into deep water. But they were kept in the bay by the bait and feed given to them by the American fishermen until it got too late in the season and too rough for their boat fishery. This fishery, owing to this, had been for some years past a failure. From these facts he was sure it could not be doubted who had sustained the loss. It was most certainly the fishermen of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and they were the people who should get the benefit of the award. This proposition appeared to him quite plain and intelligible. This money should not be absorbed into the

Dominion Treasury to be used for general purposes; it should be appropriated exclusively for the use and benefit of the fishermen. Newfoundland had secured her share of the award, one million of dollars. Was Nova Scotia to be treated worse because they were in the Confederation? Would their fishermen be made to feel that they were less worthy of consideration than the fishermen of that Colony? He trusted not; he hoped this question would receive from the Government the consideration it deserved. The fishermen had much to contend with in prosecuting their dangerous calling. The whole southern coast of Nova Scotia, from Cape Sable to Cape North, was much exposed to Atlantic storms, affording, with few exceptions, but little shelter to the fishermen, whose occupation was at all times attended with danger, but particularly so in the spring and fall. On many fishing grounds, they were compelled to haul up their boats whenever the wind came from the south or eastward, and very often were unable to launch them, even after the storm was over, until the heavy Atlantic swell, which broke against the rocks on that iron-bound coast, subsided. Having to fish from these exposed situations caused them to lose many days during the fishing season. He did not wish to dictate to the Government the way in which this money should be appropriated for the fishermen's benefit, but he would suggest that a portion of it should be applied to harbour improvements and the building of breakwaters. If it were expended in this manner, much shelter and protection would be given where there was none at present. While other industries in this country had been encouraged and protected both by Provincial and Federal legislation, while large sums had been spent and grants of public money had been given to encourage and promote the agricultural industry of this Dominion, fishermen alone had received no helping hand. The National Policy, which they were now so anxiously looking for, and which they were told would give additional protection to the different industries of this country, could not in any way benefit the fisherman. On the contrary, it would add to the burthens he had already to bear in the increased

taxation he would submit to. It would increase the cost of his living, for he would have to pay more for what he consumed in his family, or used in the prosecution of his business. He was told that the coal and milling interests of this Dominion were to be protected by having a duty imposed on coal and flour. Were those industries more important than the fishing interests? Were they operated by a class of men more worthy the consideration of the Government than the poor and toil-worn fishermen of this Dominion? He thought they were not, and he trusted the Government would entertain the same opinion. The exports of fish were very large, being a tenth of our total exports. It was one of our most valuable industries, giving employment to a great many men and vessels engaged in the business. The product of the fishermen's labour brought a large amount of money into the country annually. They were consumers of a large quantity of dutiable goods, and contributed more to the revenue than any other class. The productions of the fisheries added largely to the exports, the trade, and wealth of the Dominion. He knew of none in this country who were more worthy of the consideration of the Government, and he was satisfied there was no other industry more deserving of their fostering care. He trusted the award would be distributed in a manner that would satisfy the fishermen who, in his judgment, were solely entitled to it.

Mr. OGDEN said that, in regard to the discussion that had taken place with respect to the destruction of the fisheries, he could endorse everything that had been said. He desired, however, to state that the Americans were not alone to blame for the destruction of our fish. The fish were greatly destroyed by our own fishermen—not only by the use of purse-seines, but by the use of fish trawls and traps. He desired to state that fishermen under the former reign of Sir John A. Macdonald did receive protection. Before the Washington Treaty, their shores were protected from Americans by armed cruisers. This was done at a large expense, and, if he mistook not, Ontario had contributed as largely to the support of those cruisers as did

Nova Scotia or Quebec. He believed that the same Government which protected their fisheries in former years, was equally able to protect them in the future, and he would not wish to say or do anything that would embarrass the Government, in which he had perfect confidence. He had also perfect confidence in the body of gentlemen who supported them, from the Upper as well as the Lower Provinces, and that they would deal justly and generously with the fishermen. He was satisfied that, when the Estimates were brought down, the Government would show that they were disposed to deal fairly and liberally with the Maritime Provinces. He had stated to the electors of his constituency that, as we had received an award of five and a half million dollars, the fishermen of the coast of Nova Scotia would receive their share. He stated that, either in building breakwaters, or in some other way, the Government would judiciously and wisely expend the money. He stood pledged to this, and, if he found that the Government would not do justice to his constituency, he would no longer support that Government. He felt himself perfectly independent. He believed it was the duty of every man to support a Government in everything that was right, but that he should not support a Government which would neglect the interests of his constituency. The moment the Government sacrificed the interests of the fishermen, he would be compelled to be an opponent of that Government.

Mr. YEO asked if there was any correspondence on the subject between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion Government.

Mr. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.): None.

Mr. YEO said that he had not brought this matter up in a party spirit, and he would support any Government that would do justice to Prince Edward Island, the Maritime Provinces generally, and the fishermen particularly.

Mr. DALY said he felt the subject was one of so much importance, not only to the Dominion at large, but to the constituency which he had the honour to

represent, that he could not refrain from offering a few remarks to the House. He held that the fish trade was an industry upon which hinged the prosperity of the whole Province of Nova Scotia. If the fisheries did not succeed, the trade of Nova Scotia was materially injured. The trade of the West Indies was affected by it, the exports being smaller, and the productive resources of the country were thereby materially diminished. The award of five millions and a-half of dollars was peculiarly an award made in repayment to this Dominion of the loss they sustained under the Washington Treaty, by giving the use of their fisheries to American fishermen. It was a direct loss to the fishermen themselves, who now had only a right, in common with their neighbours, to the fisheries in which they formerly enjoyed a monopoly, and, as had been stated, the amount of \$5,500,000 did not represent the whole actual loss. They had also been relieved, as a Government, of the charge of protecting their shore fisheries. He thought it was the duty of the Government to give this matter their earliest consideration. It was a part of the policy of the Government to protect the industries of the country, and he was very glad to hear the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) concede the fact that, at all events, the fishing interests of Nova Scotia and the Dominion should receive protection. It was, therefore, with much pleasure that he urged upon the consideration of the Government that they should concede, as far as possible, to the Maritime Provinces, a just share of the benefits to be derived from the sum which had been paid into the Treasury in consequence of the award of the Fishery Commission at Halifax.

Mr. FLYNN said he desired, in explanation to the last speaker, to say that he did not ask for any protection of the fisheries.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): No; because they have it already.

Mr. FLYNN said they had not protection in the light protection was looked upon by hon. gentlemen opposite. What he said was that, when the National Policy was brought down, as it was expected to be brought down, it

would further increase the burthen of taxation upon the fishermen. His argument went in the direction of showing that the fishermen, as a class, were entitled to the award.

MR. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) said the duty that was imposed by the American Government of two dollars a barrel on mackerel, prior to the Washington Treaty, fell altogether on the fishermen of the Lower Provinces, and the probability was that, when that Treaty ceased to exist, the Americans, in the interests of their own fishermen, would again impose a similar duty, which would fall directly on the fishermen of the Lower Provinces, and would not, in the smallest degree, be felt by the people of Ontario. Therefore, he thought the liberal and large-hearted people of Ontario would see the justice of giving a fair share of the fishery award to the people to whom it rightly belonged, the people of the Lower Provinces. In this way they would, in some small way, compensate them for the infringement by American fishermen upon their rights. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would see its way clear, and he believed it would, to a proper and fair distribution of the award amongst the Maritime Provinces.

MR. Fiset said that he was pleased to see that the motion, as made by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Yeo), had raised such an interesting discussion, the effect of which would be to prove to this House that the Canadian fishermen in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence were far from being satisfied with the manner in which the Government intended to divide the sum paid over by the United States Government as a compensation for the damages that the fishermen had sustained and were yet sustaining. He had been particularly pleased with the remarks of the hon. member for Gaspé, who, by his long experience, had, as every one knew, acquired a perfect knowledge of all matters respecting the fisheries. In the first place, it was asked what interests had most suffered from the Treaty of Washington. The answer was easily given, and naturally presented itself. The interests of the fishermen had been attacked in the first place, and our fisheries being thereby rendered less

productive, our commerce had also suffered. The moment that the Americans were allowed to come and fish within the three-mile limit, our fishermen were incapable to compete with them. Until then, the latter, seeing the abundance of the fish, had been content with the use of lines, and they could then earn a livelihood for themselves and families, and considerably benefit, at the same time, the export trade of the country. After the arrival of the American fishermen in our waters, as they made use of seines and other apparatus too costly for our fishermen, the latter could not compete with them. Moreover, the fish, being destroyed in such great quantities, was becoming continually scarcer. Formerly, for instance, both mackerel and cod were very abundant between Matane and Gaspé. To-day mackerel had almost entirely disappeared from that part of the coast, and cod-fishing was not nearly so productive as formerly. On the north shore, from Betsiamis to Mingan, the same effects had been felt, and were nearly as disastrous. And, instead of protecting this class of our population, who worked so hard, and who were every day exposed to new dangers, the Government had taken from them the privileges of fishing in our principal rivers, which were farmed out to strangers, for the most part, who prosecuted fishing as a pastime. This, he repeated, was greatly to the detriment of the population of these localities, and of all Canadian fishermen. As a first consequence of the privilege granted to the Americans, our fishermen were obliged to take up another calling, and, from fishermen, they became farmers. It might, perhaps, be urged that they had gained thereby. He wished that it was so. Unfortunately, the greater number of them, lacking the means of purchasing good land, were obliged to settle on land near by and at their disposal; and it was known that, in that part of the Province of Quebec, the land along the shores of St. Lawrence was barren, and almost entirely unfit for cultivation, so that our fishermen had, for the most part, remained poor. He believed, therefore, that it would be but doing justice to this class of our population to appropriate the interest of the indemnity paid by the American

MR. FLYNN.

Government for public improvements in the different Provinces where fishermen had suffered. In the Province of Quebec, for instance, an excellent means of indemnifying the fishermen would be to improve the maritime road between the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure, the road being the natural outlet of the county of Gaspé and the lower part of the county of Kimouski. He would say no more, as the discussion on this subject had already been continued at some length.

MR. HOUDE said that he regretted to be obliged to differ with several hon. members who had just spoken. He had no doubt but that these hon. members, when they spoke outside of this House or upon other subjects, gave expression to large views. But, when they rose in this House in order to forward local interests, they often gave expression to rather narrow ideas, so much so that one would be led to believe that these ideas were moulded in herrings. Much had been said about the fishermen of the Gulf, and he saw that their interests were well defended in this House. But, in order to advocate the rights of the fishermen, it was not necessary to sin against logic. He thought that these hon. gentlemen had shown more zeal than logic. The premises they had laid down seemed to him false, and, if they were false, the conclusions they drew were equally false. He would beg to ask these hon. gentlemen whether the fisheries were public or private property,—whether they belonged to the whole people or to certain individuals? He was ready to admit that the Washington Treaty had done particular harm to the interests of the people along our sea-board, but, as they suffered from harm done to a public property that they were making use of, and not to a private property, it did not seem to him to necessarily follow that the money paid by the United States, as a compensation for the temporary privilege that we had granted them to fish in common with our fishermen, should be distributed between certain sections of the country instead of going into the Treasury of the Dominion. He had no ill-will against the Maritime Provinces; on the contrary, he would always be

ready to second their representatives in all their just and logical claims. But this manner of discussing public interests seemed to him to be of a sectional character, and the less the House had of sectionalism in its debates the better it would be, he thought, for the Dominion. For instance, an hon. member (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) had complained that more public works were carried on in other Provinces than in his own, and he had endeavoured to draw an argument from that in support of his thesis that the law of compensation required that the Maritime Provinces should be indemnified in their turn, and that this was an excellent opportunity of giving them the benefit of the \$5,000,000 remaining from the sum granted by the Halifax International Commission. It should not be supposed that public works were only profitable to that part of the country where they were carried on. It very often happened, on the contrary, that canals or railways were built in one part of the country for the benefit of another. Thus, the hon. members from the Maritime Provinces, who did not, any more than anyone else, live on fish alone, would be very glad, in a near future, to have the canals widened and the Pacific Railway and its branches built, in order to bring to their markets the products of the West, such as cattle, grain, and especially flour; and, in their turn, to be able to send their products to the Western Provinces. Allusion had also been made to the Washington Treaty. If he said a word on that subject, it was because he had remarked, since the beginning of the Session, that hon. members on the other side had often renewed the attack upon this point, and had sought to make a little political capital out of this question. He would not deny that it was the Americans who had most largely profited by it. But, in order to fully appreciate this Treaty, it would be well to revert to the grave circumstances under which it had been concluded, with the participation of the right hon. the leader of the present Government, and approved of by Parliament. At that time there existed a strong feeling of uneasiness between the United States and Great Britain—the diplomatic intercourse between the two countries was strained to the utmost.

There existed in the United States an influential body of public men who were anxious to pick a quarrel with England and to indemnify themselves, as they said, by taking Canada for the damage to their country by the *Alabama* and other privateers, for whose depredations they held England responsible. In the New England States, there was General B. F. Butler; in the Western States, Mr. Z. Chandler; and at Washington, at the head of the Republican party then in power, Senator Sumner, the President of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and very influential throughout the whole country; all these men were striving to bring about a rupture with England. It was well known that, if war had broken out, Canada would have been the fighting ground. The right hon. leader of the Government believed that it was preferable not to press certain just claims that Canada had, rather than allow this danger to remain longer hanging over our heads, provided that this could be done without sacrificing our national honour. This idea of settling international difficulties by arbitration was a great idea and worthy of occupying the attention of every public man. This idea was not new; a great and good king, Henry IV, had given expression to it, in order to settle amicably, without having recourse to arms, the conflicting claims of France, Spain and Austria, to the north of Italy. This idea, if put in practice, would free humanity from much suffering. Hon. members had urged that it was necessary to protect the fishing interests. He was, undoubtedly, in favour of such a protection, and he thought that, to a certain extent, this protection had been granted when, by the Washington Treaty, the American markets had been opened to our fishermen. There were, moreover, the public works that were carried on each year by the Dominion, for the maintenance and improvement of the fisheries. As to the useless destruction of fish, this could not be exclusively laid to the charge of the Washington Treaty, for an hon. member from the Maritime Provinces had stated this afternoon, in speaking on another question, that the Americans destroyed immense quantities of fish by means of seines and traps outside of the three-mile limit, and that

would show that, without the Washington Treaty, this senseless destruction of such a fine source of wealth would have taken place, at least in part. He thought that, instead of indulging in useless recriminations, it would be far more practical and reasonable to draw the attention of the Administration to this matter, and urge upon them the necessity of coming to an understanding with the American Government, in order to devise some means of preventing the destruction of this source of wealth so profitable to both countries, by making and putting in force stringent regulations for this purpose. That would be the best protection that could be afforded to the fishing interests, and under the circumstances the most easily granted.

MR. HACKETT said he was sorry the hon. member for Prince, Prince Edward Island, (Mr. Yeo) had made the statement he had. It appeared he had no better authority than the Governor's speech in Prince Edward Island, and he (Mr. Hackett) regretted this because the people of Prince Edward Island had a right to a part of this award. The island of Prince Edward being a separate Province with a separate form of Government at the time the Washington Treaty was entered into, had become a separate contracting party to that Treaty. They maintained that American fishermen had the right of fishing in their waters for two years previous to the entrance of Prince Edward Island into the Union; and had they no right to compensation for that? Then again, what right had they, simply because they had entered the Confederation, to be deprived of their share of the Washington Treaty award? Their entering into the Dominion of Canada had not prejudiced in the smallest degree their right to a separate portion of the award. What right had Ontario in this matter? These particular clauses in the Washington Treaty were placed in it for the purpose of saying that the Americans would possess certain privileges regarding fishing in the waters of the Bay of St. Lawrence, and their exercising those privileges, coming down to the Bay each year in large numbers to prosecute the fishing, had materially affected the prosperity of our own fishermen who should receive a large portion of the award for

the loss thus sustained. It had been said that the fishermen of British Columbia had been neglected in the Washington treaty. He would say that the American fishermen did not want to go there, and it was not necessary for that Province to be included in the Treaty. Around the Maritime Provinces the fish the American fishermen required abounded, and they had been in the habit of fishing there, where they knew they could be caught in large numbers, and now they had been told that the people of these Provinces had no special right to this fish. They had just as good a right in that respect as the people in this Province had to the lumbering interest. They claimed that they were a separate contracting party when their delegates went to confer with the Dominion Government, and, therefore, that their portion of the award should be considered specially. He had every confidence that the present Government would do them justice in the matter.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion, inasmuch as there is no correspondence.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes before
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 11th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE ESTIMATES.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. TILLEY delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

MR. SPEAKER read the Message, and it is as follows:—

“LORNE.

“The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1880; and in accord-

ance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
“OTTAWA, 11th March, 1879.”

MR. TILLEY moved that the Message of His Excellency and the Estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and *read the first time*:—

Bill (No. 40) To incorporate the Napance, Tamworth, and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Hooper.)

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the British American Mutual Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 42) To amend the Act respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Gigault.)

DISMISSAL OF QUEBEC GOVERNMENT BY THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

RESOLUTION PROPOSED.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, before placing in your hands the motion I gave notice of a few days ago, I desire to offer to the House, and to the country, a few remarks on the step I am taking, and the motives which have led me to take it. And, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, in order to commend myself to the indulgence of the House, I promise to do my very best to keep up to the level of my subject, that is to say, to treat it with becoming dignity and moderation. The subject is most important in itself, and vastly so in its consequences. There is one thing I desire to say distinctly, at once. I would not have it thought that party spirit has been the motive of my resolution. No man shall charge me with having brought on this great question for party purposes. I am a party man; I am a Conservative, it is true; and the question involves the censuring, and probably the dismissal, in consequence of such censure, of a Liberal Lieutenant-Governor appointed in December, 1876, by a Liberal Administration. And all this just at the close of an election, during which party spirit naturally ran high. These three facts, of which I fully understand the bearing, render my position

a most difficult one, at all events at a first glance and superficially. But this is not the true way for enlightened and thoughtful persons like the members of this House to view the matter. In the first place, party spirit does not mean blindness, exaggeration, want of patriotism. Such an idea would be the death of our free institutions. The object of political parties is not the personal advancement of their leaders and members. No, they have a nobler destiny, a far higher aim. Their end and object is to inculcate a body of ideas, doctrines and principles, social, economical and political, which they believe to be advantageous to the well-being of the people and the country. No; it is not a party question we are about to discuss. We are to deal with a great political principle, a great national question, which interests every Province in the Dominion. Let us treat it as though we were about to write a page of history to be recorded in the annals of our country for the instruction of our successors and of posterity. Through lack of experience and the necessary knowledge, I shall probably fall far short of the great task I have undertaken. But one thing I believe I perfectly well understand. I can assure this House I have long grasped the bearing of the *coup d'état* of the 2nd March, 1878, all the dangers, all the tempests it has laid up for us in the future, if this first attempt against our liberties be not firmly repressed, if its author be not severely punished. I naturally regret that this violation of the principle of responsible government should occur in the Province of Quebec, which I am proud to claim for my native Province. I regret that the bad example should originate there; but I must at the same time declare that I do not feel at all humiliated. It was said formerly of a great nation that it was rich enough to pay for its glory. The Province of Quebec, Lord Dufferin tells us—and all who have read our history know that in this his Lordship says but the truth—the Province of Quebec I say was the first of the British North American colonies to ask for responsible government. If one of its sons, unworthy to rank with the men of her glorious past, has sought to wrest that system of government, to attack it or set it aside, the

MR. MOUSSEAU.

Province of Quebec may be forgiven, when we call to mind her heroic struggles in the past. Moreover, Mr. Letellier is the first, and will probably be the last of the race of political violators. He will have no imitators, and party spirit, in its most detestable sense, will never be able to find him panegyrists. Mr. Speaker, I now come to the facts. I shall strive to be as brief and clear as possible. But, in order to have a proper understanding of the subject, we must go further back than the Session of 1878. The Province of Quebec had long wished for a railway on the north side of the St. Lawrence, in order to develop the vast resources of every kind with which its lands and forests and rivers teemed. From 1852 or 1853 to 1867, the question was repeatedly discussed; but for lack of means the agitation was fruitless, and confined to the continuing of Acts of incorporation, and the forming and reforming of companies destitute of capital. As will be remembered, our means were all being absorbed by the Grand Trunk, which was enriching the south side of the St. Lawrence and Upper Canada, while doing but little for the North Shore, where a numerous, robust, industrious population were anxiously awaiting their iron highway. Confederation, by giving to Quebec the exclusive ownership of the public lands, revived the hopes of the supporters of the Grand Trunk of the north. They were eager to participate in the tide of activity, and the great prosperity which the other railways, like arteries of generous life-blood, distributed in their course. In 1868 and 1869, the Quebec Parliament passed several Acts of incorporation for a railway from Quebec to Montreal, another from Montreal to St. Jerome, and a third from Montreal to Aylmer. At first, aid was confined to grants of land, and later in lands and money. When the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was decided upon, a twofold impetus was given to the desire for railways on the North Shore. This was due to the fact that the people of the Province of Quebec understood perfectly well the importance of connecting our railways on the North Shore with the Pacific by extending the road further, along the Ottawa. Having thus the shortest and most direct line, the Province of Quebec hoped

to have its share of the profits and prosperity to result from the trade of the west and of Asia. Nevertheless, in the spring of 1875, the attempts to secure loans in England by private companies having utterly failed, other means had to be found to complete the railway already commenced between Montreal and Ottawa, and to build the railway from Quebec to Montreal, which was not yet begun. At that trying moment, the people of Quebec manifested a degree of patriotism and public spirit seldom equalled, and, setting aside political feeling, unanimously asked their Government to assume the position of the private companies, and build the railways with the public funds. There was not a dissenting voice in the matter. Liberals and Conservatives alike, in the press and in public meetings, pressed the matter on the Government. On this point I feel sure no one will contradict me. In June and July, the general elections took place for the Quebec House. The DeBoucherville Government appealed to the people on that question. They were victorious, having a majority of 23 to 25 in a House of 65 members, in support of their policy. About the same time, the Government made arrangements with private companies and corporations which had subscribed or voted bonuses, amongst others Quebec, Montreal and other municipalities. Montreal and Quebec, under certain conditions, accepted by the Government, promised to pay—as to the first, the balance of its million, and the second, the whole of its million. Fortified by these promises and guaranties, the Government went resolutely to work. They built rapidly, in fact very rapidly. When they met the House, on the 17th of January, 1878, they were in this position: They had incurred debt in order to build rapidly and satisfy the eager wishes of the people; the line, between Montreal, St. Jerome and Ottawa, was open to the public, but not quite finished, and was not, under the contracts, to be handed over to them until the 1st August then next; the line between Quebec and Montreal, was also already partly in operation, and the rest was to be finished and handed over in the autumn (1878); the cities of Quebec, Three Rivers and Montreal, and some

other municipalities, refused to pay their subscriptions, giving reasons, for the most part futile, and some not bearing the stamp of good faith. Notwithstanding these notable disadvantages, the Government had to meet a deficit of but \$81,000. The Government then, without any immediate revenue from its railways, had to meet the deficit mentioned; and these wealthy and powerful municipalities said, in effect: "Now that we have the railway, why should we pay? Let the Government pay." What was the duty of an honest Government under such circumstances? To compel the recalcitrant corporations and municipalities to pay, and levy a tax, at once light and equitably divided, in order to meet the deficit. Strictly speaking, the Treasurer of the Province of Quebec might have done as the Liberals are now doing in Quebec—take the capital set apart for railways to pay the interest of our debt in England. But the Hon. Mr. Church, a gentleman of high integrity and honour, had already been in London to secure a loan for the Province of Quebec. He found, when there, that the credit of the Province stood exceedingly high, and succeeded, without difficulty, in contracting a loan on most advantageous terms, as advantageous as any great nation, enjoying the highest credit in England, could obtain. But Mr. Church understands, as everyone understands, for it is nothing but common sense, that the best means for a nation, as it is for an individual, to maintain its credit, is to pay the interest of its debt with its own revenues, and not by drawing upon its capital and incurring fresh debt in order to pay off the interest of previous indebtedness. On the 29th January, 1878, the resolutions respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, and Occidental Railway—a name substituted for those of the private companies—were submitted to the Houses. I read from the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec:—

"Mr. Attorney-General Angers informed the House that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, having taken communication of certain resolutions respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, and Occidental Railway, has been pleased to recommend them to the favourable consideration of the House."

"Mr. Attorney-General Angers, seconded by Mr. Treasurer Church, moved that this House do now go into Committee of the Whole to consider the said resolutions."

I shall not try the patience of the House by going through the details of the Bill founded on those resolutions. I shall only say, briefly, that the Government, by that measure, took a most legitimate means of compelling payment by debtors of most just debts already in part overdue. These debts the Government had considered so good and sure that they set them down as an asset, when, in the fall Session of 1875, they passed the Act to secure the construction of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway. That Bill declared in substance that when the Railway should have been completed with all depots, workshops, etc., in accordance with all conditions subscribed to by the Government in the agreements passed between them and the private companies and corporations, competent engineers were to report thereon to the Government. On that report, the Lieutenant Governor in Council was to decide, if he found it correct, that the corporations were to pay. After demand made, and delay granted, if the corporations persisted in their refusal to pay, the sheriff would receive orders to collect the amount in the usual way, just as a municipal council is empowered to do in the case of recalcitrant rate-payers. Was this new, odious and retroactive legislation as has been so broadly stated in certain quarters? Not at all. I have never seen nor read that a law is called odious, which is simply intended to compel an unwilling or dishonest debtor to pay his lawful debts. Here, in the case we are now considering, it is not the law that is odious, but the conduct of the corporations and municipalities encouraged in their obstinacy by Liberals who were ready to do anything to withstand or defeat a Conservative Government. Let it not be forgotten that the DeBoucherville Government had only engaged to build that railway, because it relied upon nearly two millions and a half of good subscriptions, of good promises made by corporations whose previous engagements had ensured the construction of that great trunk line. The Govern-

MR. MOUSSEAU.

ment loyally fulfilled its promises, and, when it has completed the roads and calls for instalments to replenish the impoverished public chest, it finds itself openly laughed at and hears adduced conditions which had been formerly abandoned. Were then all the inhabitants of the Province of Quebec, to be subjected to a new tax of two millions and a half to relieve the rich municipalities, who, more than others, reaped the benefit of the railway? Was it a new law which compelled the corporations to abstain from wasting their subscriptions and their bonuses in costly long and ruinous suits? The Municipal Code of the Province of Quebec contains many similar provisions. The Act respecting the Consolidated Municipal Loan Fund contains similar provisions. The Legislature of Ontario, in 1873, passed an Act entitled "*An Act respecting the Municipal Loan Fund debts, and respecting certain payments to Municipalities*, 36 *Vict., Chap. 47.*" In this Act again we see that the sheriff is substituted for the Courts of Justice, to compel debtors, who are not acting in good faith, to fulfil their engagements. This legislation is based upon an excellent principle, the public interest, which consists in avoiding difficulties, litigation and suits, which, in such cases especially, always enure to the detriment of the people, that is to say, of the greater number who are the least in a position to bear such burdens. It has also been stated that the law was detestable, because it was retroactive in its nature. In the ordinary vocabulary, there are often found certain words which are, in a way, stereotyped. They are booby-traps. The word in question has been greatly misused, as respects the legislation which we are considering. A settler leases a lot of land from the Government, upon the condition of paying thirty dollars a year for five years, and two hundred dollars at the end of six years, whereupon he is to become the absolute proprietor of the lot. At the end of five years he has laboured, he has cleared and improved the land considerably. He is ready to pay his two hundred dollars, and so obtain his final title. Parliament passes an Act compelling him to pay one thousand dollars instead

of two hundred dollars. That would be a retroactive law, and an odious one, because it imposes a new burthen, onerous to a degree, and in no way provided for in the original contract. But for how long a time has the term retroactive and odious legislation been applied to a simple law which only compels a debtor to pay a lawful debt, and one which he long since bound himself to discharge? On the 31st January, Mr. Church made his financial statement. In his very exhaustive speech, he announced the political views of the Government with respect to the recalcitrant corporations, as I have just stated them. At the same time, he announced that he proposed to ask the House to impose a stamp duty on certain documents, to raise the funds necessary to meet the deficit. He took special pains to demonstrate the excellent financial position of the Province of Quebec. The tax was to be but a temporary one, lasting but one or two years, at the most; for the Government was certain to receive from its railways, from two hundred and fifty to three hundred thousand dollars a-year. I say that it was certain, because the best means had been adopted to ascertain the facts of the case. Tenders had been invited for the leasing of the road. Now, experience has been gained. The best business men, the most experienced railway men, know that our North Shore Railway will yield to the Government a net revenue of at least three hundred thousand dollars a-year. It is not until the 19th of February that the famous tax Bill came before the Houses in the shape of resolutions. As with respect to the railway, the proceedings were regular and constitutional. We find on page 149 of the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, the necessary announcement:

"Mr. Treasurer Church, seconded by Mr. Attorney-General Angers, moves, that this House do resolve itself into Committee to take into consideration certain resolutions for the imposing of a Stamp Duty on certain documents."

"Mr. Treasurer Church then informed the House that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the said resolutions recommends them to the consideration of the House."

The resolutions were adopted, a Bill was introduced, discussed and passed

between the 19th February and the 1st of March. The Bill respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway had been before the House from the 29th January to the 19th February. It was on the latter day that it received its third reading and was adopted by the House of Assembly. Like the Tax Bill, it had been warmly discussed, and had given rise to repeated debates. These two measures, therefore, were equitable and considered necessary by the Government and the Chambers to maintain the credit of the Province of Quebec; they had been announced by the Treasurer in his statement of the 31st January; the Lieutenant-Governor had known all this for a month when he wrote to the Hon. Mr. DeBoucherville the strange letter, the incredible document which I shall now read at length, and submit to the consideration of the House:—

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

Quebec, 1st March, 1878.

"To the Honorable C. B. DeBoucherville, Premier, Quebec:—

"The Lieutenant-Governor, taking into consideration the communication made to him verbally (on the 27th February) by the Premier, and also taking into consideration the letter which the Premier then gave to him, is prepared to admit that there had been no intention, on the part of the Premier, to slight the prerogatives of the Crown, and that there was only on his part an error committed in good faith in the interpretation that he gave to words used by the Lieutenant-Governor in the interview which they had on the 19th February instant; words which did not imply the authorisation attributed to them by the Premier.

"With this interpretation and the instructions given in consequence by the Premier to the Hon. Messrs. Angers and Church, these gentlemen did not, willingly, do anything against the duties of their office.

"As to the blank, which the Lieutenant-Governor addressed to him from Rivière Ouelle, the Lieutenant-Governor *knew that such blank was to be used for the purpose of submitting the Estimates to the House.*

"This act was a token of confidence on his part, as stated by the Premier in his letter of the 27th, but it was confidential.

"The Lieutenant-Governor deems it his duty to observe that in his memorandum of the 25th February last, he in no way expressed the opinion that he thought that the Premier ever had the intention of arrogating to himself the right of having measures passed without his approval, or of slighting the prerogatives of the representative of the Crown.

"But the Premier must not lose sight of the fact that, although he had not so intended, the fact remains, as he was told by the Lieutenant-Governor.

"The fact of having submitted several new and important measures to the Legislature, without having previously, in any manner, consulted the Lieutenant-Governor, although without any intention of slighting his prerogatives, gives rise to one of those false positions which places the representative of the Crown in a difficult and critical situation with reference to both Houses of the Legislature.

"The Lieutenant-Governor cannot admit that the responsibility of this state of things rests upon him.

"So far as concerns a Bill entitled 'An Act respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, the Premier cannot apply to that measure the pretended general authorisation mentioned by him in his letter, for their interview took place on the 19th February, and the Bill had then been before the House for several days, without the Lieutenant-Governor having been in any manner informed of it by his advisers.

"The Lieutenant-Governor then told the Premier how much he regretted such Legislation; he represented to him that he considered it to be contrary to the principles of law and justice. Notwithstanding this, the measure was pushed on until it was adopted by both Houses.

"It is true that the Premier gives in his letter as one of his reasons for so acting, 'that this permission of making use of the name of the representative of the Crown had been, moreover, always allowed him by the predecessor of the present Lieutenant-Governor, the late lamented Mr. Caron.'

"This reason cannot avail with the Lieutenant-Governor, for, by so doing, he would abdicate his position as representative of the Crown—a proceeding which neither the Lieutenant-Governor nor the Premier could reconcile with the duties of the Lieutenant-Governor towards the Crown.

"The Lieutenant-Governor regrets being compelled to state, as he told the Premier, that he has generally not been explicitly informed of the measures adopted by the Cabinet, although the Lieutenant-Governor often gave the Premier opportunities to do so, especially during the course of last year.

"The Lieutenant-Governor, from time to time since the last meeting of the Legislature, drew the attention of the Premier to several matters respecting the interests of the Province of Quebec, amongst others:—

"1. To the enormous expenditure occasioned by very large subsidies to several railways when the Province was burdened with the construction of the grand line of railway from Quebec to Ottawa, which should prevail over all others; and that at a time when our finances compelled us to raise loans disproportionate to our revenues.

"2. On the necessity of reducing the expenses of the Civil Government and those of Legislation, in place of having recourse to

new taxes, with a view of avoiding financial embarrassment.

"The Lieutenant-Governor, although with regret, expresses to the Premier the opinion that the Orders in Council, for the increase of the salaries of Civil Service employes, seemed to him inopportune at a time when the Government had effected with the Bank of Montreal a loan at the rate of seven per cent. for half a million with power to increase this loan to one million, and, in fact, to-day even (1st March) the Lieutenant-Governor was obliged to allow an Order in Council to be passed to secure the last half million for the Government, without which the Government would be unable to meet its engagements, as stated to him by the Honorable the Treasurer, by order of the Premier.

"The Premier did not either then or since inform the Lieutenant-Governor that the Government were in so impecunious a condition as to require special legislation to increase the public burdens.

"The Lieutenant-Governor therefore stated and repeated these facts to the Premier, and now deems it his duty to record them here, in order that they may serve as a memorandum for himself and the Premier. It results therefore:—

"1. That although the Lieutenant-Governor had made many representations, in his capacity of representative of the Crown, to the Premier on those various subjects of public interest, his advisers have taken administrative and legislative steps contrary to such representations, and without having previously advised him.

"2. That the Lieutenant-Governor has, without evil motives, but in fact, been placed in a false position, by being exposed to a conflict with the desires of the Legislature, desires which he acknowledges to be paramount, when expressed in a constitutional manner.

"The Lieutenant-Governor has attentively read and examined the memorandum and documents which the Premier was kind enough to bring him yesterday.

"In the record are petitions from several municipal corporations, and from citizens of different localities, addressed to the Lieutenant-Governor, against the resolutions and the Government Bill respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.

"The Lieutenant-Governor was only yesterday in a position to take communication of some of those petitions, inasmuch as they had not been transmitted to him before the record.

"The Lieutenant-Governor, after mature deliberation, cannot accept the advice of the Premier in reference to the sanction to be given to the Railway Bill entitled 'An Act relating to the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.'

"For all these reasons, therefore, the Lieutenant-Governor cannot conclude this memorandum without expressing to the Premier the regret which he feels in being no longer able

to retain him in his position, contrary to the rights and prerogatives of the Crown.

“(Signed) L. LETELLIER,
Lieut.-Governor.

It is just to say, as an excuse for Mr. Letellier, that he was all ashamed of this first letter; he saw all the injustice, and all the absurdity of it. He understood that a man who calls himself a representative of the Crown, of Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, should not write in that way, should not violate the sacred principle which is the basis, as it is the guarantee, of the constitutional system, for reasons so futile, so devoid of good sense, as those adduced by him in his letter of dismissal. For some days he deliberated and puzzled his brain to find new means, and being a man of resource, he discovered seven or eight, which he collected into a celebrated document which he addressed to Lord Dufferin on the 18th March:—

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
“QUEBEC, 18th March, 1878.

“To the Right Honorable the EARL OF DUFFERIN, K. P., K. C. B., G. C. M. G.,
“Governor-General of Canada,
“Ottawa.

“MY LORD.—I have the honour now to submit for your Lordship's consideration documents and details which I could not lay before the public, but from which it would have been more clearly understood that the dismissal of M. DeBoucherville's Cabinet was forced upon me by circumstances.

“These details are not contained in the correspondence which I authorized M. DeBoucherville to place before the House, and which are hereunto annexed.

“From the day that I was, by Your Excellency, raised to the position I occupy at present, all my private relations with the members of the Cabinet, up to the time of their dismissal from office, were, I must admit, generally of an agreeable nature; but in those of an official character with the Premier, I almost invariably felt that I did not enjoy that entire confidence on his part, which is the chief element of a cordial understanding between the representative of the Crown and his advisers.

“After having studied the general state of the affairs of our Province, after having become convinced that legislative and administrative changes were becoming more and more necessary, I decided upon using, with moderation, and with the greatest possible discretion, the influence attached to my position, in order to obtain the realisation of that which I deemed to be of the greatest advantage to the Province.

“I regret to state to Your Excellency that, although M. DeBoucherville did, on most

occasions, take my advice in good part, and generally approved of it, he, nevertheless, almost always acted as though he had never received it. Nevertheless, far from using my authority to obstruct his action in any way, I invariably treated him with great indulgence, as will appear to Your Excellency by the following facts:—

“1st.—During the Session of 1876, a Bill had been read three times in one of the two branches of the Legislature, and only twice in the other.

“This Bill, bearing all the certificates which were necessary to induce me to believe that it had been regularly passed and adopted, was submitted to me by the Premier for my sanction.

“In consequence of being left in ignorance of these facts by my advisers, I sanctioned the Bill.

“Not long afterwards, I was informed of the irregularity, and I immediately spoke of it to the Premier. I made the observation that such an act would entail too serious consequences to allow of its being passed over.

“As a favour to him, however, I passed over this instance of irregular legislation, which was then irreparable.

“2nd.—During the same Session, another Bill was submitted to me for my sanction.

“On examining it, I perceived a blank which had not been filled up, which I pointed out to the Premier, in the following letter:—

“Private.

““QUEBEC, 27th December, 1876.

“MY DEAR PREMIER.—A Bill (E) which originated in the Council was passed by the Legislative Assembly, without amendment; upon reading it before adding my certificate of sanction, I noticed that a blank had not been filled up in the seventh line of the sixth section.

“You followed the usual practice in not fixing the amount of the penalty in the Legislative Council; but the matter passed unperceived, or the officers, through some mistake, omitted to insert the amount fixed by the House, or it may have been an error in the proof-sheets.

“While on the subject of these mistakes, you will find another in the second section of the same Act, wherein the word *amender* is in the infinitive mood. I notice this latter inaccuracy, to which I do not attach much importance, only because I discovered another in an Act in which I had to point out to you an omission which I consider fatal.

“Yours very truly,

“(Signed) L. LETELLIER.”

“The Premier came to me and said that he regretted the omission; he requested me to give my sanction to the Bill in the state in which it was. The conciliatory spirit which I showed in granting my consent seemed to please him.

“3rd.—In March, 1877 (*vide* Appendix A), my advisers caused me to make an appointment of a Municipal Councillor for the South Ward of the Village of Montmagny, under the

pretext that there had been no election, or that if such election had taken place, it was illegal.

"The whole of the circumstances connected with this case, I deem it my duty to explain to Your Excellency, on account of the important principle involved therein.

"After due personal examination of the petitions and other accompanying documents relating to that election, I called on the Premier, at his own office, to beg of him not to hurry the appointment, which he was asked to make, of a Municipal Councillor for that locality, before receiving more ample information.

"I pointed out to him that it appeared that a municipal election had taken place, and that in such case, as a principle, the Executive Council should not interfere.

"I added, that from the moment that a legal, or even an illegal election had taken place, the duty of deciding it rested with the courts, in accordance with the ordinary course of law, of which they are the interpreters.

"I then intimated to M. DeBoucherville that I maintained, on principle, that all matters cognisable by the judiciary should be invariably left to the courts, which from their organization are better fitted than the Executive to enquire into matters of fact and of evidence, and that I would never allow the substitution of the powers of the Executive for those of the courts, when the latter had jurisdiction.

"The Premier admitted that that opinion, and the principle on which I based it, were in conformity with his ideas, and necessary for the proper administration of justice. He asked me if I would consent to see Mr. Angers, the Attorney-General, on the subject.

"I at once consented, and the Attorney-General was immediately sent for; the facts connected with that election difficulty and my views regarding them, were then communicated to him. He promised that before any appointment should be made by the Lieutenant-Governor he would make enquiry.

"Shortly afterwards he reported to me that he had made an enquiry into the facts of the case, and, at his suggestion, I appointed Jules Bélanger to be Councillor.

"In the beginning of March, 1877, difficulties and quarrels arose at Montmagny, in consequence of that election.

"After that appointment, those quarrels broke forth afresh in the municipal council itself, from which the Councillor whom I had thus been caused to appoint, was expelled with violence. That appointment I was recommended to make, notwithstanding the fact that an election had taken place; that it had been held and presided over by the Mayor, that Eugène Fournier had been returned by acclamation, that he had been sworn in according to law, and that at the very time when the appointment of Jules Bélanger was recommended to me, the person thus elected had in fact taken his seat, had been sworn, and had sat at the said Council, as appears by the minutes of the Council.

Mr. MOUSSEAU.

"When I afterwards learned these facts, I communicated them to the Premier, whom I requested to prepare a revocation of the appointment which I had thus been caused to make, contrary to the principles above set forth, and the justice of which he had himself admitted.

"The Premier answered that the matter was of a very delicate nature, as such a proceeding would be contrary to the recommendations of Mr. Angers, his Attorney-General; he concluded by saying that he would get him to prepare a report on the subject.

"I received that report some days later. After having read it, I again intimated to Mr. DeBoucherville, that in the interests of peace, and in conformity with the principle that the executive should not be substituted for judicial power in matters within the province of the latter, I insisted upon the revocation being made.

"After waiting several days for an answer, and not having received any from the Premier, I addressed a letter to him, of which the following is a copy:—

QUEBEC, March 14, 1877.

"Private and Confidential.

"MY DEAR DEBOUCHEVILLE.—I have not received any answer on the subject of the appointment of a Councillor at Montmagny.

"Those who deceived the Government in order to induce me to perform an executive act in connection with a question which they then knew to be within the judicial power, do not, in my opinion, deserve consideration, which cannot but be injurious to the Government and myself.

"The remedy is very simple, rescind the appointment; allow the parties interested to fight it out before the Courts.

"Yours very truly,

(Signed) L. LETELLIER.

"If, my Lord, I insist upon this latter point, it is to show Your Excellency that the Prime Minister was then perfectly aware of my views on that point, and should not, in consequence, have introduced during the last Session of our Legislature, any legislative measure, or performed any administrative act tending to substitute executive for judicial power without notifying me, and especially without advising me on the subject.

"It was easy for the Premier to understand from my remarks and the frequent conversations which I had with him, that I could not consent to see Her Majesty's subjects despoiled of the right guaranteed to them by Magna Charta—that their property should never be interfered with, except in virtue of a judgment rendered by the tribunals of the country.

"4th —On the 19th March, 1877, being on the eve of absenting myself for a few days, I wrote to the Hon. Mr. Chapleau; and in a postscript I said: 'Please oblige me by telling the Premier that if he needs my concurrence, Mr. Gauthier may bring down to me the documents requiring my signature.'

"M. DeBoucherville should have understood from that, that if I was ready to give

him my concurrence, it was on condition of having all documents submitted to me before signing them.

" I leave you, my Lord, to judge in what manner my views were interpreted.

" 5th.—Under date of the 6th of November last, I addressed to the Hon. M. DeBoucherville the letter of which the following is a copy :—

" ' QUEBEC, 6th November, 1877.

" (Private.)

" ' MY DEAR DEBOUCHERVILLE.—In the last *Official Gazette* were published, under my signature, two proclamations which I had not signed.

" ' One was for the summoning of Parliament, which I had reserved in order to confer with you; the other, which I did not even see, appoints a day of thanksgiving.

" ' These proceedings, the nature of which I shall not characterise, entail, apart from their impropriety, invalidities which you will easily understand.

" ' Yours very truly,

" ' (Signed) L. LETELIER.

" ' The Hon. C. R. DEBOUCHERVILLE,
" ' Premier.'

" The following are the notes which I took of the conversation which I had with M. DeBoucherville on the subject :—

" ' M. DeBoucherville came on the same day he received the letter, to tell me that he regretted that the thing had occurred, and that it was no fault of his. I accepted the excuse, and then told him that I would not tolerate my name being used, when necessary for any duty of my office, unless the documents requiring my signature had been previously submitted to me, and unless information was afforded to me, which M. DeBoucherville assured me would be the course followed in future.

" ' (Signed) L. L.

" 6th.—But, my Lord, there is another point still more important, which I cannot any longer refrain from mentioning.

" From the conversations which I have held with M. DeBoucherville, there results a fact, which, if it were known, would, of itself, have sufficiently justified me in believing that he did not possess the confidence of the people of this Province.

" On two different occasions, some time after the Session of 1876, I pointed out to him that millions had been voted to aid railways in general, at a time when our finances did not appear to me to be in a condition to warrant, all at once, a lavish expenditure in subsidising these numerous undertakings, particularly as, apart from that, our credit was so heavily pledged towards the building of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.

" He very frankly avowed that these grants, though they were for the development of the Province, had been necessitated by political considerations; that without them, the support of the members whose counties were traversed by those railways would cease to be secured to Government; that there would be

no means of having a majority; that those members formed combinations—'Rings'—to control the House.

" M. DeBoucherville is not unaware that I thereupon told him that it was better to save the Province than a Government; and that if his Administration was not strong enough to resist those influences, it would be better for him to form a combination of honest and well-meaning men from both sides of the House, rather than submit to the dictations of those 'Rings' and to the control of those combinations.

" When he made no attempt to escape from that deleterious influence, after his own avowal that the Legislature was controlled by those 'Rings'; when, by his legislation, he sought to favour them anew during the last Session without having previously advised with me, had I not the right, as the representative of my Sovereign, to believe and to be convinced that M. DeBoucherville did not possess a constitutional majority in the Legislative Assembly?

" 7th.—In communicating to both Houses my memoranda of the 25th February and 1st March last, the Premier and Mr. Attorney-General Angers, in violation of their duty, overstepped the authorisation which I had given by my letter of the 4th of March last, for that purpose. They added to that communication a report of pretended conversations, the correctness of which I contest and the impropriety of which I maintain.

" I shall point out, my Lord, one fact alone to prove that incorrectness and that impropriety: the Hon. Messrs. DeBoucherville and Angers, in their explanations to the two Houses, lay great stress on the telegram which Mr. DeBoucherville despatched to me at Rivière Ouelle, to ask my permission to introduce resolutions concerning the finances, and on the blank signature that I sent up in answer to it.

" But these gentlemen themselves had that blank signature filled up by my Private Secretary, so as to give to the telegram the meaning which I attributed to it, namely, a request for permission to introduce the supplies. The following is a copy of the message produced with that blank signature.

" Mr. Treasurer Church presented a message from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, as follows :—

" ' L. LETELIER,

" ' The Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec transmits to the Legislative Assembly the Supplementary Estimates for the current year, and for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1879, which, in conformity with the provisions of the 54th section of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends to the Legislative Assembly.

" ' GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

" ' Quebec, 30th January, 1878."

" My Ministers never had, by their own admission, any other authorisation from me for the introduction of their railway and taxation resolutions, than the blank signature above-

mentioned, in which not a word is said of them. Besides which, it will be noticed that the railway resolutions were introduced on the 29th January, whereas the message is dated the 30th.

"It is for this reason, my Lord, that I bring to your knowledge all the facts and details which are connected with the relations which I have had with M. DeBoucherville and his colleagues.

"Were the controversy with me alone as a private individual, I would abstain from any remonstrance against the injustice of their reflections upon the conduct of the representative of the Crown, which they have made in violation of their duty; but in this matter the maintenance of the constitution is at stake.

"If, without any authority from me, proclamations have been issued which I never signed, is it surprising that messages were communicated in my name to the Houses, respecting which I had never been consulted?

"It is because, as the representative of my Sovereign, I have been unjustly and shamefully dragged before the public, that I make known to you, my Lord, that in the performance of my duty as Her representative, my object has not only been to protect the dignity of my office, but to afford to the people of this Province an opportunity of knowing that, under existing circumstances, the exercise of the Royal Prerogative has not been hostile to their constitutional liberties; but that, on the contrary, it has afforded them the means of freely exercising their judgment.

"These results, my Lord, from what I have now stated:—

"1st.—That, in general, the recommendations which I have made to my Cabinet did not receive the consideration which is due to the representative of the Crown.

"2nd.—That my name has been used by the members of the Government in the signature of documents which I had never seen.

"3rd.—That a Proclamation, summoning the Legislature, was published in the *Official Gazette* without my being consulted or informed of it, and before my signature had been attached thereto.

"4th.—That a like Proclamation, fixing a day of Thanksgiving, was also published under similar circumstances.

"5th.—That, although I had intimated to the Premier, by my advice and by my letter of the 14th March, 1877, my firm determination to protect the inhabitants of this Province against the arbitrary decisions of the Executive in matters within the jurisdiction of the Courts of Justice, he thought proper, without my participation and without advising me, to propose to both Houses, in legislating for the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, 'to substitute the power of the Executive for that of the Judiciary.'

"6th.—That, without having advised me, and without having received authorisation of any sort whatever from me, the Government of M. DeBoucherville proposed to the Legislature a measure of almost general taxation upon the ordinary contracts and transactions

of life, transfers of bank stock, &c., while no message from me had been asked for this object, nor signed by me to authorise its proposition to the Houses.

"7th.—That, after its dismissal, the Government of M. DeBoucherville again failed in its duty by assigning reasons for the adjournment of the House from day to day, different from those agreed on between myself and the Premier, at the risk of prejudicing public opinion against the representative of the Crown.

"8th.—That, at the time of the communication of the causes which rendered necessary the dismissal of the Cabinet, in the explanations which were given by the Premier to the Legislative Council, and by the Attorney-General to the Legislative Assembly, both of them referred to pretended conversations which they had no authority whatever to communicate to the Legislature, since the Premier had, by his answer to the letter of the Lieutenant-Governor of the 4th March last, limited his explanations to the communication to both Houses of my memoranda of the 25th February and 1st March, and the answers of the Premier of the 27th February and of the 2nd and 4th March, instant.

"9th.—That, therefore, the additions and comments made by the Premier before the Legislative Council, and by the Attorney-General before the Legislative Assembly, were contrary to the conditions agreed upon between the Lieutenant-Governor and the Premier.

"10th.—That the Premier and his colleagues, by making use of pretended private conversations to explain the causes of their dismissal, in contravention to their duty to the Crown and to what they had pledged themselves to observe with regard to it, have placed the Lieutenant-Governor under the necessity of bringing under the notice of Your Excellency all the reasons for that dismissal.

"I have the honour to be,

"My Lord,

"Your Excellency's

"Most obedient servant,

"(Signed) L. LETELLIER,
"Lieutenant-Governor."

His Honour Luc Letellier, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, puts out Mr. DeBoucherville because he can no longer "retain him in his position, contrary to the rights and prerogatives of the Crown." He does not say that Mr. DeBoucherville has infringed those rights and prerogatives; nor does he say what those rights and prerogatives of the Crown, represented at Quebec by Mr. Letellier, are. On the contrary, he takes care to proclaim the good faith of Mr. DeBoucherville, and declares that Messrs. Angers and Church did nothing which was not in accordance with the duties of their office. Why then was

the DeBoucherville Cabinet dismissed? From appearances and from the letter of the 1st March, it seems that Mr. de Boucherville and his colleagues were driven from power for the following two formidable reasons: "1st. That, although the Lieutenant-Governor has made many recommendations, in his position as Representative of the Crown, to the Premier, on these different subjects of public interest, his advisers have undertaken a course of administrative and legislative Acts, contrary to those recommendations, and without having previously advised with him. 2nd. That the Lieutenant-Governor has been placed, without evil intention, but, in fact, in a false position, by being exposed to a conflict with the will of the Legislature, which he recognises as being, in all cases, supreme, so long as that will is expressed in all constitutional ways." This constitutional jargon is not very intelligible. It certainly proves a difference of opinion between the Lieutenant Governor and his Cabinet, in relation to mere matters of administration, but nothing else. A strong effort of the imagination was requisite, in order to discover that Mr. DeBoucherville had acted "contrary to the rights and prerogatives of the Crown" by not paying very great attention to these mild complaints. For the present, I do not discuss either the intrinsic merits or the truth of the complaints or reproaches; I shall return to them later. I will content myself, for the present, with calmly examining whether these complaints and reproaches, admitting them to be well grounded, are sufficient to authorise a constitutional Lieutenant-Governor to turn out a Government sustained by a majority of twenty-one in a House of sixty-five. These were, on 1st March the only reasons given, the only reasons known, the only reasons that Mr. Letellier allowed his dismissed Ministers to communicate to the Chambers. Mr. Letellier has judged them himself, and condemned himself when he tried to discover better ones. Let us now see what these new reasons are. Mr. Letellier, it is needless to say, was, like the Liberals of Ottawa before the 17th September last, inspired with pure patriotism, with unbounded devotion to his beloved Province of Quebec, and with

profound respect for the people's money. "After having," he says, in his letter of the 18th March, "studied the general state of the affairs of our Province; after having become convinced that Legislative and Administrative changes were becoming more and more necessary, I decided upon using with moderation, and with the greatest possible discretion, the influence attached to my position, in order to obtain the realisation of that which I deemed to be of the greatest advantage to the Province." He then complains bitterly to Lord Dufferin that his Ministers had not listened sufficiently to him, and, as a proof of their disobedience, he complacently sets forth his seven grievances, which I read out just now. Let us examine into them a little. 1st. He says, in substance, I was made to sanction a Bill which was not passed. A clerical error. So far we do not see in what respect the rights and prerogatives of the Crown were trodden under foot. Let us seek further. 2nd. (A digression on comedy). The second grievance is more dangerous. Mr. DeBoucherville, too much inclined to undermine the foundations of the rights and prerogatives of the Crown, sends to the Lieutenant-Governor for his sanction, a Bill sullied by two important defects: a blank not filled up and a verb "in the infinitive mood" instead, I suppose, of the past participle. Rarely does history, I admit make mention of so dark a conspiracy for violating the rights and prerogatives of the Crown. Let no one accuse me of endeavouring to cast ridicule upon a State paper. I have quoted literally. Notwithstanding the respect which is due from me to a Representative of the Crown my position as a Representative of the people, gives me the right, and makes it my duty, to examine into and to judge the actions and the writings of an officer of the Federal Government. 3rd. The third new reason is the election, or want of election, of a municipal Councillor in the village of Montmagny. Mr. Letellier complains that the Attorney-General caused him to make an irregular appointment of a municipal Councillor. The Government yielded out of courtesy, and Mr. Letellier did as he liked. He revoked the appointment. It does not yet very clearly appear from this in what respect Mr. DeBoucherville

wished to attack the rights and prerogatives of the Crown. 4th. On the 19th March, 1877, in a postscript to a letter to the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, Mr. Letellier instructed him as follows:—"Please oblige me by telling the Premier that, if he needs my *concurrence*, Mr. Gauthier may bring down to me the documents requiring my signature." Mr. Letellier adds that that was a sufficient notification to place Mr. DeBoucherville upon his guard. With such a postscript, Mr. Letellier thought that the rights and prerogatives of the Crown were safe. These four grievances all date back to 1877. They are of so little importance that the Lieutenant-Governor retained his Ministers afterwards, and did not think proper to mention them in his letter of the 1st of March. 5th. On the 6th November, 1877, Mr. Letellier wrote a severe letter to Mr. DeBoucherville, reproaching him with having published two proclamations which he had neither signed or authorised. He has, himself, destroyed that grievance in his reply to the memorial of Messrs. Chapleau, Church and Angers. 6th. The sixth ground of accusation against Mr. DeBoucherville has not much to do with the rights and prerogatives of the Crown. Sometime after the Session of 1876, Mr. DeBoucherville acknowledged to Mr. Letellier that his Government was controlled by Rings, dishonest combinations among Conservative members, who exercised influence to obtain grants in favour of railways on the South Shore. This is a wholesale accusation against the Conservative party, an accusation intended to serve the Liberal cause, and which did serve that cause admirably in the local elections of the month of April last. I shall, in a few moments, treat with stern justice that unqualifiable accusation. And now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what this matter had to do with the rights and prerogatives of the Crown. What had these famous imaginary combinations of 1876 to do with the dismissal of Mr. DeBoucherville? 7th. The seventh grievance is a repetition of that mentioned in the letter of the 1st March. Mr. Letellier reproaches Mr. DeBoucherville with having misused his telegram from River Ouelle, permitting him to lay before the Houses the resolu-

tions respecting the finances. According to Mr. Letellier, that authorisation could only cover the estimates, and in no way the Tax and the Railway Bills. I must acknowledge that this famous reason is a very poor one. The Lieutenant-Governor, every morning, receives the proceedings of the evening before. He, therefore, knew at the time that his Government had used his name on the 29th January, to submit to the House the resolutions respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, and on the 19th February the resolutions for imposing a stamp duty upon certain documents. He did not protest, he did not remonstrate, he did not ask his Government to suspend or withdraw those measures which appear to afflict and annoy him so much, so great was his love of the people. At the last hour, when a large majority had adopted and sanctioned the political course of the Government he steps into the way and says, what is a correct summary of his letters: "You were wrong, Mr. DeBoucherville, in believing that my telegram from River Ouelle authorised you to present your measures respecting taxes and the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway. You and your colleagues have acted in good faith. But you place me in a false position, and I must show you the door, for I cannot continue to retain you in office contrary to the rights and prerogatives of the Crown." I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have given a faithful summary of the reasons adduced by Mr. Letellier for the dismissal of his Ministers. He has no reasons, he has only pretexts. Let us see the force of these pretexts, as compared with the great principles which established the true doctrine of self-government. The foundation, the corner stone, is that the king reigns but does not govern. The Sovereign, the Governor, the Lieutenant-Governor, are all subject to the same rule, to have confidence in and to advise the Ministry which is supported by a majority in the House; to be loyal, open and sincere with it, and to give it every necessary support, so long as it is honoured with the confidence of a good majority in the House. Truly, in this country, we know that beautiful and great system. Responsible government, ministerial responsibility, the constitu-

tional system, with all these are we acquainted. We have studied them, we have learned them, we have watered the soil that produced them with our blood. They have been more to us than the Tree of Liberty, they have been the Tree of Salvation. Let us see what this system is; let us see what part is played in it by him who is called upon to superintend the working of the entire mechanism. He is called King, Queen, Viceroy, Governor-General, or simply Lieutenant-Governor. The name does not signify, because the principle is the same. Lord John Russell may be considered a respectable authority. The following is what he says, in a despatch to Lieutenant-Governor Thompson, of Upper Canada, dated 4th October, 1829:—

“The Constitution of England, after long struggles and alternate success, has settled into a form of government in which the prerogative of the Crown is undisputed, but is never exercised without advice. The Crown must only oppose the wishes of the Assembly where the honour of the Crown or the interests of the Empire are deeply concerned.”

Lord Brougham, a great authority on constitutional questions wrote, in 1835, on the subject of the dismissal during the preceding year of Lord Melbourne, by William IV. He says, first, that the King is but the depository of power. In fact all power belongs to Parliament. And he adds:

“No Sovereign of this country has a right by the Constitution. The Sovereign, I say, has no right by the Constitution, it is illegal, it is prohibited to the Crown; it is a wrong, an unlawful, a criminal act to exercise that high function of dismissing his Ministers and choosing others unless on grounds capable of being stated and defended.”

Harrison, in a work published in 1875, states, in relation to this power of the Sovereign:

“The King cannot insert a sentence or a phrase in his own speech. He cannot add a clause to a Bill in Parliament. The very thought would raise a smile; to act on it would cause a revolution.”

Disraeli, explaining in the English Commons, the formalities of the change of Government, says:

“The Sovereign in England, as we repeat with serious pride, has no part in government.”

Bagehot, in his work on the English Constitution, says:

“No monarch should dissolve Parliament against the will and the interest of the Ministry which is in power. No doubt the King can dismiss such a Ministry and replace it by another Administration, whose advice to dissolve Parliament he could take; but, even with this precaution, to act thus towards a Ministry which had a strong majority in Parliament would be to strike a blow which it is almost impossible to suppose. We do not believe that Queen Victoria herself, in spite of the popularity and respect by which she is surrounded, would even have recourse to such a measure. No Englishman can dream even of a catastrophe of this nature, but it, to him, appears to belong to the phenomena of a world altogether different from that which he inhabits. In practice in England the Sovereign considers himself obliged to follow the advice of the Ministry which the House of Commons desires to maintain in power. All prerogatives at variance with this principle have fallen into disuse. To strike from behind, so to speak, and strangle by means of an appeal to the country a Ministry sustained by Parliament, would be an event which no longer enters into the calculation.”

Bagehot, after having spoken of the dismissal of Lord Melbourne by William IV., concludes by saying:

“The Queen can hardly now refuse a defeated Minister a chance of a dissolution any more than she can dissolve in the time of an undefeated one and without his consent.”

The same author also says:

“The written law leaves to the Crown the choice of all Ministers and agents, but the unwritten law or the unwritten Constitution makes it practically impossible for the Sovereign to keep a Ministry in office whom the House of Commons does not approve, and it makes it almost equally impossible to remove from office a Minister whom the House of Commons does approve.”

Could anything more appropriate, more powerful, more well-founded, to demonstrate and develop the constitutional principle, and to show how Mr. Letellier violated and slighted it, possibly be found? Let us now hear Lord Dufferin upon the duties of Governors. In his speech at Halifax, in 1873, he spoke as follows:—

“My only guiding star in the conduct and maintenance of my official relations with your public men is the Parliament of Canada. I believe in Parliament, no matter which way it votes; and to those men alone whom the deliberate will of the Confederate Parliament of Canada may assign to me as my responsible advisers can I give my confidence. Whether they are heads of this party or of that party must be a

matter of indifference to the Governor-General. So long as they are maintained he is bound to give them his unreserved confidence, to defer to their advice, and to loyally assist them with his counsels."

I again quote Lord Dufferin. On the 22nd February last the English Reform Party gave a dinner at the Reform Club, in honour of our last Governor-General the Earl of Dufferin. The Earl of Granville occupied the chair, and the Marquis of Hartington, the leader of the Whig party, was present. The chairman, proposing Lord Dufferin's health, complimented him highly on the good which he had done for Canada during his term of office. Lord Dufferin, true as ever, to the great principles of responsible government, replied to that part of the Earl of Granville's eulogy in these words:—

"If anything satisfactory to this country has occurred during the course of my administration, it is to be attributed to the patriotism, to the elevated spirit and to the loyalty of the Canadian people themselves [cheers]; and, my lords and gentlemen, I freely confess that I should not consider it a compliment to the head of any self-governing community, if he were credited with the exhibition of any personally invented policy or any independent initiative of his own. [Cheers]."

That is what the English Liberals applauded not three weeks ago. Evidently Mr. Letellier did not draw water from that spring. He is himself a Liberal, but not in the style of great Liberals such as these. Lord Metcalfe, Governor of United Canada from 1843 to 1845, wished, like Mr. Letellier, to institute personal Government. Like him he wished to hand over the power to the minority, and turned out the Lafontaine-Baldwin Cabinet, which was sustained by a large majority of the House. Lord Elgin was charged with the duty of repairing his fault. The instructions given to him by Lord Grey are strikingly applicable at the present time. Among other things, he says to him:—

"The object with which I recommend to you this course is that of making it apparent that any transfer which may take place, of political power from the hands of one party in the Province to those of another, is the result not of an act of yours. To this I attach great importance. I have, therefore, to instruct you to abstain from changing your Executive Council until it shall become perfectly clear that they are unable, with such fair support from yourself as

MR. MOUSSEAU.

they have a right to expect, to carry on the government of the Province satisfactorily, and command the confidence of the Legislature."

Bagehot says also :

"To state the matter shortly, the Sovereign has, under a constitutional monarchy such as ours, three rights:—the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn; and a King of great sense and sagacity would want no others. He would find that his having no others would enable him to use these with singular effect. He would say to his Minister: 'The responsibility of these measures is upon you. Whatever you think best shall have my full and effectual support, but you will observe that for this reason and that reason what you propose to do is bad; for this reason and that reason what you do not propose is better. I do not oppose, it is my duty not to oppose, but observe that I warn.'"

A little further on Bagehot says :

"The popular theory of the English Constitution involves two errors as to the Sovereign. First, in its oldest form, at least, it considers him an estate of the realm, a separate co-ordinate authority with the House of Lords and with the House of Commons. This, and much else, the Sovereign once was, but he is no longer. That authority could only be exercised by a monarch with a legislative veto. He should be able to reject Bills, if not as the House of Commons rejects them, at least as the House of Peers rejects them. But the Queen has no such veto; she must sign her own death-warrant if the two Houses unanimously sent it up to her. It is a fiction of the past to ascribe to her legislative power. She has long ceased to have any."

This is how the head of the Government sums up and estimates the authority in question :

"And that is the duty of a Sovereign. If any legislation carried on by a Ministry having a majority in Parliament, and of course they cannot carry it on without that, was opposed to the view of the Sovereign, he had the right to send for his First Minister and say: 'I will continue to support you, but I have had experience for years, and I warn you;' and that is substantially the only power he has in matters of legislation."

I have reserved one last quotation, the most important of all. I propose now, Mr. Speaker, to shew you Mr. Letellier of 1873, boxing the ears of Mr. Letellier of 1878.

On the 13th August, 1873, Lord Dufferin, listening to the advice of his Ministers—who, in the Session of the spring of that year, had been sustained by a large majority in the House of Commons—prorogued Parliament. The Opposition of the day, the Liberals and the

Grits, were irritated that the minority could not control the action of the Governor-General. After the prorogation, the Liberals met in Committee, and adopted the following motion :

"It was proposed by Mr. Cauchon, seconded by Mr. Mills, and resolved:—That, in the opinion of this meeting, the prorogation of Parliament, by not affording to the House of Commons an opportunity of carrying out the enquiry which they had undertaken, was a revolting violation of the privileges of the Independence of Parliament, and of the rights of citizens."

Inflammatory speeches were made. Mr. Letellier delivered himself of one, — here it is :—

"It is desirable, under the present circumstances, to speak with all the calmness possible, in spite of the popular ebullition, which is a national ebullition. The question to examine is to ascertain whether the Executive can interpose the prerogative of the Crown between itself and Parliament, and in this way hinder the free exercise of the popular will. This prerogative ought not to be employed in overthrowing the freedom belonging to the people (cheers), but should follow the course of events and remain in conformity with the interests of the people. Were it otherwise, Parliament might be dispensed with, and the people would be obliged once more, by means of the rod, to obey the Crown, without regard to other rights. * * The Committee appointed by the House could not be dissolved by any external power without a gross violation of its privileges."

A few minutes before this Mr. Letellier had applauded the following words of the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, used when moving his resolution :—

"If I had been alone, I would have gone further than others have done, and I would have said that neither the Crown nor its representatives have the right to meddle with the privileges of Parliament." (Applause.)

Our Lieutenant-Governor was irritated by the fact that Lord Dufferin did not wish to follow the minority. What would he have done had the Governor-General acted as he did, in opposition to the wishes of the majority? He would evidently have shouldered his musket. The Conservatives in Quebec were not so red-hot. Mr. Letellier put them out of doors, without rhyme or reason; and they only asked for him to be censured, while waiting for his dismissal. I have placed, Mr. Speaker, before the House, a statement of the facts as represented by Mr. Letellier, and the

true principles which apply to the case. I am not afraid to state that not a single member of this House, not a single inhabitant of our country, having any ideas respecting the constitutional principles by which we are governed, would have ventured to have defended the conduct of Mr. Letellier. He has committed two grievous mistakes; the first was the putting out of doors a Government sustained by a large majority. In face of the authorities which I have just cited, the reasons which he advances in his letter to Mr. DeBoucherville, of the 1st March, are not worth the paper on which they are written. Even supposing, as I have already said, his motives to have been sincere, that the facts which he adduces were true, at the most it but proves a mere difference of opinion. His opinion ought not to prevail, for he is not appointed adviser by the Constitution. He knew everything, and allowed everything to take its own course. Instead of warning and remonstrating, instead of suggesting a change of policy at the time of the introduction of the two measures of which he complains, he waited until they were passed, and made use of them as a pretext for dismissing his Ministers, at the very moment when he had no longer the right to interfere, because the Houses had decided the question by a large majority. The second fault is a still more serious one. Forgetting his duties as an impartial Governor, he wrote to the Governor-General, in order to excuse himself, a letter, in which he made use of new reasons, and in which he brought against his old Ministers small, absurd and paltry accusations, not one of which can justify his *coup d'état* of the 2nd March, 1878. I must say, before proceeding further, that this was to us, inhabitants of the Province of Quebec, a sorrowful spectacle. We had for many years made heroic struggles to secure the application to Lower Canada of the great principles of constitutional liberty, which have established the honour, the glory, and the prosperity of England. Confederation had affixed the seal to, and placed the crown upon, our long and glorious struggles, by assuring to us political liberty and our self-government as a nation. These considerations, Mr. Speaker, are an explanation to us of the

patriotic indignation of the people of the Province of Quebec, when they learned that the first blow struck at our liberties was given by a French Lieutenant-Governor. The affair was so astonishing that even our adversaries, who were not in Mr. Letellier's secrets, refused to believe that the DeBoucherville Cabinet had been dismissed. The Montreal *Herald* of the 5th March, 1878, refused to believe in the dismissal. It alleged that Mr. DeBoucherville had resigned because Mr. Letellier wished to reserve for the Governor-General's pleasure the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway Bill. It could not believe, it could not even entertain the idea that Mr. Letellier had dismissed Mr. DeBoucherville for a mere difference of opinion. I think that I have, Mr. Speaker, sufficiently shewn that Mr. Letellier deserves more than censure, even if he is judged by his own allegations. It remains for me to fulfil a painful, delicate and eminently disagreeable task: it is that of shewing to the House and to the country that the grievances he had against the De Boucherville Cabinet, were, to make use of a polite and parliamentary expression, purely imaginary. Not only does Mr. Letellier, in order to justify his *coup d'état*, set out puerile motives, but these motives even, in fact, have no foundation of truth. For my own satisfaction, and for the satisfaction of the House, I wish on this point to be methodical and categorical. 1st. Mr. Letellier alleges that Mr. DeBoucherville had made an improper use of his telegrams from Rivière Ouelle. On the twenty-eighth of January Mr. DeBoucherville had sent to him at Rivière Ouelle the following telegraphic despatch: "Can you send me authority for the resolutions in the financial matters." The next day, the 29th January, the Lieutenant-Governor replied in English: "Blank mailed to-day. If presence necessary, telegraph; return Friday." Mr. DeBoucherville believed in good faith that this authority covered their three financial measures, the Estimates, the Railway Bill, and the Tax Bill. The first use that was made of it was on the 29th January, the day on which the telegram was received, and after it had been received. I have already stated to this honourable House, that it was on this

Mr. MOUSSEAU.

day that they made use of Mr. Letellier's name for the introduction of the Railway resolutions. Mr. Letellier knew of this by the Votes and Proceedings, and on the third day by the financial statement of Mr. Church. He maintained silence for one month. Did he do so in good faith, or did he wish to set an odious trap for his Ministers? The House and the country have the right to put this question. 2nd. During the Session of 1876, in which they made him sanction a Bill which had not passed—he complained of this, and adds: "A short time afterwards I was informed of this irregularity, and I at once spoke about it to the Premier. I remarked to him that an act of this nature carried with it consequences of too serious a character to be passed over in silence. To oblige him, however, I made no grievance of this act of irregular legislation, which had now become irremediable." I hold in my hands proof to the contrary. The Bill in question related to the formation of companies formed for making roads and destroying noxious weeds in the country. The clerk, by mistake, put the draft of this law in the list of Bills to be sanctioned. The hon. Mr. Angers, Attorney-General at the time, at once discovered the mistake, when the Bills sanctioned were read, and told Mr. Letellier of it, in the room of the Speaker of the Council, on the very day of prorogation. Mr. Angers prepared a report which Mr. Letellier signed, and himself sent to the Secretary of State, to be forwarded to the Minister of Justice;—in this report he requested the latter to disallow this Act. Mr. Blake replied that the Bill was a dead letter, and that it was not necessary to disallow it. This answer passed through the hands of Mr. Letellier. The famous Bill was not even included in the Statutes containing the laws passed in the Session of 1876. This is the big affair with which Mr. Letellier reproaches his Ministers as being an outrage against the rights and prerogatives of the Crown. If there were nothing in this but absurdity, I would say nothing about it. But it has its serious and sad aspect; and that is to see a Lieutenant-Governor writing to the direct representative of Her Majesty, the Earl of Dufferin, things which he himself, better than anyone else, knew

were not correct. Why talk of irregular and irreparable proceedings, when he himself knew that irreparable legislation was not even recorded in the Statute-book. 3rd. Let us say a word more about the famous Bill with the little blank not filled up, and an infinitive badly placed. This was in December, 1876. Mr. Letellier tells Lord Dufferin how he had paternally admonished Mr. DeBoucherville. He then adds :—"The Premier came to tell me that he regretted this omission, and asked me to sanction this Bill in the condition it then was. The spirit of conciliation with which I agreed to this seemed very agreeable to him." In his zeal for the rights and privileges of the Crown, so vilely outraged by this infamous Bill, Mr. Letellier forgets that he sanctioned, at the same time as this informal Bill, another Bill, which amended and completed it. This is to be seen in the Statutes of 1876, chapter 19 and chapter 20. But I have never been able to find out what became of the infinitive which horrified his conscientious scruples so much. 4th. We now reach the municipal election of Montmagny. The person named N. Bernatchez, Mayor of his village, is an important personage in the south ward of the village of Montmagny. A devoted liberal, ready to sacrifice everything for his party, he knows his value. and steps over the heads of Ministers to address the Lieutenant-Governor directly, not in Council, but personally. In the official papers submitted to the House at Quebec, in July, 1878, we find a very interesting letter from the aforesaid Bernatchez. The following is that interesting document :—

"MONTMAGNY, 10th March, 1877.

"To His Excellency

"The Honourable LUC LETELLIER DE ST. JUST,
"Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of
Quebec.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY :

"I take the liberty of respectfully informing you that on the 19th day of February last, Eugene Fournier, of the Village of Montmagny, was elected by acclamation Municipal Councillor for the South Ward of the said Village of Montmagny, at a meeting of the municipal electors of said Ward, held in accordance with a judgment rendered by the Magistrate's Court for the county of Montmagny, dated the 31st January, eighteen hundred and seventy-seven, as appears by a copy

of the minutes of the said meeting, which I have the honour to enclose herewith.

"That the said Eugene Fournier has been duly sworn in as Municipal Councillor, and that he has already exercised, and still exercises the duties of the said office.

"The Council learns with regret that Your Excellency has been deceived and led into error, and that in consequence of false representations, Your Excellency being under the impression that the said seat was vacant, has appointed Jules Bélanger as the person to fill the place of Municipal Councillor for the said Ward.

"Under the circumstances, we respectfully hope that, in consideration of the facts elsewhere set forth, Your Excellency will be pleased to cancel the appointment of the said Jules Bélanger, so as to avoid the inevitable trouble to which this conflict of authority will give rise.

"I have the honour to be,

"Your Excellency's

"Very humble servant,

"(Signed) N. BERNATCHEZ,
"Mayor."

Mr. Letellier, always jealous of the rights and prerogatives of the Crown, but a little forgetful of the rights and prerogatives of his Ministry, and of Parliament, causes himself to be advised by the Mayor of Montmagny; and, strong in that adviser so distinguished in the south ward of Montmagny, he forces upon his own responsible Ministers the opinion of Mr. Bernatchez, who was himself responsible only to the the south ward of the Village of Montmagny. Attorney-General Angers was of opinion that Mr. Eugene Fournier was not elected; because, in fact, there had been no election. A former election having been contested, and annulled, a new election was ordered by the judgment; our municipal code requires that notice of that election should be given under pain of absolute nullity. The friends of Messrs. Bernatchez and Letellier, wishing to have an election to their taste, I suppose, avoided giving the necessary notice. The election was consequently null, or rather there was none. Mr. Angers, upon these facts, made a report to His Excellency, who appointed Jules Bélanger. But Bernatchez had not spoken. He said his word, and at once Mr. Letellier takes his advice instead of the advice of his Ministers. Mr. Angers has the reputation of being an eminent advocate, but his legal attainments will never equal those of Bernatchez. That was Mr. Letellier's opinion, and because

Bernatchez advised him, Mr. DeBoucherville, by that very fact, attacked the rights and prerogatives of the Crown. But we should forgive Mr. Letellier, in view of the greatness of the motive which inspired him. He repudiated the action of his Ministers, because they wished to substitute the intervention of the Executive for judicial action. Last year, Mr. Martel, member for Chambly, in the Local Legislature, had the misfortune to displease Mr. Letellier by his votes. He had been elected a Municipal Councillor and Mayor of Chambly in February or March, 1878. He had forgotten, however, to qualify himself. But he had been Mayor for four or five years and was known to be a man of means. Some weeks subsequent to the Session in July last, Mr. Letellier appointed in place and stead of Mr. Martel, a Councillor to suit himself, on the ground that Mr. Martel had filed his qualification papers a few days too late. Of course Mr. Letellier did that in order to "substitute the action of the judiciary for the intervention of the Executive, and for the better protection of the rights and prerogatives of the Crown." 5. A word only as to Mr. Letellier's complaint about the two proclamations, inserted in the *Official Gazette* without his knowledge and consent. Messrs. Chapleau, Church and Angers furnish a reply to the charge, which places Mr. Letellier in a most humiliating position. He says that one of the proclamations was for the calling of the Legislature. The official papers laid before the Quebec Assembly in July last, prove that Mr. Letellier is wrong. It was merely the formal calling of the Legislature, not for the despatch of business, which takes place every forty days, and is done by an ordinary clerk. We find, moreover, by those official papers that the Order in Council, in relation to that proclamation and the proclamation itself bears the signature of Mr. Letellier himself. Mr. Letellier also signed the Order in Council and the proclamation relating to Thanksgiving Day. Moreover, it was he himself, acting on a letter from the Dominion Prime Minister, the hon. member for Lambton, who had asked Mr. DeBoucherville to prepare the Order in Council and proclamation respecting the Thanksgiving Day.

MR. MOUSSEAU.

These facts are painful to state; unfortunately they are true. Mr. Letellier must have been badly in want of arguments to justify the dismissal of his Ministers when he has recourse to such inaccuracies. 6. I now come to the most delicate point in my task. Mr. Letellier solemnly asserts that Mr. DeBoucherville admitted to him that his Government could not do any good, because it was controlled by "Rings," that is to say, by odious combinations among Conservative members who wanted to get their hands into the public chest. This serious charge is not founded on fact. But I shall answer it with the respect and dignity characteristic of Mr. DeBoucherville's reply. He might well have said: "Mr. Letellier, you are wrong in making such a charge on the eve of a general election; you know in the first place it is not true, in the next you know what harm such an accusation over your signature will work to the country and to a powerful party. Full of respect for the rights and prerogatives of the Crown, which you have utilized to cover your political nakedness, I respect them too much in your person to qualify your accusation as it rightly deserves." Mr. DeBoucherville refrained from saying that, and he did well. But he respectfully submitted to Mr. Letellier a crushing truth of far greater weight. He said to Mr. Letellier, I could not have made such an admission, the thing is simply impossible, for the best of reasons, namely, that my Government never experienced the pressure of "Rings," for railways on the South Shore, and that since I came into power, in 1874, I have not increased by one single cent the grants to those railways. There has been what was called a doubling up of grants, that is to say, that one railway company which shortened its line, renounced a portion of its grant, in order to apply the remainder to the part of the road already begun or constructed. That legislation was so good and so excellent that a Bill of that nature, which had been introduced by the DeBoucherville Administration, in the winter session of 1878, was carried through, after the dismissal of that Administration, by the Joly Cabinet, with the sanction of Mr. Letellier himself. This is the same Bill that served Mr. Letellier as a pretext for thwarting the DeBoucher-

ville Ministry as to its Bill relating to taxes, and its Bill respecting the Q. M. O. & O. Railway. I trust, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Letellier's conduct will be censured, and that that censure will be followed by practical consequences. Three powerful motives of public interest imperatively demand that solution. It is of vital importance that in the first stage of our history, as a Confederation, we should repudiate, we should repel, we should stigmatise any attempt at personal government. We have based our new system on the British Constitution, the grandest, the most liberal under the sun. Let us maintain it intact, and let punishment proportioned to the heinousness of the offence, be inflicted on the first who dares to violate it. Let us establish at once, in the apt words of the right hon. the leader of the Government, a salutary and lasting precedent, a precedent which may serve as a warning and a lesson to future generations. In the second place, Mr. Letellier has rendered himself unworthy of the high office he holds; his mode of acting towards his Ministers, his treatment of a powerful party in the country, the numerous inaccuracies of which he was voluntarily guilty in his official correspondence on the subject, not only render him unworthy of his position, but must bring discredit on the Royal authority, and thereby inflict an injury on monarchical institutions in this country. But there is another, and a still greater danger. Mr. Letellier, by openly declaring war against a powerful party in the Province of Quebec, by insulting it as he has done in his letter of the 18th of March, to Lord Dufferin, has rendered any administration by him impossible in the Province of Quebec. By identifying himself with a party, as Lord Metcalfe did, he compels the Opposition to strike, not merely at the adverse party, but at the representative of authority. He has, therefore, rendered impossible any co-operation between himself and the majority in the Province of Quebec, in carrying on the public business. And now, what reply is there to all these accusations against Mr. Letellier. I do not pretend to a monopoly of the knowledge and virtue of justice; but what reply is there to this? I ask in what way certain subsequent acts can be

adduced in favour of Mr. Letellier? It may, perhaps, be said that, during last Session, we tried Mr. Letellier, and that he was acquitted. Mr. Speaker, there are certain crimes in the case of which neither the plea of already tried nor prescription can ever be advanced. And, in the first place as a matter of fact, he did not undergo his trial; he was not judged. The motion of censure, made last year, was not rejected upon its merits. Despite the docile and powerful majority which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) then had, he did not choose that the debate should be exhausted upon the merits of the Lieutenant-Governor's conduct. On the contrary, he had recourse to a subterfuge. He entered a dilatory plea for the defence. He demanded that the cause should be put off until the time when the judgment of the people should be given. The writs had been issued, the local elections were soon to take place, and it was said: Let us leave it in the hands of the people; let them decide. I did not approve of that judgment; it cannot be revoked now; it was not only one of the rights of the Federal Parliament, but also one of its duties, generally, to superintend all persons employed by the Crown. It has a right to say in such a case, or in such circumstances, an employé has misbehaved himself; that is what we did; we had a right to do it, and, in England, the thing has been done over and over again. I am aware that Mr. Letellier, in answer to Messrs. Chapleau, Church and Angers, says that, after all, he was right, and that his Ministers did not possess the public confidence. He quotes victoriously the case of my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker). It is true that the hon. Provincial Secretary for Quebec, for the time (the member for Missisquoi) was defeated, but it was a defeat that does little honour to the party which Mr. Letellier wished to bring into power. Every one knows the enormous infamy, the terrific outrage, by means of which Mr. Baker was defeated. On the eve of the elections, the services of a swindler were secured, who wrote in a newspaper infamous statements against Mr. Baker, absurd and impossible statements, but it was too late to refute them in time to

prevent the evil which they were to do during the election. By means of this conspiracy—the foulest and the vilest, perhaps, which has come to light for years and years—they succeeded in crushing a distinguished man, and were able to say that he had been defeated, and consequently that the *coup d'état* had been ratified by the people. The newspaper which published those infamous statements against my friend, Mr. Baker, was brought before a criminal court, and, some time after, retracted fully, apologised and paid the costs. Many defeats have been occasioned by similar means, and if it is wished to plead such a victory as a justification of Mr. Letellier, I think that the less he boasts of it the better for his honour. In fact, it appears that that Government had a majority at a given period of its existence, but it was not upon the constitutional question on which the elections had been held. It was defeated, it was censured at the opening of the House upon the very vote on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Later, by means of those “human devices,” of which Mr. Letellier has the secret, the Joly Government obtained one vote more, but it was the purchased casting-vote of the Speaker of the House. A law was passed there, but it was only passed by the casting vote of the Speaker. It was reserved for the decision of the Imperial Government, and then it was declared that it must be disapproved and not allowed, because it was passed by the casting vote of the Speaker. By the quotations which I have made, we have seen that that change of Government, that scandal by which the representative of the Sovereign proceeded without authority to bring a minority into power, are always deserving of rebuke, are always blamable. We have always the right to blame the means which he employed to give the power to a minority which had it not, and to drive from power a majority which possessed public confidence, as well as that of the House. It has also been said, and, I suppose, that the same reason will be adduced with great vigour, that Mr. Letellier's course was approved, because the supplies were voted to the Government of his selection. But, Sir, that would be

MR. MOUSSEAU.

a sad argument. It would be a very severe punishment to inflict on all those devoted, intelligent, and patriotic men who preferred the public interest to their own just resentment. We had, in the Province of Quebec, very important works under way; we had to construct a railway and we required money to pay the contractors, and we had to meet our engagements. The Conservative party might refuse the supplies, it might have thrown the Province into great confusion, and done great injury to its credit, but that party preferred to sacrifice its political rancour, and its just mistrust upon the altar of its country; and now can it be brought forward as a reproach against our Conservative friends who did thereby a great act of devotion, rather than punish those men who so justly deserved it? It only now remains for me to thank the House heartily for the attention with which I have been listened to; with me, the House understands the importance of the subject. If I have gone too far in my allusions to certain actions, I ask pardon. But I think I have done what I proposed to do. I wished to do two things,—to prove, before the House and before the country, that the reasons adduced by Mr. Letellier for having dismissed his Ministers and so eminently respectable a leader of the Government (Mr. DeBoucherville) that these reasons I say were not sufficient, even supposing them to be well founded, to justify his action. I further wished to prove that those reasons were absolutely valueless because they were characterised by very serious errors and incorrectness, if not something worse. The motion which I am about to submit is word for word the same as that brought forward in April last by the right hon. the leader of the Government. Every one will understand why I present the same motion: it is for the purpose of obtaining more easily the punishment reserved for the fault or the crime of Mr. Letellier. The motion is as follows:

Resolved:—That the dismissal by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec of his Ministers, on the second day of March, 1878, was under the circumstances, unwise and subversive of the position accorded to the advisers of the Crown since the concession of the principle of responsible government to the British North American Colonies.

MR. McCARTHY: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion of my hon. friend, I regret it will be necessary for me to travel, to some extent, at all events, over the ground which my hon. friend has so fully gone over, because, to a great number of members of this House, his speech has not conveyed to us the facts, from our inability to follow him in the language in which he has spoken. I shall not be able to do so in the full, explicit manner in which I have no doubt that hon. gentleman has spoken. I will not attempt to occupy the time of the House to such an extent, because we have had the papers in our hands for several days, and most of us, no doubt, have made up our minds and formed an opinion upon the facts thereby conveyed to us. But I would say that this is one of the most important questions which can come before us this Session—very possibly during this Parliament. It is a question involving the position of a high official of the Dominion; an officer who, to some extent, represents our Sovereign, and who, to some extent, exercises sovereign power; an officer who, for a term of years, unless there is grave fault to be found with him, holds his position independent, as well of Executive, as of Parliamentary control. And I would say to my hon. friend, and this House, that no question that can come before us deserves to be more impartially considered, or to be considered more free from party bias and from party feeling, than the one which is now before the Chair. I trust it will be so considered; I trust we will be able to lay aside our party feelings, and that the more as we are now exercising, probably for the first time, rights somewhat of an Imperial character. This, perhaps, brings more forcibly to us than anything can do the great stride that was made in the Constitution which was given us by the Confederation Act of 1867. Before that period, although the Governor-General of Canada was Governor-General of British North America, the Lieutenant-Governors held their commission direct from the Queen herself, and were not subject to our Parliament, nor their acts to our criticism. Now, for the first time—leaving aside for the moment the same question that came up last year—we have to pronounce an opinion involving Imperial

consideration. The high position of the gentleman whose conduct is now under review is another reason, if a reason were wanting, why we should give to this subject our greatest consideration. I trust that, bearing in mind the responsibilities which weigh upon us, bearing in mind the result of this debate, bearing in mind that we are now about to lay down and establish a precedent which may be quoted in generations yet to come, we will be careful to see that we do not pronounce against this high public officer and distinguished official unless his conduct merits our condemnation; and, at the same time, be careful to guard the rights of the people whose representatives we are. If these rights have been invaded, we shall protect them and defend them here in their own House. Now, I would ask, too, that this be not looked upon as a provincial matter. I believe it has been said that we can very easily learn to regard with equanimity the misfortunes of our friends, and I would say to the representatives from other portions of the Dominion that this, although a matter more nearly affecting the Province of Quebec, is one that in principle affects the whole Dominion. The Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec is charged with having been derelict in his high office, with having trampled upon the rights of the people of that great Province, and, Sir, what was done last year in Quebec may yet be done in Ontario, may yet be done in the other Provinces if the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor, calls for condemnation, and passes without censure. Therefore we are not to look upon it as a provincial question, or as a matter affecting merely the rights of the Province of Quebec. We are bound to look upon it as one affecting the interests of the whole Dominion, and as one affecting the interest of every elector in this Dominion, and of every freeman in this country. I trust it will be so considered, and so viewed by the representatives of the other Provinces when they come to express their opinions on this question. Now, what was the accusation which has been made against His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor? He is accused of having usurped the prerogative. He is accused of having trampled the

rights of the people under foot. He is accused of having acted without the advice of his Council, and contrary to the advice of his Council; of dismissing the Ministry, having the confidence of the majority of the people's representatives in the House, and were willing to support the then Government of Quebec in an unconstitutional manner. These are grave charges, and charges which, when made, deserve careful consideration. These are charges which call upon us, in passing judgment, or in censuring the acts of that official, to give him the benefit of every doubt, to place upon his conduct the most favourable construction, and to place upon his words the construction which would be consistent with his honour and the duty which he owed to his Sovereign and to the people whom he was placed to govern. Unless we can come to the conclusion that he has violated these principles; unless we can, after giving the matter our most careful consideration, come to that conclusion, we ought, in justice to that official, refuse to pass a vote of censure upon him. That we have power to pass a vote of censure, I do not think there is any doubt. The Lieutenant-Governors are appointed by our own Government here, and they are removable for cause by our Government here, and we have a right, and it is our duty, to investigate and to pass judgment, from time to time, not only on what they have done, but also, we have a right to express an opinion about what they ought to have done, and what they have failed to do. If we have the right, and I am not going to quote the Statute, which we all know so well, the next question in order is, is it expedient we should exercise that right; is it expedient that we should, as it were, sit in judgment upon the doings of the late Government and the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. I will admit that it is only in grave cases that we are justified to sit in judgment, to repeat my words, upon the doings of the Local Governments and the Local Houses. But I think, Sir, when we look at these papers, and find that an angry controversy is being kept up between the Lieutenant-Governor and the distinguished leaders of a great party in the Province of Quebec; when we find that these gentlemen

made a formal representation to His Excellency the Governor-General; when we find that they have charged the Lieutenant-Governor with dereliction of duty in his office; with being guilty of conduct subversive of the rights of the people and of responsible government; when they add to that the charge that he has made statements which cannot be reconciled with facts; when these statements have been made not unwittingly, not carelessly, but deliberately; and, as it is charged, under circumstances to which only one word can be applied, and that word I am not going to apply here, then we should not be doing our duty in this House if we failed to take notice of these papers that have been brought down. We should not be doing our duty to the great Province of Quebec if we allowed a controversy of this kind to remain unsettled; if we allowed matters of this kind to create heart-burnings and difficulties, which are sure to follow if it were not finally settled once and for all. I think that these papers and these grave accusations are ample justification for our moving in this matter. Now, Sir, what was the position of affairs in the Province of Quebec when this difficulty arose? Mr. Letellier had been sent to govern that Province by the late Administration. He was, at that time, a member of the late Administration; a warm partisan and hostile to the party which then ruled that Province. It is unfortunate, it is unfortunate, I say, that our Lieutenant-Governors have, from the very necessity of the case, to be selected from warm partisans. It behoves gentlemen thus honoured, and thus placed in control of our different Provinces, to forget, during the time they exercise the rights which they are sent there to exercise, during the time they are, to some extent, representatives of Her Majesty—it behoves them, I say, to be more careful, if possible, than the gentlemen who are sent to preside over the whole Dominion. They should be careful to abstain from any interference or from any show of interference between the two political parties into which all our Provinces are divided. For two years, the Government of Mr. De Boucherville successfully managed the affairs of the Province. During that period they were supported in a House

of 65 or 66 members—I forget for the moment the correct number—by a majority of twenty, a very large majority considering the number of members. During that period there was no agitation out of doors; nothing unusual; but the machinery of the Government was running as smoothly as possible, without any difficulties such as occasionally arise under our Constitution. But, Sir, we find this Lieutenant-Governor, this chief executive officer, this head of the Government of Quebec was bound to do as Her Majesty has done during her reign, as the Governors-General who have presided in this country do, I may say, without exception; he was bound to give his advisers his implicit confidence; he was bound to carry on the Government by them, and to place implicit confidence and reliance in them, so long as they had the confidence of the majority of the people's representatives. Well, on the 27th of February last, or the 26th, without any notice, without any warning, without any complaint, the Lieutenant-Governor sent a Message to the Premier, and in this Message demanded several documents, and he winds up by saying:—

“12. A detailed statement of the reasons which induced the Provincial Government not to content themselves with the provisions of the Statute and Common Law, and with those of the Civil Code of this Province, for the recovery of the sums of money which might become due by the said Corporations, but without having in any manner previously consulted with the Lieutenant-Governor, to propose an *ex post facto* legislation to compel them thereto.

“Another very important measure to provide for the imposition of new taxes was also similarly proposed to the Legislature, without having been previously submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor.

“The Lieutenant-Governor is perfectly aware that measures of secondary importance, which have previously been sufficiently explained to him, may be, as a matter of routine, proposed to both Houses without an express order from himself, but he cannot allow the Executive to communicate to the Legislature on his behalf, any important or new measures without his special order, and without his having been previously fully informed and advised thereof.”

What was the accusation which he made against his Government? And, remember, that, so far as these papers show us, with the excep-

tions which I will advert to by-and-bye, there had been no difficulties between the Lieutenant-Governor and his advisers, and there was no warning given to them that they were bringing down measures to the House without his authority and without his approval. There had been nothing to indicate that there was any difficulty between his advisers and himself, but those referred to almost at the end of the Session. Thus, when the measures, as I will presently show, had been brought to a state of completion; when the Legislature had almost passed upon them, he sent this communication, in which, for the first time, he makes the accusation which is, in substance, that they had brought down measures to the House without his authority, and without having previously consulted him. Well, Sir, what was the answer which was made by the Premier of Quebec? It was prompt, and, I think I may say, satisfactory. He waits upon His Honour before all these documents, which had been called for, could be prepared, so that not one moment should be lost in explaining his action, and showed that the charges which had been made were absolutely baseless. This interview took place on the 28th February. Remember, Sir, that this accusation was conveyed by him on the 27th February. He states that he sent to the Lieutenant-Governor, who was then away from the seat of Government, for authority to introduce the financial measures. He showed that to that communication he received an answer from the Lieutenant-Governor by telegraph that the authority would be sent in blank, and the authority was sent in blank, showing most clearly and most conclusively the position in which the Premier of the Province stood towards the Lieutenant-Governor; showing the terms upon which they were carrying on the business of the country, and proving, as it appears to me, conclusively, that the step that was afterwards taken, that the pretence that was afterwards made, was merely a pretext, and was not bottomed or based upon any substantial grounds or upon any substantial foundation. “Later on, I had the honour,” says the Premier, “of requesting Your Excellency's authorisation to lay money questions before the House, and this

Your Excellency granted, with your usual condescension. I must admit that, with this authorisation and conviction in my mind that Your Excellency had read the Treasurer's Budget speech, in which he announced the taxes afterwards proposed and considered, I had the right to inform my colleagues that I had your permission concerning all questions respecting money. I beg Your Excellency to believe that I never had any intention whatever of arrogating to myself the right of having measures passed without your approval, and that, under existing circumstances, having had occasion to speak to Your Excellency in reference to the law respecting the Provincial Railway, and not having received any order to suspend it, I did not think your Excellency would discover in this measure any intention on my part to slight your prerogatives, which no one is more disposed than I am to respect and uphold." It is for us to say whether that was a satisfactory explanation or not. We have the Lieutenant-Governor's own statement that it was a satisfactory explanation, that he did not believe there had been any attempt on the part of the Premier, Mr. DeBoucherville, or his colleagues, to assail the prerogatives of the Crown, or to slight them. He did not think there was any intention on their part to do that which was unbecoming their position as his advisers. The Lieutenant-Governor said this, and it is stated in the papers which have been submitted to us :

"After some conversation, the Lieutenant-Governor, having heard Mr. DeBoucherville's explanations, admitted that, if there had been any misunderstanding, the latter had acted in good faith in authorising his colleagues to say they were authorised to submit the legislation in reference to money matters."

And so the interview went on; and it ends in this way:—

"In reply to a question on the subject, he (the Lieutenant-Governor) afterwards told him that the only difficulty remaining was the question of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, and that he would give an answer on the following day, the 26th February."

Thus, all pretence that the advisers of the Executive had done that which was unbecoming their position is, upon meeting the Premier face to face, abandoned. No claim is made upon that ground.

MR. MCCARTHY.

The only question is, whether this Railway Bill, which had been brought down to the House and carried through its second reading, and was about to become law, was to be reserved by the Lieutenant-Governor, or to be sanctioned in the ordinary course. There was nothing in this, I think we must all see, to cause any disruption between the Lieutenant-Governor and his advisers. And, on the following day, when the Premier again waits upon His Honour, and asks for an answer, what takes place? On leaving, Mr. DeBoucherville said: "If I understand you rightly, you are hesitating between giving your sanction to the Railway Bill and reserving it." He replied, "That is it." Now, Sir, we have got down to the explanations that were made and submitted to the Provincial Parliament, and I think that, if these explanations are not sufficient, and are not satisfactory, then the Lieutenant-Governor must stand convicted of having been guilty of conduct which, in the language of the resolution, "is subversive of the rights we have under responsible government," because he dismissed his Ministers, with their large majority, for no other cause than the ones we have here mentioned, and in which, after explanation, he was satisfied there was no attempt to slight his prerogative, on the part of his advisers, or to be guilty of disrespectful or insubordinate conduct. All that remained for him to consider was whether he should reserve or sanction this Railway Bill. Upon that question he did not seek their advice, but sent to the Premier, without more ado, a communication to the effect that he could not accept their advice, and forced them to resign; in other words, he dismissed them. Are we prepared here, for that is the question, to say that the Lieutenant-Governors of our different Provinces are placed in a position higher than that which Her Majesty the Queen occupies in Great Britain; higher than that which the Governor-General occupies here? If not, we must come to the conclusion that a Lieutenant-Governor who has refused to follow the advice of his Ministers, who possess the confidence of the representatives of the people, who has violated what all understand to be parliamentary or constitutional govern-

ment, who has violated the rights we believe we have obtained since the days of Baldwin and Lafontaine, the rights of responsible government, ought not longer to be maintained in the position to which he has been called and in which he has been guilty of such misconduct. Let us see what are these rights, these duties, which belong to the Lieutenant-Governor, and which I, for one, would be the last to say he ought not to possess. I assume, and I fancy there can be no reasonable doubt, that our Lieutenant-Governors, as to their own local Parliaments, possess the same powers and authority as our Governor-General possesses as to this Parliament; and I think we cannot work out our system of constitutional government in our Local Legislatures unless we admit this principle. If so, what is the position of the representative of the Crown? I will quote from a work that has been read before in this House, and which is, I believe, generally accepted by men of all shades of politics, as being, perhaps, the best exposition of responsible government that has yet been written, Mr. Bagehot's work on the English Constitution. I will read one or two extracts as to the duty which the Crown has to perform under our system of Government:

"The popular theory of the English Constitution involves two errors as to the Sovereign:—First, in its oldest form at least, it considers him as an 'Estate of the Realm,' a separate co-ordinate authority with the House of Lords and the House of Commons. This, and much else, the Sovereign once was, but this he is no longer. That authority could only be exercised by a monarch with a legislative veto. He should be able to reject Bills, if not as the House of Commons rejects them, at least, as the House of Peers rejects them. But the Queen has no such veto. She must sign her own death-warrant if the two Houses unanimously send it up to her. It is a fiction of the past to ascribe to her legislative power. She has long ceased to have any."

Further on, this writer states:

"To state the matter shortly, the Sovereign has, under a constitutional monarchy, such as ours, three rights: the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn. And a King of great sense and sagacity would want no others. He would find that his having no others would enable him to use these with singular effect. He would say to his Minister: 'The responsibility of these measures is upon you. Whatever you think best must be done. Whatever you think best

shall have my full and effectual support. But you will observe that, for this reason and that reason, what you propose to do is bad. For this reason and that reason, what you do not propose is better. I do not oppose, it is my duty not to oppose; but observe that I warn.'"

Now, I suppose that that will not be denied by any hon. member who calls himself a Liberal to be the position which our Lieutenant-Governors occupy with regard to their Executives.

MR. HOLTON: Hear, hear.

MR. MCCARTHY: An hon. gentleman calls "hear, hear", whether in assent or dissent to that proposition, I know not.

MR. HOLTON: Decided dissent.

MR. MCCARTHY: I will be glad to hear, when that hon. gentleman addresses the House, as, no doubt, he will, his reasons for considering the Lieutenant-Governor possesses greater power than that. For my part I am not willing or desirous that our Lieutenant-Governors or our Governors-General should be shorn of one atom of their rightful power. No one could have read the life of the Prince Consort, written by Mr. Martin, and printed under, I might say, the supervision of Her Majesty, without being convinced of this: that great good has resulted in England from the superintendence, the administrative ability which has characterised, not only Her Majesty, but, during his lifetime, the Prince Consort. No person can doubt that; nor can we doubt here when we read the despatches which have been and are submitted, from time to time, to the Imperial Parliament, as to the conduct of our Governors-General, that their assistance has been very great, and that it is not wise that they should be mere automata, figure-heads, ornamental appendages. I maintain, under a constitutional government, the people are, after all, supreme, and that this House, as representing the people, is the supreme, and, in the end, the absolute authority. As to the Lieutenant-Governor's power of dissolving the House, we will hear what the same writer says:

"Principle shows that the power of dismissing a Government with which Parliament is satisfied, and of dissolving that Parliament

upon an appeal to the people, is not a power which common hereditary monarchs will, in the long run, be able to beneficially exercise. Accordingly, this power is almost, if not quite, dropped out of the reality of our Constitution. Nothing, perhaps, would more surprise English people than if the Queen, by a *coup d'état*, and on a sudden, destroyed a Ministry firm in the allegiance, and secure of a majority in Parliament."

This is exactly what was done by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

MR. MCCARTHY:

"That power indisputably, in theory, belongs to her; but it has passed so far away from the minds of men that it would terrify them if she used it, like a volcanic eruption from Primrose Hill."

Do we not feel that is only a correct exposition of the Constitution under which we live? I do not mean to say that, legally speaking, or theoretically speaking, if you like, the power of dissolution is not still one of prerogative, like many other rights of prerogative, but I mean to say that these prerogative powers are now hemmed in by constitutional rules and principles, and that, to quote the words of Mr. Freeman's late work on the subject, "We now have a whole system of political morality, a whole code of precepts for the guidance of public men, which will not be found in any page of either Statute or common law, but which in practice holds hardly less sacred than any principle embodied in the Great Charter, or in the Petition of Rights," and one of these principles is that the authority of the people's representatives in Parliament, and that the men whom the people's representatives in Parliament have confidence in, are to be the advisers of the Sovereign, and it is a breach of the British Constitution and of the unwritten law, when the Executive power attempts to control Parliament by dismissing those who have its confidence, and without advice, dissolves the House. So far, I have spoken merely as to the grounds which were submitted by the Lieutenant-Governor to the Provincial House, for the dismissal of his Cabinet; and, perhaps, it would be only proper, from a constitutional point of view, that the action of the Lieutenant-Governor on that occasion should be judged on those grounds. According

to the well-understood principles of the British Constitution, when the Administration either resigns, or is dismissed—probably it is absurd to talk of dismissing a Government; such an act has not been heard of almost in this century, except on this unfortunate occasion—it is customary that all the reasons which led to their resignation shall be stated fully to the people's representatives, and that all the reasons which caused the difference between the Executive and his advisers should be stated. Well, the Lieutenant-Governor, in this case, was not content to rest upon the reasons which were submitted to the Provincial House, because both the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly, by a large majority, voted against the dismissal of the DeBoucherville Administration, and their representations were sent to the House of Commons; but as I understand it, and as those papers show, no complaint on the subject was made by the Government of the hon. member for Lambton. Lord Dufferin did not seem to have been advised to call on him for any explanations, or to have made any representations as to the impropriety of his conduct on his unusual course. But the Lieutenant-Governor himself felt that his conduct, as it stood, appeared in a most unfavourable light; that, according to the papers submitted, and the statements made according to the facts as they appear when all the statements of both sides have been published, his conduct was not to be justified; his own conscience appeared to have forced him to send in his explanatory case, and his bitterest enemy could have desired nothing better. "Would that mine enemy would write a book," is a common saying, and, when we consider that case, it would be found he forgot the moral of the expression in setting forth his reasons for dispensing with the DeBoucherville Government. Let me briefly draw attention to those charges, bearing in mind that his first complaint was that Mr. De Boucherville slighted the prerogative of the Executive; that, upon his interview with that gentleman, he admitted it was not his intention to slight it, notwithstanding which, the Lieutenant-Governor made that the pretext for dismissing the Premier, and that he could not take his advice with re-

MR. MCCARTHY.

gard to the Railway Bill. What do we find, when he comes afterwards to state in detail those other reasons which he did not think proper to give to his advisers; when he told Mr. DeBoucherville that he no longer required his services? The first reason—and they are all pretty much of a character—was that the Bill was not read a third time in both Houses, but in one only, being read a second time in the other; that he was advised by the Government, and that he did give assent to it as the Lieutenant-Governor. Now, Sir, that is rather an extraordinary charge to make. One can hardly see the object which would have induced an Administration commanding a majority of twenty in the House where this Bill was not read a third time, to slight the prerogatives of the Lieutenant-Governor with regard to a Chamber where all know, according to Parliamentary practice and principle, discussion most takes place and all the objections to a Bill are generally met. It is a strange reason to give as justification for his conduct in dismissing his Cabinet, and particularly when we find the supposed offence was committed in 1876, and the dismissal was accomplished only in 1878; we are lost in amazement to think that gentlemen who could have been considered worthy to administer the affairs of the Province of Quebec should have seen the Lieutenant-Governor stoop to advance such a reason as this for their dismissal. But what are the facts? Why, that by an accident, the Clerk of the House certified that the Bill which the Quebec Government intended to oppose had been read the third time, and he supposed was to be assented to in the ordinary course; that upon this matter being discovered by the Attorney-General, attention was drawn to it, and a representation was made to Ottawa for the purpose of having the Bill disallowed. Now, this is the fact which the papers brought down plainly and unmistakably prove—that this Bill, which he complains he was forced to assent to in 1876, was assented to through the accident I spoke of—that his attention was at once drawn to it, not by the Lieutenant-Governor himself, but by his advisers, that they advised him to represent to the Minister of Justice of the day, Mr.

Blake, that, under these circumstances, the Bill ought to be disallowed; and that Minister answered, saying that the Bill, not having been read a third time, in both Houses, was only waste paper, and that there was no necessity for its disallowance. When we consider that this great State paper was sent to the Governor-General as an explanatory case, as a reason for assisting the Lieutenant-Governor out of his difficulties—that he tells us in it what took place in 1876, this mere slight omission, this clerical error, makes him stand self-condemned; because no man who had a better case would present one like that to justify the dismissal of his Ministers. We would hardly send away a footman on a pretence like that; and yet, under responsible government, these rights of the people are to be violated in this manner. Charge No. 2 is, perhaps, even more contemptible than the one to which I have just adverted. The Lieutenant-Governor says that a Bill, during the same Session, was submitted for his assent. He says: "On examining it, I perceived a blank which had not been filled up, which I pointed out to the Premier in a letter." He adds: "The Premier came to me and said that he regretted the omission; requested me to give my sanction to the Bill in the state in which it was. The conciliatory spirit which I showed in granting my consent seemed to please him." Now, what are the facts? I find the Bill, No. 19, of the Statutes of the Province of Quebec for 1876, was introduced in the Legislative Council, where they had no power to impose a money penalty, for which they had to leave a blank. Passing through the Lower House the amount was not inserted, when the Government introduced another Bill, No. 20, to correct that mistake, to both of which Mr. Letellier assented at the same moment, and yet he writes to Mr. De Boucherville, vainly imagining the papers would not be brought to light, saying the Premier came to him, observed he regretted the omission, and requested him to sanction the Bill in the state in which it was. How is it possible to reconcile that statement with what we find in the Statute-book? Yet Mr. Letellier brought that statement forward, two years afterwards, as a grave charge against the Administration, and his reasons for dismiss-

ing it. The next charge, No. 3, relates to the appointment of a municipal councillor for the south ward of the village of Montmagny, under the pretext that there had been no election; or, if so, it was illegal. We have a long story on this subject, the gist of it being this: According to the law of Quebec, with which we have nothing to do, and which, I assume, the Lieutenant-Governor was bound to administer, if a difficulty arose in the election of a councillor, instead of settling it, as we do in Ontario, by a resort to the law Courts, they settle it by the Executive. In this particular case the matter was formally brought before the proper officer, the Attorney-General, upon whose report and counsel the Lieutenant-Governor appointed a gentleman to fill the vacancy. So far there does not appear to be anything extraordinary in that proceeding. It may not be in accordance with his notions or the practice in the other Provinces, but I believe that one of the strongest reasons for our Federal Constitution and the separate Provincial Governments is that the people of Quebec desire to govern themselves in their own way; and, therefore, they have their own Code, according to which the Government acted. It appeared afterwards, by some influence which does not clearly appear, that the Lieutenant-Governor prevailed upon his Council, contrary to their own idea of what was right—they wishing to prevent any difficulty—to cancel that appointment. Surely that hardly forms a ground for the dismissal of the Administration two years afterwards. On the contrary, if it shows anything, it is that the De Boucherville Government to some extent yielded their own convictions, when, perhaps, they ought to have stood firm, in order to oblige the Lieutenant-Governor. It is alleged—I do not know with what truth—that this action was at the instance of a gentleman outside the Cabinet, who ought not to have been an adviser of His Honour. Backstair influence was brought to bear not only in this, but in other instances. Now, the fourth charge is hardly one that I can speak of as a definite and distinct allegation of impropriety on the part of the Government. It merely states the fact that, in a letter written to Mr. Chapleau, these words occurred: "Please oblige me by telling

the Premier that if he needs my concurrence, Mr. Gauthier may bring down to me the documents requiring my signature." The fifth charge is this:

"5th.—Under date of the 6th of November last, I addressed to the Hon. M. DeBoucherville the letter of which the following is a copy:—

"QUEBEC, 6th November, 1877.

"(Private.)

"MY DEAR DEBOUCHERVILLE.—In the last *Official Gazette* were published, under my signature, two proclamations which I had not signed.

"One was for the summoning of Parliament, which I had reserved in order to confer with you; the other, which I did not even see, appoints a day of thanksgiving.

"These proceedings, the nature of which I shall not characterise, entail, apart from their impropriety, invalidities which you will easily understand.

"Yours very truly,

"(Signed) 'L. LETELLIER.

"The Hon. C. B. DEBOUCHERVILLE,

"Premier."

"The following are the notes which I took of the conversation which I had with M. DeBoucherville on the subject:—

"M. DeBoucherville came on the same day he received the letter, to tell me that he regretted that the thing had occurred, and that it was no fault of his. I accepted the excuse, and I then told him that I would not tolerate my name being used when necessary for any duty of my office unless the documents requiring my signature had been previously submitted to me, and unless information was afforded to me, which M. DeBoucherville assured me would be the course followed in future.

"(Signed) 'L. L.'"

Now, what were those proclamations? It turns out one was a formal proclamation, not for summoning Parliament, as stated here, but for proroguing Parliament. It was a document purely formal in its character, which, as my hon. friend here (Sir John A. Macdonald) says, is never in practice brought before the Governor, and which, in Ontario, Mr. Mowat speaks of as being of so little consequence that it might even be issued before the House could properly be called for the despatch of business. We all understand they are not required to be brought formally before the Executive; and, therefore, I am astonished to find such a charge from one who ought to understand something of responsible government and the working of our institutions. The other proclamation appointed a day of thanksgiving, and it appeared

the day had been fixed by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in this House. He wrote to Mr. Letellier, desiring it should be the same day as fixed in the other parts of the Dominion. Mr. Letellier conveyed that letter to his Council, who, after some demurring, fixed the day desired. Is there a reasonable man in this country who would say that there was any offence in this purely formal document, brought to the notice of the Executive, in order that he might sign his name, directed by Orders in Council assented to by Mr. Letellier? It appears to me, the statement of such grounds for the dismissal of his Administration comes from him with a very bad grace. Perhaps I should characterise it in much harsher and stronger language. Now, we come to complaint No. 6, with regard to the formation of rings. He says that Mr. DeBoucherville admitted they controlled the Legislature in 1876. All I can say with regard to this is that, if the charge is correct, the DeBoucherville Government ought to have been dismissed in 1876. It is needless to discuss whether the rings did or did not control Mr. DeBoucherville, because he distinctly denied any such thing existed, or that such statement was ever made by him, and also, conclusively, reasons that he could not have said so, and that the railway measure introduced by his Government followed the elections. When the question of the building of this line of road had been before the people, the question asked and put to both parties was, whether they were favourable to the construction of these roads, and, if I remember the facts rightly, the policy for constructing these roads met with no opposition in the House. Again, Sir, we have to recollect that a gentleman occupying so high a position should not have forgotten himself so far as to be guilty of the misrepresentation which is conveyed in this charge. We have still another charge; but, I think, it is not necessary we should deal with it here. It relates to the conduct of the Attorney-General in announcing his dismissal from office. That, certainly, could not be any justification for his dismissal. That may have been in accordance with constitutional usage, or it may not. I must confess, Sir, that I do not understand it is within the power either of the Lieutenant-

Governor or of the Ministry to say that the other shall go. On the contrary, I understand, if our Administration either resigned or was dismissed, we would be entitled to the very fullest explanation, and it would be a breach of privilege if any demand was made by the Executive authority to withhold from the House the fullest possible explanation of the cause of disagreement. I have now, Sir, gone over *seriatim* the different charges which have been made in this explanatory case, and I appeal to every fair-minded man in this House if there is one solitary reason here which commends itself to our sense of justice, in view of our rights under the Parliamentary form of Government. I appeal to every hon. member of this House if the recital of these grounds does not establish, in the clearest possible manner, that the Lieutenant-Governor was casting about for reasons; that he had not, if I may be permitted to say so, honestly dismissed his Administration. He had been seeking for reasons of complaint against them, seeking for grounds of excuse upon which to found these trumped-up charges which appeared in the explanatory case. For my part, I do not think it is right we should go into the merits of this railway measure, or the merits of this Tax Bill. It is sufficient for me to know that the people of the Province of Quebec, by their representatives, passed these measures by large majorities. It is sufficient for me to know that they, having responsible government and constitutional rights, were satisfied that those measures were in their interest. I do not understand that the Lieutenant-Governor had any right to dictate, and say that they were not in their interest. An extract has been read from a speech that Lord Dufferin made at the Reform banquet—a speech which, I think, shows the position in which the Executive stands with the Parliament of the country. He had been complimented at this great banquet—a banquet at which, I believe, the most liberal minds of England, at all events many of the most distinguished, were present—complimented for his wise administration of Canadian affairs. And how does he answer that? Does he take credit to himself for all the results

of that administration. No; we have heard what he said. Now, Sir, in the Province of Quebec, Mr. Letellier thought otherwise. When George the Third attempted to make his Administration pliable to his own peculiar wishes, there was not to be found a single public man in England who would do so. The Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was merely the pivot on which the Constitution worked, and knew that he had only to assist the Administration in carrying on their affairs. Perhaps no hon. gentleman can be found with the hardihood to get up and say that the dismissal of the DeBoucherville Administration is in itself an act to be justified. The hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition, in the debate which took place on this question last Session, did not deny the right of this Parliament to criticise and examine this matter. He did not say one solitary word, if I read his speech correctly, which would show that he had so far forgotten his professions of a lifetime and the tenets of the great party which he leads, to justify the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor; but he thought that the discussion was untimely, and that, during the pendency of the election, that it was unwise for the House to express an opinion, which, in point of fact, would be adopting the policy of either one party or the other that were then engaged in the electoral contest. Perhaps he went so far, though I am not quite sure about that, as to say that the result of the election would be conclusive; that, as he understood responsible government, it would depend upon what the people of the Province of Quebec thought, whether they would sustain Mr. DeBoucherville's successor, who, according to the Constitution, was bound to assume the acts of the Lieutenant-Governor, and all responsibility for them, and had assumed to justify his conduct on that occasion. Well, Sir, we know the election has since taken place; we know that there was a very considerable change in the sentiment of the House that was elected, and it may be claimed that the result of that election was to justify the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor on that occasion. I do not know, Sir, that that ground will be taken, but I have this to say, that that is not, in my humble judgment, a ground that

can be successfully maintained. I see my hon. friend laughing; we will, no doubt, have the benefit of his judgment and experience on the subject before long. In the meantime he will allow me to express my humble opinion, be it worth little or much. In the first place, the Lieutenant-Governor is not responsible to the people of the Province of Quebec. That is the first answer I give to that argument, if it should be advanced. He is an officer of the Dominion Government, and is responsible to the Dominion authorities, just as the Governor-General is answerable to the authority of the Colonial Secretary as the Queen's adviser, with regard to such matters, and the Lieutenant-Governor owes no responsibility in any way to the Provincial Parliament in that Province. His advisers—and he must have advisers for everything he does—have to justify their conduct to Parliament, but the maxim that “the King cannot do harm,” holds good here, as it does everywhere, but he has to have advisers, and the advisers are the parties who must bear the responsibility and blame. But, Sir, there is a better reason, perhaps, than that, if a better reason was required; that is, that the people of the Province of Quebec did not sanction this act; the people of that Province refused distinctly to assume it. And, knowing their duty, their responsibility, carefully making out what was their right and their duty, they have agreed that the Government that succeeded Mr. DeBoucherville, should be sustained, that their measures should be adopted, and that they should have what is called a fair trial. They, with equal distinctness, refused to sanction or agree to the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor in the dismissal of Mr. DeBoucherville. Now at page 25 we will find a resolution which we know was carried into effect, viz:—

“That this House, while expressing its firm determination to insist on the strictest economy in every branch of the public service, and on the closest supervision over the expenses of the administration, regrets that the present advisers of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor should have persisted in remaining in power without having been supported by the majority of the Legislative Assembly upon their taking office, and without yet being supported by such majority.”

So that we have the refusal of the newly elected House of the Province of Quebec, elected under the auspices of the Governor that succeeded Mr. DeBoucherville, elected by means which we know were used in order to carry that election, to sanction the wrong that had been done by the dismissal of Mr. DeBoucherville's Government. And, Sir, we have a very grave statement made here by the Lieutenant-Governor in his answer to the complaint and the accusation made against him. He says on page 38 :—

"In support of that allegation, they furnish a copy of a resolution adopted by a majority of one, when the House was not full, concealing the fact that the following resolution was immediately adopted in a full House as an amendment and an addition to the one alluded to by the memorialists :

"That nevertheless under the present circumstances, this House believes it to be its duty to give a general and independent support to the Government, in such a manner that the measures which it proposes, may be submitted to the judgment of this House."

Why, Sir, I think that the statement he then made as to the rights of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, could not be better exemplified, better justified, than by these two resolutions. Their meeting was in the month of June, the supplies had only been voted to the thirtieth of that month; if they refused to vote the supplies, if they refused to allow the new Government time to develop their plans and measures, the whole country would be in confusion, and anarchy would prevail, and they said, we will, under the present circumstances, give them the fullest possible latitude to develop the measures which they propose to submit to the judgment of this Assembly.

Mr. MACKENZIE : That is all any Government wants.

Mr. McCARTHY : No doubt it is all any Government wants. I trust my hon. friend would not be content with a majority of one. I trust my hon. friend would not like to lead this House by the casting vote of the Speaker.

Mr. MACKENZIE : I have seen the hon. gentleman do it.

Mr. McCARTHY : I trust my hon. friend would not be guilty of the conduct we know obtained the support of that Speaker.

MR. MACKENZIE : I have known him do that too.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : You never knew me to buy a Speaker.

MR. McCARTHY : My hon. friend disdains all practice of corruption, he has never been guilty of dishonest transactions. I am bound to believe all that in a parliamentary sense. I believe, and I am assured that my hon. friend would not be bound to purchase as Speaker a gentleman who had been a supporter of Mr. DeBoucherville, and who, on the day the House of Assembly met, went over to the new Government, receiving, as the price of his shame, the office of Speaker. All I can say is that, if my hon. friend thinks the denouement of the course pursued by the Lieutenant-Governor, is justifiable, and that responsible government has been satisfied, because the present Administration in the Province of Quebec are able to carry on its affairs by the casting vote of the Speaker, he is welcome to his opinion. And now, Sir, having a vacancy in that House, they have allowed months to go by without taking any particular steps to fill it, because they have reason to believe that this solitary influence which they have would be destroyed. If my hon. friend thinks that this is constitutional government, I do not care to look at the matter through his spectacles. Here is a letter which my hon. friend has just handed me, under date April 2, 1878, from Mr. Turcotte :—

"I have never authorized any one to publish or announce in the journals that I would support the Joly Government, and I have not even dreamed of doing so. I desire and intend to solicit the suffrages of the electors as a Conservative, consequently I will be opposed to the present Government."

Now, can anything be plainer than that the affairs of the Province of Quebec are administered by virtue of the casting vote of this, Mr. Turcotte, who, in violation of the pledges to his constituency—the pledges upon which he obtained his election—has sustained that Government, and has enabled them, up to this time, in defiance of the Constitution—I hesitate not to say so—to carry on and administer the affairs of the Government. There is, perhaps, one other argument which might be used to justify

this House in refusing to censure the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. I have heard the argument used, and I will just mention it, not that I think there is any weight to be attached to it, but I will refer to it as the only possible ground which could justify hon. gentlemen, as it appears to me, in voting against this resolution. That argument is, that, during last Session, this matter was passed upon by this House, when it refused to carry a motion similar in purport, if not in language, to the one now in your hands; and that the Lieutenant-Governor is now being tried a second time for the same offence. Well, Sir, we are not trying him at all, nor has he been tried. We are here, as a newly elected Parliament, to correct many grievances, to undo a good deal of what was done last Parliament. We are not going to be bound, I trust, by the last Parliament. When I look upon my hon. friends on the Opposition side of the House, I have a living proof that this House entertains very different opinions on great public questions to those entertained by the House, led by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie). Therefore, Sir, this matter being one which has been submitted to the people throughout the whole Dominion, and one which has formed a very pointed issue in the Province of Quebec, we are bound to give effect to the wishes of our constituents, and to pronounce upon this matter, notwithstanding what the other House had done. I hardly can imagine it can be, for one moment, seriously contended that we are not authorised in the fullest manner to deal with it. I should like to have discussed in this speech, the various grounds which induced, or which, according to this paper, appeared to have induced, the Lieutenant-Governor to have summarily dismissed the DeBoucherville Administration. I have not done justice to the subject, and it seems to me extraordinary that we should, in Canada, at this period of the 19th century, be investigating a subject of responsible government; but it is one example more that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and we have constantly to be on our guard against our Lieutenant-Governors, and possibly it might be, some day or other, and I trust it will

MR. MCCARTHY.

not be in our day, against Governors-General, in order to protect the rights of the people, which we are sent here to protect; and I trust we will be always proud to claim that we are here possessed of a Constitution that is not inferior to any other. We believe we have got a Constitution in which liberty prevails more generally and more widely than under any Constitution of this globe; and, if it is worth having, it is certainly worth protecting. We know it was not obtained in the country without generations of labour on the part of the public men. We know, in this country, that it was not obtained without noble self-sacrifice and self-denial. And I think, Sir, we are not so degenerate as not to understand the privileges and blessings that we possess. I think, Sir, we will maintain, on this occasion, as on any other occasion when the question has to be presented to us, that the rights of the people are paramount in constitutional government, and that these rights will be held against any use or abuse that may be made of the Royal prerogative.

MR. OUMET: Before I put the motion I now hold in my hand, I may be permitted to say a few words in explanation of it. The question now before this House is, in my opinion, the most important question that may come up for the consideration of this House. Everyone knows that this question was up before the House last year; but, unfortunately, power existed stronger than any Constitution, and caused the question to be left without any solution. The motion as it stands is, word for word, the same motion that was put last year. It is a motion declaratory of a principle which those gentlemen who brought the question before the House desired should be established, without any shifting, without any amendment. In making this motion, I do not desire to preclude any further debate on the subject, but to bring it before the House in its full sense. I beg to move that the question be now put. This motion does not close the debate; on the contrary, the debate may go on as long as it may be deemed necessary. If I may be allowed to cite a precedent, I would cite the precedent which was made in the discussion which

took place when certain resolutions were moved in the Legislative Assembly of the old Province of Canada, in Quebec, for the establishment of this Confederation. This motion was put by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, and the debate continued, but no amendment could be proposed. Thus, the real question before the House had to be adhered to, and brought to a straight issue.

MR. MACKENZIE: I regret exceedingly, Sir, that the hon. gentleman opposite and his colleagues have not had the courage to take this matter into their own hands. I regret exceedingly to find one of the Ministers of the Crown gently preparing the way that the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) should be seen first by Mr. Speaker in order to get a motion in, which would preclude the putting in of an amendment. It shows an amount of courage on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that is astonishing. It shows a confidence in their own judgment that ought to commend itself to all the inhabitants of this country. Here, Sir, we have a Government, powerful in their majority, who are endeavouring, by getting members on the back benches to submit a motion condemning the wisdom of the Lieutenant-Governor, to shirk what is their own duty in the premises. If they believed the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec acted unconstitutionally and improperly, it was their duty to dismiss that gentleman and then to submit the reasons to Parliament. But, Sir, as the law provides, what do we find? In the first place we find the hon. gentleman standing where I now stand, as leader of the Opposition, last year, moving a motion exactly similar in terms to the motion now submitted. He was not prepared then to say that the action of the Lieutenant Governor was unconstitutional. He was forced, after devoting weeks of preparation to the motion, hunting up precedents, and making a long speech, a very able speech—though very little of it touched the question at issue—he was forced to come to the conclusion, at last, that he would only say in the motion that the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was unwise; and he proposed then, as his followers propose

now, to gravely sit in judgment—to use the words of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)—upon the actions of the Lieutenant-Governor and the Government of the Dominion, as to whether the course of the former was wise or unwise. They did not then, Sir, venture upon direct condemnation in terms which would justify them in dismissing, or justify any Government in dismissing, that dignitary. Now, Sir, what is the true position of the question at the present time? When this transaction took place, I had the honour of being at the head of the Government, and it would have been my duty, as head of the Government, and it would have been the duty of the Government I led, if we believed that the Quebec Governor had acted unconstitutionally, to have dismissed that Governor and accounted to Parliament for the action, stating the reasons as required by the Constitutional Act. We did not consider that we had any grounds for such dismissal. We knew perfectly well that he did not, as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said, create a prerogative. He exercised a prerogative he had confided to his care. We did not believe he was acting beyond his powers in the course he had adopted. As to whether he was wise or unwise was an individual matter of opinion, and far be it from me, on any occasion, to say that any person, acting in the capacity of King or Governor, should strain to the utmost the legitimate powers which he possesses. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman opposite, who now leads the Government, came forward with his motion, declaring that it was unwise and that his action was subversive of the position of his advisers. Of course it was, for it subverted them from their places. It was a mere truism. But as to whether we should pronounce upon the wisdom or unwisdom of the action, I believed we had no right to pronounce upon it. I believe it was wholly mischievous for this Parliament, then and now, to undertake to try every action of a Governor, whether it was wise or unwise at the moment. I then said, as a reason for the course I took as leader of the Government, in opposing the hon. gentleman's motion, that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's then Ministers became

responsible for his action in this matter ; they stood between him and the people. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) wasted a good deal of his time to prove that the Lieutenant-Governor had no business to dissolve the House without the assent of his Ministers. Well, Sir, he was wrong in the assumption that this was done ; he had the power, but the power was not exercised, and it is not necessary to consider to what extent it exists. He dissolved Parliament on the advice of his new Ministers, and the country sustained his Ministers.

Some HON. MEMBERS : No ; no.

MR. MACKENZIE : I listened with the greatest possible attention to my hon. friends who made able speeches in support of their views. It was quite true I was not able to follow the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) as I would like to have done, but I know what arguments have been used, and I propose to deal with them briefly. My hon. friend, I say, assumed that the Lieutenant-Governor dissolved Parliament of his own volition. He did nothing of the kind. He dissolved Parliament under the advice of his constitutional advisers—

Some HON. GENTLEMEN : No, no.

MR. MACKENZIE : That was the question that came up before the electors. It was the subject of dispute at the polls, and the Ministry that assumed that responsibility are at this moment conducting successfully the affairs of the Province of Quebec. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite, responsible for the administration of this House, seek to relegate to their supporters on the back benches the responsibility which they did not take in hand themselves, as they ought to do.

MR. OUMET : These back benches were very handy for you last year.

MR. MACKENZIE : I am quite prepared for any interruption from the hon. member for Laval, but his interruptions will not cause me the slightest uneasiness.

MR. OUMET : I know that very well.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. MACKENZIE : I have the floor at present.

MR. SPEAKER : Order.

MR. MACKENZIE : The Government, I say, relegated the subject to members on the back benches, and relegated to the member for Laval the rather inglorious part he has acted in the discussion ; and he is content, it seems, with the position afforded him. Well, Sir, we must not judge people too harshly ; he knows his own strength. Now, Sir, the Ministry of Governor Letellier, having thus appealed to the country and obtained a majority of the people's representatives to sustain them—

Some HON. MEMBERS : No ; no.

MR. MACKENZIE : Will hon. gentlemen allow me to make my speech ? I never interrupted them. Their interruptions will not affect the question one whit. I am simply stating my view of the matter. My hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) should not be so impatient, and I accept this impatience as a sign of the weakness of their cause. My hon. friend from Bagot will remember that, on a remarkable occasion, recorded in ancient history, the prophets of the true God and the prophets of Baal were assembled on a particular occasion, and it was said the prophets of Baal imagined they would be heard for their much speaking. My hon. friend is playing the same rôle to-night. A good cause does not require so much shouting and so much speaking. We have simply to consider in this case what standing we have as a Legislature in the matter. Are we to understand, by the argument of the hon. gentleman that we are here for the purpose, as he stated, to use his own words, " of sitting in judgment upon the conduct of Lieutenant-Governors, as to whether their actions are wise or unwise ? " Why, Sir, if the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, if the Ministry who induced him to take up this matter—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : No.

MR. MACKENZIE : If they believed that the Lieutenant-Governor acted unconstitutionally and improperly, if he is guilty of the crime of exceeding his

powers for partisan objects, as they have asserted, why did they not say so in so many words, and take the vote of the House upon it? Why endeavour, in this manner, for the third time, to place a man in jeopardy for an alleged offence, contrary to all judicial precedent and practice? The hon. gentleman who seconded this motion says this is not the same Court; that the last Parliament was a Court, but did not include the next one that assembled. The hon. gentleman assumed an exceedingly judicial tone when he commenced his remarks. He declared this must be considered free from all party bias; that, if it was found that the Lieutenant-Governor was improperly accused, after this investigation—what was the investigation? My hon. friend's speech; that was the investigation—my hon. friend said that if, after this investigation, he was found to have been improperly accused, then we must vote down this resolution. I have no doubt my hon. friend was considering whether he could vote down this resolution or not, when he uttered these sentences. No doubt he was considering the feasibility, if not the propriety, of so voting down the resolution, or he would not have uttered these words so deliberately, and in a tone of judicial deliberation, for which I credited him at the moment with all possible praise. But he passed on, and, as his speech progressed, so did his anger and indignation increase, until he ended with declaring that this gentleman whom he was to treat free from all party bias, and to deal with in this judicial spirit, had acted with a tyrannical spirit, was guilty of deception, misrepresentation, and that he endeavoured to trump up charges against his Ministry, in order to justify his dismissal of them. Where did the hon. gentleman expect to find this calm deliberation with which he predicated his remarks? Was it in his own speech? Did he expect every man here to make a speech expressing his convictions, beginning in the judicial spirit and ending in a recriminatory condemnation, the criminal to be executed at once? That was worse than a trial by a single Judge. The hon. gentleman constituted himself Judge and jury; and this, we are told, is the proper spirit in which to consider the matter. I have never heard, since I

have been in Parliament, stronger language applied to any person charged with an offence, than that used by hon. gentlemen opposite. We know by the language of the Press, by the language of the papers that are before us, from Mr. Letellier's late Ministers, that this spirit pervades the entire discussion on that one side; that there is an entire absence of the judicial spirit. I take the ground that this Parliament has no business in this matter—has no standing-ground upon which to propose this resolution. My hon. friend opposite knows quite well—no man knows better—what his duty in this case is. His duty is what I have already stated. If he believes this Parliament has a right to interfere, as this motion proposes to interfere, then it is his duty to bring down a reason why he has not dismissed the Lieutenant-Governor. He has not dismissed him. He has now been five months in office. He did not allege a year ago that he should be dismissed; that he had acted unconstitutionally; and now he endeavours by a sideward proposition, the very words proposed last year, to secure some kind of a vote against the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, upon which he hopes to base some ulterior action. This is the straightforward course that the hon. member for Simcoe would have us to believe they intended to enter upon in proposing this resolution. There was never anything more dangerous brought into the Federal Legislature than this attempt to interfere with the autonomy of the Provinces. The hon. member for Simcoe said rightly that the true policy for the country to pursue is to allow the people to govern. Well, the people of Quebec have decided this matter. At the time that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier dismissed his Ministers, they were opposed to the Administration that succeeded Mr. DeBoucherville. It is well known that Mr. Joly, as leader of the Opposition, commanded a comparatively small support in the House of Assembly, and it is believed that, if the contest at a general election then, had proceeded exclusively upon the usual old party lines—at least, it was firmly believed by most people—it would be very doubtful, indeed, if Mr. Joly could get a majority; but when the dissolution took place, and the issue

was squarely put before the people, as to whether they approved of the dismissal of the DeBoucherville Administration or not, and the accession to power of the Joly Administration, the people of the Province of Quebec, instead of being a large majority in favour of Mr. DeBoucherville and his Administration, gave a majority the other way, and in support—

Several Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hon. gentlemen opposite may say "No," and may possibly think no; but here is one broad, undeniable fact, that the Joly Administration still lives; that the Government of Mr. Joly carried all its measures through Parliament. Here is an undeniable fact, that the Opposition to the Joly Administration attempted to stop the supplies, and, when they found they could not stop the supplies, they walked out of the House and the Government got its supplies. The hon. member for Simcoe said the public necessities were great, the time for which money had been voted was about to expire, and, from purely patriotic motives, the majority in that House decided that they would listen to Mr. Joly submitting his measures to the judgment of the House. Not only did they listen to him submitting his measures to the judgment of the House, but the judgment of the House went in favour of his measures, and the majority of the people, as represented in that House, voted for them. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman opposite that it is a thoroughly just constitutional mode of checking any act of any arbitrary power to suspend the Supply Bill. That is a well-known expedient frequently and properly resorted to, and I am quite certain that there is not as much meekness in the whole Ministerial bench opposite as would have induced them to refrain in Quebec from stopping the supplies if they thought they could do so. And I am quite sure of another thing, that no Conservative Ministry ever existed in this country which possessed more vim, more audacious energy, than did Mr. DeBoucherville's Government. I recollect well that so strong was their intense partisan feeling that they committed the impropriety of

declining to attend a dinner to the Governor-General, because the then leader of the Federal Government—a political opponent—was invited to be present. These are the sort of men who are supposed to have been so meek, that in order that the public accounts should be paid, they were willing to vote the supplies to a Government in which they had no confidence. Does any one believe that they should do so? I would not pretend to any such patriotism as that. If I were in that House, and believed the Lieutenant-Governor had acted unconstitutionally, arbitrarily, and tyrannically, as the followers of Mr. DeBoucherville say they believed, I certainly would not have, on any consideration, voted for the supplies, or given any vote which would have the effect of keeping that Administration in office. Although all these things were fully considered in the House of Assembly of Quebec, we find that Mr. Joly's Government was sustained; its measures were carried through, and Mr. Joly is, at this moment, a successful administrator of the affairs of his native Province. We are asked in this House, in an insidious, improper, unconstitutional, unparliamentary manner, gravely to condemn the Lieutenant-Governor, his advisers, and the people of the Province of Quebec, all in one batch, by this motion. I say, if we vote to-day, after the Lieutenant-Governor has been on his trial twice, if we had voted, even in the first place—it makes no difference as to that—that a particular action of a particular Governor and his Government is unwise, then where are we to stop? Is there any stopping place? Whenever a majority of this House entertains a belief that the action of a particular Lieutenant-Governor in any one of our Provinces is adverse to the interests of the party in the majority in this House, then a member will only have to bring up a motion here declaring that the action of the Governor in some particular was unwise, and I have confidence enough in the intense party feeling which prevails in this country on occasions of electoral excitement, to say there is a strong probability, under ordinary circumstances, of such a motion obtaining the support of those who believe that such inter-

MR. MACKENZIE.

ference as this is proper and constitutional. Our constitutional system of Government is on trial at this moment. One of the most precious principles of this constitutional government is to preserve intact the autonomy of the respective Provinces. It is the only security that the small Provinces have that the rapacity or the selfishness or the improper views of public Government which may be taken by the major or larger Provinces shall not be imposed upon them, and, if there is one Province that more particularly requires the shield of the constitutional authority to be thrown around it, it is the Province of Quebec.

MR. MASSON: Protect us against the Federal Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: It may well require to be protected against the gentlemen who are at present on the Treasury benches. These gentlemen are aiming a blow at the independence of Provincial Governments. It is impossible for the House to interfere continually in the actions of Lieutenant-Governors, without submitting those Governors and their Governments to particular danger, and I am sure my hon. friend for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) must see that and acknowledge it, whatever part he takes in this debate, and, with his usual candour, will be prepared to say that, if carrying the motion or submitting it were to result in such a course as that, it would be a most disastrous one for our system of Government. I am a devotee to our present system of Government. I did my best to assist in its inauguration. I believe its existence is essential to the prosperity of the country, and view with alarm any course which may be taken by this or any of the branches of Parliament in the Dominion to interfere with perfect independence of Provincial action in all our Provinces. I was glad, Sir, to hear a full-bred Tory, like the hon. member for North Simcoe, defend responsible government. It is a good sign of the times, but I am sure that when he thinks over this matter he will come to the conclusion that in his speech to-night he was hostile to responsible government; and, however much we may differ, and I grant that hon. gentlemen opposite may

fairly differ in opinion from gentlemen on this side, in this particular case—I quite admit they may fairly have a strong view of the unwisdom of the action of Governor Letellier, and gentlemen on this side may also believe to a greater or less extent in the wisdom of the action of the Governor—it is one thing to believe that that action has been wise or unwise, and another to declare that it deserves and should have the active interference of the Federal Parliament. I do not propose, for one moment, to waste the time of the House or my own time in discussing the merits of the dispute between Governor Letellier and his Ministers. Those who belong to the Province of Quebec may do so if they like. Those who desire to enter into that discussion, as if it formed an element which ought to guide us in our decision, may do so. I do not think that, even if the two hon. gentlemen opposite were to prove all that they asserted, and I am sure they cannot do that, it would affect in the slightest degree the vote I shall give on this matter. I would, all the same, vote against any interference with provincial action, unless, indeed, the Government were prepared, and brought down reasons, to show that the action was unconstitutional, wholly improper, beyond his powers, that his continuance in office was a danger, a public menace to the security of the country. Then I would be disposed quite to consider such a motion as that upon its merits. That, however, is not alleged by any one. I must assume, therefore, that the Government, having been five months in office, fully acquainted with the minutæ of this subject, were not prepared to take such grounds as that as a Government, or, if they were prepared to take such ground as a Government, they deserve the censure of this House for not having taken it promptly. It will not do for them to say that they waited until they could get what the hon. member for Simcoe calls the judgment of this House. The judgment of this House has no existence on the subject which can possibly affect the position of the Government. Suppose this motion were carried to-night, the Government would not dare to dismiss Governor Letellier upon such a motion, because it does not assert what

is necessary to be asserted as a pre-requisite for such action as that ; and because the initiative rests with the Government, who have first to remove a Lieutenant-Governor for cause, and then report the fact and reasons therefor to Parliament. I have, therefore, confined myself to the question which I have already discussed, namely, the danger of interfering with Provincial Government, and to declaring my opinion that no case has arisen, by the confession of the Ministers in this House, which would justify us in such an interference as the motion now practically invokes. I feel quite certain that every member of this House, when he considers the position of the Provinces relatively to each other and the Dominion, must come to the conclusion that our federal system is a fraud, if this Parliament is to constantly exercise *surveillance* over the actions of the Local Legislatures and Local Governors, which are subject to the usual approval or disapproval of the people of such Province. We may as well, at once, revert to our former system of Government, however inconvenient it may be. A Legislative Union, with all its evils, in a country diversified as ours is, in many respects would be infinitely preferable to a federal system which vests all the power in the federal authorities, and where the federal authorities were disposed to use that power tyrannically towards the Provinces. Both the hon. gentlemen who spoke on the subject, the hon. members for Simcoe and Bagot (Messrs. McCarthy and Mousseau) alluded to a former case of this kind in Canada, and to the action taken on it by the Liberal party. I am not aware that the Liberal party, on any occasion, ever invoked Imperial aid or assistance in settling political disputes. I believe they did not. We had strong reason to condemn the conduct of Lord Metcalfe towards his advisers, but we brought it out at the polls ; not one petition or remonstrance was sent to the Imperial authorities concerning it. We believed it was a question wholly for the people to settle. The people did settle it, as the people of Quebec have settled their case already ; and, if the hon. gentleman who moves in the matter here proposes any settlement, it is a settlement to undo what the will of the people has dictated as the proper course to be pursued.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. MACDOUGALL said it was not his intention to make any observations at this stage of the discussion ; but the motion of his hon. friend (Mr. Ouimet) compelled him to ask the indulgence of the House for a moment. He regretted very much the hon. gentleman had made that motion. He (Mr. Macdougall) saw no occasion for it ; besides, it rather implied a feeling of distrust among the supporters of the main motion as to the strength of their case. The precedent cited to justify it was not parallel. The motion of the right hon. gentleman who led the House was made after many days' debate, when there was a general opinion in the House that the question was ripe for decision.

AN HON. MEMBER : No.

MR. MACDOUGALL : Yes. But on this occasion the motion was made before the question had, in reality, been discussed. They had not heard any views in opposition to those of the hon. gentleman who had submitted the motion, and he (Mr. Macdougall) really felt the case had been prejudged by a motion for the previous question, which would have the effect of preventing a full and free discussion of a most important question. He hoped, therefore, they would not be left in that position ; that his hon. friend would be induced to withdraw his motion. If the main motion was fit to be discussed, if it was in their constitutional right to deal with it, then he thought there should be freedom of discussion, and the right to offer amendments. The motion might not contain exactly the proposition the majority of the House might be disposed to adopt, and they ought to have the privilege of amending it in accordance with their views. But, if he would not withdraw it, he (Mr. Macdougall) would direct the attention of the House to one or two points involved in the resolution. He had no hesitation in expressing his opinion as a private citizen, and as a public man, in condemnation of the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor in dismissing his Ministry under the circumstances. He thought so at the time ; he had read the statements of the late Ministers and the Lieutenant-Governor, and had since seen nothing to change his view that their dismissal was an improper and, in one

sense, an unconstitutional exercise of the prerogative of the Crown. The question was one that had attracted the attention of the people of Quebec and the Dominion generally, and came in regular course and form, he presumed, under the attention of the constitutional authority for dealing with it, namely, the Government of the Dominion. Under our Constitutional Act, the Governors of the Provinces were appointed for five years, certain, and were not removable except for cause; that cause to be assigned and communicated to them by the Federal Executive. That power and duty, as he read the Act, was imposed upon the Government of the Dominion who were to act in the first instance. The Lieutenant-Governors were the appointees of that Government, and accountable to them for misconduct or disobedience of instructions. He had no doubt the Federal Government of the day examined this case with great care, and evidently came to the conclusion there was no cause for removal which they could assign to Parliament as they were bound to do by the Constitutional Act. The question was not disposed of by the refusal of the Government of the day to pass an order for removal. He admitted it was quite open to Parliament to discuss any matter affecting the general interests and welfare of the Dominion, brought under its notice by any hon. member, and, possibly, the general conduct of a Governor or even of a local Executive Council, under certain circumstances. But, in this case, though the general Government refused to entertain the matter publicly, it was brought under the notice of Parliament by the motion of a leading member of the then Opposition, and a very able, exhaustive and highly constitutional speech was made in support of that motion by the leader of the present Government. He (Mr. Macdougall) was not then a member of the House, but, in the gallery, listened to that speech with great attention, instruction and admiration, as one of the most able expositions of constitutional principles he had ever heard in Parliament. But, notwithstanding, the House declined to interfere, and, by a vote of 112 to 70, the motion was defeated. Therefore, the House of Commons pronounced upon that question. After the first and proper constitutional

tribunal had declined to interfere, this House found the Governor of Quebec not guilty of the offence charged against him. It remained to be dealt with by another tribunal, the electors of Quebec, to whom an appeal was made. His Honour's conduct being the principal issue of the election; and, although it might be truly said there were some improper practices in the elections, and in dealing with some of the members returned, yet the fact was recorded in the history of the time; the majority of the representatives of the people sustained the Lieutenant-Governor through his Administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. MACDOUGALL said they were there to day. Their laws were upon the Statute-book, and had not been disallowed. Therefore, he held that the electors approved of the Lieutenant-Governor's action by the majority returned, no matter how returned—that not being a question for discussion outside the Province itself, or in this Parliament. Thus, the three constitutional tribunals having cognisance of this question had pronounced upon it, and found the Lieutenant-Governor had not committed an act which warranted his removal. Was it convenient, expedient or competent for this new Parliament to try this question over again? The political majority had changed in the meantime, men of different opinions occupying the Treasury benches. Was a man to be tried twice in his political any more than in his social or physical life? It was against the genius of English law, and therefore he felt great difficulty in supporting a resolution like the present. On another ground, he had a very strong conviction that the motion was not in order. Under our constitutional system there was a distribution of power between two Legislative bodies, and this Parliament had nothing to do with a Provincial question of this kind. The dismissal of a Governor was not one of its enumerated powers. No doubt the Lieutenant-Governor was appointed by and was under the supervision of the Federal Government. The Local Legislature and the people of the Province, through the constitutional means at their command, were competent to redress any evil or mischief of this kind, and therefore the Constitution had

not placed it in the hands of this Parliament. If so, they were travelling out of the record in discussing this matter. He felt strongly the conviction that, if the Government of to-day advised their friends, or were prepared to advise this House that it was competent to deal with it, they had rather abnegated their functions, in not dealing with it in the first instance. A question of this kind, taken up by a private member, a question which ought to be dealt with in a judicial spirit, was very likely to be disposed of in a partisan spirit, and, if thus any injury resulted to Confederation, if the Federal system were discredited, as he very much feared, the hon. gentleman, responsible for the conduct of the House, would be justly blamed. He was a Federalist, and believed in preserving the rights of the Dominion Parliament intact, but he was equally convinced that, if they were to preserve the federal system, they must preserve the rights of the Provinces intact also. The peculiar position of Lower Canada had very much to do with the federal form of the Constitution, because the majority of that Province were of a race different from the majority in the others, speaking a different language, possessing different institutions, and professing a faith not that of the majority of the Dominion. The local peculiarities and treaty rights of the Lower Canadians caused very earnest discussion during the deliberations preceding the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and they would have probably had a much more homogeneous system and larger powers in this Federal Parliament if it had not been for the arguments used, and with powerful effect, by the representatives of Lower Canada, in contending for such provisions as would secure their people in all their local institutions and peculiar rights and customs against the English majority of the other Provinces; and he could not but feel, during this discussion, that his friends from Lower Canada, in withdrawing this question from its proper forum, the Legislature of Quebec, and transferring it to this body, where there would always be a majority not entirely in sympathy with them, and sometimes, perhaps, hostile to many of their views, were running a very great risk in creating such a precedent. He warned them,

if they wished to maintain their independent position and the control of their own affairs in future, they had better have a care how far they consented to the creation of a precedent of so dangerous a character. It might be to them a matter of importance, to-day, to dismiss an obnoxious Governor, but, by-and-bye, a Governor whom they might desire to retain, because he acted unwisely, in the view of this House, might see a resolution passed expressing that opinion, which would be regarded as a direction to Ministers, as he doubted not this would be, should the motion pass, to dismiss him. This motion was unmeaning and impertinent, unless that result was expected from it. He would, then, repeat his warning to his Lower Canada friends. Let them hesitate before they established a precedent that would place some of their local rights and institutions, which they regarded as peculiarly important, under the control of a House where the majority would, in future, if not to-day, be an English-speaking one, without sympathy with their language, customs, faith, or local interests.

MR. BOULTBEE said that it seemed to him they never could have an occasion upon which it would be more important for a careful deliberation by the estates of this country than at the present moment. The question they had before them was,—whether the power of the people, as expressed through their representatives, should prevail, or the power of one man should be allowed to crush out the whole people. This question had been fought by their ancestors for forty generations; it had been fought for over the whole world, and the battle had not been in any country so successful as in the empire of Great Britain, where they had the great and inestimable boon of responsible government. They hoped to have it here, and they should retain it, and see that it was carried out on occasions like the present. Here in the Dominion they were in a peculiar position. They were a number of scattered Provinces that had been brought together; they were people of different races, speaking, in many instances, different languages; and had a great many different interests. And, therefore, it was all-important that the men

to whom power was entrusted, to whom they had confided their guidance, should endeavour to create a national spirit, rather tending towards the highest and noblest feeling, than a debased national sentiment. They should rather endeavour to make their actions bear the impress of statesmanlike thought than the stamp of petty and dishonourable intrigue. They would find that the people generally had a disposition to shape their conduct by the example of those placed in charge over them. It was unfortunate, on an occasion like the present, when this Confederation was only just formed, when the scattered Provinces were scarcely assimilated, when the many diverging interests were only approaching consolidation, that they should have the degrading spectacle of this man, to whom had been confided the honour of the people, who had been specially delegated to preside over the deliberations of Parliament, conspiring against his own advisers, lying in wait for them, trying to take advantage of some inadvertent action on their part to work them harm. It was important that this Parliament should take immediate steps to secure a better state of things; more especially as, at this very moment, they found the Premier of the Province of Ontario—a less daring man, perhaps, than the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, but the equally pliant tool of a faction—prolonging Parliament beyond the legitimate term of its existence, for the mere purpose of party intrigue. They felt it now in Ontario, and could, therefore, sympathise with the people of Quebec. He thought that, if the representatives of the people in this Parliament assembled, if the estates of this realm did not take any cognisance of this question, if they were unwilling to deal with it and to stamp this action with their supreme condemnation, it would be a very unfortunate thing for this country; but he firmly believed that this Parliament would not neglect to set the seal of severe condemnation on actions like this. He had heard his hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Macdougall), able and old parliamentarian as he was, say that this man had been tried twice, that the matter had been tried in the Parliament of Quebec, and that, therefore, it should not be tried again. He thought that opinion

was not a sound one, for, if no definite action were taken now, they would have no guarantee that there would not be a repetition of such acts in the future, and, besides that, it would enable the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec to escape the penalty which ought to attach to crimes such as this. He had looked carefully into this question and come to the conclusion that the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec on the occasion referred to was illegitimate and improper; that it was a violation of the principles of responsible government; that he had not done what he had been delegated to do. He had been sworn to conserve the liberties of the people. The will of the people had been decidedly in favour of the Ministry then in power; yet he had taken upon himself to dismiss that Ministry and to call in another set of men not possessing the confidence of the country. He had not, perhaps, studied Parliamentary usage or Constitutional Law so much as a great many other hon. gentlemen, but his plain reading of the meaning of responsible government was—and it was a reading, he thought, understood by the people—that the people through their representatives on the floor of Parliament—a majority of those representatives—should prevail. He was satisfied, and he was sure the House was satisfied from the arguments they had heard that the Lieutenant-Governor had not, under the circumstances, the right to dismiss the DeBoucherville Government. The action was a wrong-doing, and that wrong was an infringement on the Constitution, by which the rights of the people had been trampled upon. It was, in his opinion, a great injury done to our young Dominion, striking at the very roots of responsible government. When they came to reflect upon this question, it was less difficult to apprehend the causes than to calculate the consequences which might flow from it. They had, at the time, a Parliament led by the gentlemen now opposite. Those gentlemen came into that Parliament in the strong plenitude of their power, backed up by a large majority, and possessing the confidence of the country; but, when they found that confidence waning and themselves running aground in the country, they resorted to unworthy means, and, when

there was an impending general election, they refused to take the action generally desired by a large majority of the people of this country, advancing the traitorous argument—whereby to gain some advantage in the election—that the Lieutenant-Governor should be dealt with and tried by the House at Quebec. It might be that these gentlemen would deny that they entered into any conspiracy with the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, or that they improperly advised him, but they would never purge themselves before the people of this country, unless they gave their support to the resolution which was before the House; because he believed that the Lieutenant-Governor had no personal interest in such a course as that taken by him. He had committed a great crime against the people and against himself, and it would leave upon him and his family, for three or four generations to come, the stamp of ineffaceable shame. Mr. Letellier had nothing to gain in so doing, and the people of this country, whether it were right or wrong, would believe that the gentlemen who now led the Opposition in Parliament instigated the Lieutenant-Governor to take the course he did. That was the belief—this belief had gone over this country. The leader of the Opposition had said that this matter should have been fought out in the Parliament of Quebec, as it was one which affected that Province only. He (Mr. Boulton) thought that any wrong done to that Province was a wrong done to the whole Dominion, and a blow struck at the vital principles of responsible government; and that when they came to consider the value of the institutions they had, and the trouble they had taken to obtain the Constitution they now enjoyed, they should allow as little time as possible to elapse to counteract, as far as was possible, the blow struck at their liberties by the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec; and he thought it was imperatively necessary on them to carry this resolution, otherwise there would be a subversion of every principle of popular liberty. The people of Quebec had given their adherence very strongly to the scheme of Confederation. They were a brave, chivalrous people, very sensitive to every emotion of honour, and they were willing

MR. BOULTON.

to join with the other Provinces to build up this great Confederation, based on the noblest principles of the British Constitution; and how bitter would it be for them, if they found the expectations they had formed of the benefits that would accrue to them destroyed by the heinous blow struck at their liberties. The time had come when the gentleman in the supreme position at Government House here was one of the proudest scions of the noblest aristocracy the world ever saw, versed in the honourable position of English statesman, sent by our Gracious Sovereign to superintend our affairs and guide our destinies. How should we feel if we had instead some miserable trickster; he might come to this House and say, "You are taking some action in regard to the tariff, or otherwise, which seems to me not according to the practice of the Mother Land, or adverse to her interests; if you do not do so and so, I shall dismiss you." Then, even the most prejudiced would see the iniquity of the course pursued by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. He was not surprised that the leader of the Opposition declined to deal with the merits of this question. According to the practices of his past life, according to the utterances made by him on every Ontario platform, he did not deal with it. In Ontario, they had determined as far as they could, and he believed they would not go back on it, that they would not give up the principle of responsible government, as long as they had life left to fight for it. He followed, as carefully as he could, what the leader of the Opposition had said. That hon. gentleman said it was the duty of the Government, if Governor Letellier had done wrong, to have dismissed him. That was a very pretty argument; but they could hardly expect the gentlemen who had counselled the execution of this more on their behalf than on that of the Lieutenant-Governor to turn round and censure him for so doing. The hon. gentleman said that Governor Letellier dissolved Parliament on the advice of his constitutional advisers. This was too grave a matter to be made a joke of, and, in view of the facts, it did seem, viewed in the light of responsible government, to partake of the character of a farce. The hon. gentleman then went on

to make some remarks of a Scriptural character in reference to the prophets of Baal. The prophets of Baal, it would be remembered, on the occasion referred to, were called up in a crowd to generally destroy the prophets of the true God. That was a feat which the leader of the Opposition and his friends executed, and in this way carried out the Biblical history as recorded in the destruction of the prophets of Baal. Hon. gentlemen presented themselves before the people of Canada, and they were nearly as effectively destroyed. There was scarcely a remnant of them left. In reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), he (Mr. Boulton) understood the hon. gentleman to say that he condemned the action of Mr. Letellier, but, at the same time, he was going to support it. He (Mr. Boulton) did not understand that: as he understood it, if a man did wrong, and if he was to be condemned, they should condemn him. He would simply close by saying that, because he thought the act of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was unconstitutional, because he thought it was an act corruptly conceived with a view to subverting the Constitution of this country, because he thought it was conceived in treachery and shaped in fraud, because he thought this House should mark this action with most severe condemnation, he therefore would support the resolution.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell), moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY.

II. CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

- To be granted Her Majesty on charges of Management..... \$65,600.00

Resolution ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolution reported.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED.

JOHN WHITE, Esquire, having taken the oath and subscribed the roll containing the same, took his seat in the House.

House adjourned at
Thirty minutes past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 12th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 43) To provide for the transfer of lands, and estates and interests in lands, and other matters relating to real property in the Territories of Canada.—(Mr. Mills.)

Bill (No. 44) To repeal the Act passed in the 38th year of Her Majesty's Reign, intitled: "An Act to regulate the construction and maintenance of Marine Electric Telegraphs."—(Mr. McCarthy.)

INSOLVENCY COMMITTEE.

PETITIONS AND BILLS REFERRED.

MR. COLBY moved, that all petitions now received, or that may be received during the present Session, on the subject of the Insolvency Laws, shall stand referred to the Select Committee appointed to enquire into and consider the questions of Insolvency and Bankruptcy.

Motion agreed to.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of the following Bills was discharged, and the said Bills referred to the Select Committee appointed to enquire into and consider the questions of Insolvency and Bankruptcy:—

Bill (No. 2) Relating to Bankruptcy.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Insolvency Act of 1875, and the Acts amending the same.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

Bill (No. 22) To repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875, and to make provisions in lieu thereof.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

THE LETELLIER PAPERS.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN: I would like to enquire whether, since the publication of these documents in reference to Mr. Letellier and his late Government, as it does not appear that the reply contained in them had been communicated to the Lieutenant-Governor, he has had communication of it?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am not at all aware whether he has or not.

DISMISSAL OF QUEBEC GOVERNMENT
BY THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on Mr. Mousseau's proposed motion, "That it be Resolved, That the dismissal by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec of his Ministers on the second day of March, 1878, was, under the circumstances, unwise and subversive of the position accorded to the advisers of the Crown, since the concession of the principle of Responsible Government to the British North American Colonies;" and of the proposed motion of Mr. Ouimet, which was: "That the question be now put."

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said that, whatever difference of opinion might exist in this House as to the conduct of Mr. Letellier de St. Just, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, in dismissing his Ministers, he ventured to think that there would be no difference of opinion as to the importance of the question. He was as much a Federalist as either of the hon. gentlemen who had declared themselves Federalists upon the floor of this House last night. He was as anxious for the maintenance of our present form of Constitution as they could possibly be. He believed the best interests of this country would be served by preserving to our Provincial Legislatures the power to deal with purely local questions, and he would as much regret as they possibly could do any action on the part of this House, or on the part of the people of this country, which would tend to destroy the rights and the privileges of those Local Legislatures. They

were here at this moment, however, face to face, for the first time since Confederation, with a difficulty which, when Confederation was under discussion, appeared to a great many of those who took part in that discussion to be likely to prove a serious one in the future working of our government. How far then could we carry on the government of this country under the present Constitution with due regard to the independence of the Local Legislatures under Governors appointed by the Government of the Dominion, was a question which excited at that time grave apprehensions on the part of many of those who took part in the debate. And no hon. gentleman who took part in the debate upon the resolutions on which was founded the British North America Act foresaw graver dangers from this cause than the hon. gentleman who was now at the head of the Government of the Province of Quebec, the Hon. Mr. Joly. If Lieutenant-Governors were to be counters in the party politics in this country; if we laid down the doctrine that the Lieutenant-Governors appointed by the Government here, fresh, as they must be, from active participation in the party politics of the country, might become partisans in the administration of the local affairs of their Provinces; might become parties to the political interests of those who appointed them, he ventured to think that the danger to the autonomy of the Province, to their provincial independence, was very much greater than could possibly be the case from the passage of this resolution, or from any consequence that would follow its passage. In the speeches which were made last night by the hon. members for Lambton and Halton, those who believed that the conduct of Mr. Letellier was unwise and subversive of the rights accorded to the advisers of the Crown under responsible government, and was therefore unconstitutional, had this great satisfaction; that neither of those hon. gentlemen ventured to defend the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor. He was bound to say that he thought Mr. Letellier had reason to find fault with his friends; that of those who, if they did not induce him to perform the act which he did perform, at least

condoned that act to the extent of retaining him in his position, and giving his Government all the benefit of the patronage of the Government then in office in the Dominion to carry the elections; in all the discussions on the floor of Parliament, not one had ventured to defend his act. Surely, if that act was defensible, *per se*, there ought to have been some gentlemen on the floor of this House, some one of his political friends, or of his old colleagues, who would have the courage to defend him. But last night, as last year, not one single word was uttered in defence of the Lieutenant-Governor. They had, instead, the statement made as an answer to the arraignment of the Lieutenant-Governor, that the House had nothing to do with that question. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) endeavoured somewhat to play upon the terms of the resolution which had been submitted to the House. He told the House last night, as some of his friends had told it before, that the right hon. gentleman who moved in this matter last year did not venture to declare in the resolution that the act of Mr. Letellier de St. Just was unconstitutional, and he attempted to play on the wording of it—an attempt which was unworthy of the position he occupied in this House, and of the gravity of the question—by saying that, no doubt, the act of Mr. Letellier had been subversive of the position of his advisers at that time. But what were the terms of the resolution? They were asked to resolve “that the dismissal, by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, of his Ministers, on the 2nd March, 1878, was, under the circumstances, unwise,”—and no hon. gentleman had ventured to controvert that statement—“and that it was subversive of the position accorded to the advisers of the Crown,” not to those particular advisers, but to the advisers of the Crown generally, “since the concession of the principle of responsible government to the British North American Colonies.” Now, the position accorded to the advisers of the Crown since the concession of responsible government to the British North American Colonies was a constitutional right, a constitutional position, and the violation of that posi-

tion, any interference with that position, was an unconstitutional act. This was as clearly implied as if the word unconstitutional had appeared in this resolution. The leading argument of the member for Lambton was that the Government of the day were guilty of cowardice in this matter; that it was their duty, if they believed Mr. Letellier had acted unconstitutionally, if he had been guilty of conduct subversive of the rights of the advisers of the Crown, under responsible government, to have advised the Governor-General to dismiss Mr. Letellier, and, as a second argument, and these two comprised the whole, that this Parliament had no right to interfere in the matter. He (Mr. White) would take the latter position first, and he ventured to think that there was no hon. gentleman on the floor of this House from whom could come with worse grace an argument of this kind than from the hon. member for Lambton. The 59th clause of the Union Act, which determined the position of the Lieutenant-Governors, was as follows:—“A Lieutenant-Governor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor-General, but any Lieutenant-Governor appointed after the commencement of the first Session of the Parliament of Canada shall not be removable within five years from his appointment, except for cause assigned, which shall be communicated to him in writing, within one month after the order for his removal is made, and shall be communicated by Message to the Senate and the House of Commons, within one week thereafter, if the Parliament is then sitting, and, if not, then within one week after the commencement of the next Session of Parliament.” Although it was not there said that Parliament might interfere with the position and conduct of a Lieutenant-Governor; although it was clear that the initiative, in a matter of this kind, would, under ordinary circumstances, be taken by the Executive, yet the right of Parliament to discuss the question, to review the act of the Executive, was clearly expressed in the clause of the Confederation Act. The hon. member for Lambton, last year, brought down to this House, not upon an Address from the House, nor by an order of the House—of course, it could not have

been upon the latter—but by his own motion, under advice given by him to the Governor-General, by Message, the papers now before the House, at least, those of them which were in existence at that time. Why did he advise the Governor-General to bring down by Message the documents, the petitions of the Legislature of Quebec and the documents which had been submitted to the Legislature of Quebec?

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman has made a mistake; unwittingly, no doubt. The documents were addressed to the Legislature of the Dominion, and I was obliged to advise Mr. De Boucherville or the Speaker, I think it was, who came here with the papers, that they must go through the ordinary channel; but they were presented by Message of the Governor in the proper way here. It was not upon any other ground than that.

MR. WHITE said that was quite true as to the petition from the Legislature of Quebec; but was the explanatory case addressed to this Parliament? That came down in a subsequent Message from the Governor-General, not with the same documents at all, but in a subsequent Message on the mere motion of the hon. gentleman then at the head of the Government. Were they brought for the purpose of discussion, that this Parliament might, as a free Parliament, discuss the question whether the Lieutenant-Governor had acted wisely or unwisely, or were they brought here in anticipation of the general elections then coming on in the Province of Quebec, and in order that that "explanatory case," which was an arraignment of the late Ministry of the Province of Quebec, and in which every single statement was either entirely incorrect, or grossly perverted, might go to the country, and that the people of the Province of Quebec, influenced by it, might be induced to sustain the Government which had assumed the responsibility for Mr. Letellier's act. If it was intended that this Parliament should discuss it simply for the information of this Parliament, it did not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman to say now that this Parliament could not deal with a question of this kind, in anticipation of Executive action,

MR. WHITE.

but only after Executive action had been taken. The other argument was: that this Government had been recreant to their duty, had acted in a cowardly manner, because they had not chosen to act upon their own responsibility and advised the dismissal of Mr. Letellier, but had, on the contrary, as the hon. gentleman, with that courtesy which characterised him, chose to assume, put up gentlemen on the back benches to move in this matter. What were the facts with regard to that? Under our constitutional system and under the best authorities in relation to it, the Cabinet of the day was practically a Committee of Parliament. This question was before Parliament last Session. Parliament then refused to condemn Mr. Letellier. For what reason they were not at this particular branch of the enquiry called upon to say, but Parliament refused to condemn Mr. Letellier. Therefore, until Parliament reversed that decision, if Parliament should reverse it, it was not for the Executive to go in the face of the decision of Parliament at that time, and advise His Excellency to take action on the matter. If the matter had never been discussed by this Parliament, he could understand the argument of the hon. gentleman, and see reason in the charge he made; but, when it had been discussed in Parliament, and when Parliament had refused to condemn,—no matter on what reason that refusal was based,—the Government had no right, until Parliament altered, if it did alter its view, to advise His Excellency in relation to this particular case. That was a fair answer made to the charge against the Ministry that they were cowardly, because they did not advise His Excellency to dismiss Mr. Letellier, instead of having the matter brought up in this manner. New events had occurred since last year. The position of the question was now different from what it was when it was discussed last year. New papers were before the House in the petition of certain members of the late Government of Quebec, the reply of the Lieutenant-Governor to this petition, and the rejoinder of the members of the late Quebec Government. They were, therefore, in a different position now in relation to this question from that of last Session. They were a new

Parliament, fresh from the people. Every phase of this matter had been discussed most thoroughly, at least in one of the Provinces, during the last elections. He ventured to say that next, aye, scarcely next in importance in the Province of Quebec, at any rate in the whole of the French-Canadian districts of Quebec, to that greater question which had placed in power the hon. gentlemen who now occupied the Treasury benches, was the question of the dismissal of his Ministers by Mr. Letellier, and, in sending forty-eight gentlemen from the Province opposed to those who, last year, refused to condemn the Lieutenant-Governor, the people of the Province of Quebec expected that result, and would be deeply disappointed if it did not occur. The condemnation of the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was considered by them as necessary to their Provincial independence. The hon. member for Lambton had made one statement which he (Mr. White) confessed had somewhat surprised him. The hon. gentleman, with that peculiar habit which he had of posing himself and his party as much better than their fellows, as made of a different kind of clay altogether from ordinary human mortals, had called their attention to the alleged fact that the Liberal party in this country had never invoked Imperial interference in their quarrels with the Governors in this country. Did the hon. gentleman forget the agitations in connection with Sir Edmund Head, and that these hon. gentlemen, or their friends, at that time, urged strongly the recall, and did all they possibly could, not to secure a condemnation from the people, but the recall of the Governor by the Imperial Government in consequence of the action which he had taken in relation to the Brown-Dorion Government?

MR. HOLTON: Both.

MR. WHITE: Both, said the hon. gentleman who was a participant in the troubles of that day. But it was not both that the hon. member for Lambton had told them last night. His statement was that his party had never, upon any occasion, and he asked the House to take their conduct as an example worthy of being followed, in-

voiced Imperial interference in any of their quarrels with Governors-General in the country. He had seen that statement made in other places, in some of the Liberal newspapers, and he had taken the trouble this morning to look over the columns of the *Globe* of 1878 to find what really were the views of the hon. gentlemen at that time. They had started an agitation all over this country; dinners in one place, public meetings in another. He (Mr. White) had good reason to remember them, for he took a somewhat prominent position in connection with one meeting which occurred, and which resulted, he was happy to say, somewhat differently from the intentions of the gentlemen who had called it. Here was the prayer of one of the petitions, the petition at the Welland meeting, the first of importance held at that time. He gave it as an answer to the statement made by the hon. gentleman in his place last night:—

“Therefore, we humbly beseech Your Majesty to exercise Your Royal Prerogative in re-calling His Excellency from the Administration of the affairs of this Province, or otherwise acting in the premises as to Your Majesty may seem meet.”

And yet the hon. member for Lambton had stated last night that his party never invoked Imperial interference in quarrels with the Governors of this country. He had come across a speech, made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), and in view of his remarks that they must be careful not to interfere in Provincial matters of this kind, lest the Provincial autonomy and independence might be affected, he was curious to see what that hon. member had said on that occasion. This was an extract from his speech:—

“It was because the people were loyal to the British Constitution, that they would not see it dragged through the mire, and made a mockery and a by-word. It was only in extreme cases that people should resort to extreme measures; but he was sure that, under present circumstances, the people were fully justified in petitioning for the Governor-General's recall. They would take that step, and after they had done so, it would be acknowledged that in doing so they had been even more loyal to Her Majesty than if they had in silence submitted to their wrongs.” Then it was worth while to see what he said a little further.

MR. MACDOUGALL: What parallel is there between the two cases. This was a petition to Parliament. We did not petition the Imperial Parliament, but the Executive.

MR. WHITE said he would tell the hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, where the parallel lay. But he did not hear the hon. gentleman, when he rose last night, knowing, as he did from his own participation in those events, and following immediately the member for Lambton, say that that hon. member had been wrong in the claim he made for his party, that they, at any rate, never invoked Imperial interference. Then he (Mr. White) thought he would find out what the leader of the Liberal party had said. He took it for granted he would not be far wrong in crediting that hon. gentleman with the sentiments of the paper mentioned. It observed, on the subject of Lord Dufferin's action at the close of the Session of 1873, in its issue of August 31st:—

“On one point His Excellency may rest assured. The people of Upper Canada are intent upon ridding themselves of his official presence. A settled conviction exists that he occupies the position of a partisan—that he is helping a corrupt Government to play a partisan game—that he is no longer qualified to administer the affairs of Government impartially; and a change in the Executive becomes inevitable.”

He (Mr. White) would ask if the same charge of partisanship could not honestly be preferred against Mr. Letellier? The same journal observed, in dealing with the action of the Governor-General:—

“One course, and one alone, is open to Sir Edmund Head. He must make room for a better Governor-General. The change is inevitable. He must retire or submit to be re-called.”

And yet, with that record, which everyone, who knew anything of the politics of the country at that time, was perfectly familiar with, they had the leader of the great Liberal party, whose statements should be so entirely accurate that everyone could accept them without hesitation, claiming that his party had never invoked Imperial interference in their quarrels with the Governor of this country. They then had a speech from the member

MR. WHITE.

for Halton (Mr. Macdougall). Standing upon that lofty pedestal to which his wanderings had at last brought him,—he, who was at this moment the independent, the impartial, the judicial arbiter between parties in this honourable House, had given them a speech whose exordium was an advice, and whose peroration an admonition and warning. As to the advice, he (Mr. White) dared say that hon. gentleman knew the proverbial fate of those who gave unasked-for advice; and he was very much inclined to fear that, when that hon. member undertook to advise the people of Lower Canada, at any rate in relation to their local affairs, he would find his advice was not likely to be accepted.

MR. MACDOUGALL: The hon. member did not get a seat there.

MR. WHITE said he was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say he condemned the action of Mr. Letellier; but he told them the question had already passed through three tribunals: the late Government and Parliament last Session had refused to censure, and the people of Quebec had sustained the Administration which assumed the responsibility for Mr. Letellier's Act, and that, therefore, Parliament ought not to be called upon to deal with this question. Now, he (Mr. White) did not know whether he was right or wrong in assuming that, if the hon. gentleman had had a seat in Parliament last year, he would have voted for the motion of the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) which was similar to the present; but he inferred from his remarks—and he hoped he did him no injustice in that inference—he would have voted for that motion. If so, then what greater injury was going to befall the Provincial autonomy, and the independence of the Provincial Legislature, when the present motion passed? It was an interference then as much as to-day; his argument now equally applied to the motion of last year. The truth was, they stood to-day in the position of a new Parliament. The people had had this whole matter under view, had sent this Parliament here, and there was no more harm in its taking the action proposed than there could possibly have

been last year. It was quite true hon. gentlemen opposite took no proceedings last year—did not condemn Mr. Letellier ; and he was inclined to think they had good reason not to ; that it would have been an act of ingratitude, to say the least, to condemn an act performed in their interest, and whose only object had been, if popular statements were correct, to secure control of the Provincial Government, in order that the patronage of the Government might be used in the Dominion elections last fall. To say that the advisers of the Crown here, who were so deeply interested in those elections, whose continuance in office depended upon their result, did not condemn men who had done what seemed to give them the best possible chance in Quebec of carrying the elections in that Province was, surely, a most remarkable argument to use on the floor of this House. The hon. member for Halton was fortunate enough to obtain last night the applause of hon. gentlemen opposite. Upon that point at any rate he (Mr. White) congratulated him. For years past they had exhausted the whole vocabulary of abuse and invective in order to destroy his personal and political character, and that he had succeeded by a single speech in securing their approbation must undoubtedly have been to him a source of gratification, however much his friends might have doubted the sincerity or value of that applause. He supposed hereafter they should hear no more of that invective, no more references to "that abandoned man," which they were wont to hear on the Liberal platforms in Ontario. If he were able to show he had converted his traducers into his applauders by a single speech, he would have accomplished a great deal for himself. They might, as the result of it, witness again that of which he would be sorry to see another illustration, but of which the record of hon. gentlemen opposite afforded so many illustrations in the past—that they had no standard of right or wrong except that of political opinion—that, with them, political hostility made the sinner and political friendship the saint. He thought that was not a lesson for the advantage of the people of this country, or one that it was well public men should be taught. Now the leading argument and, perhaps, the

only very strong argument used by hon. gentlemen opposite against this resolution was that the people of Quebec had had the matter under review, and had sustained those who took the constitutional responsibility for Mr. Letellier's acts. It was strictly true that under the surprise to the Province and other circumstances characterising the election, a large following had been secured for the Government of Mr. Joly. But, if he had obtained a majority, he (Mr. White) did not admit that that, in itself, was a reason why Mr. Letellier's action should be condoned. Success did not necessarily make right. He ventured to say that, if they laid down the principle in this House, or consecrate as true the doctrine that to succeed was to escape all punishment in a matter of this kind, they would simply give *carte blanche* to the Lieutenant-Governor hereafter, if disposed, to play the partisan, and run the risk of all the consequences. What was the position of Quebec at that time ? There were great practical difficulties surrounding the Government. Immediately after Confederation, the people of Quebec showed an ambition to develop their country by railways in different parts. Beginning with small wooden railways, assisted under the Treasurership of Mr. Dunkin, with \$1,000 a mile, they went on to encourage iron roads, and increased to such the subsidies to \$2,000, \$3,000 and \$4,000 a mile. Next, they projected a trunk railway on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. Long ago, the people of Quebec had become deeply interested in the construction of the North Shore Railway. They had given large subsidies to these railways, one from Quebec to Montreal, another from Montreal to Ottawa, and thence to Portage du Fort, to connect with the Pacific Railway ; but, owing to the position of the Province, the intense opposition of rival railway undertakings, and, in some degree, to political influence used against Quebec, the companies building the railway were unable to float their bonds in the English market. The question that presented itself was, whether they would abandon all the money of the public already spent, including that of the municipalities, or by coming forward and taking up the North Shore Railways

as a Government work, bring them to completion as they had done since. The railway policy of the Province was not a party policy, but one on which all parties united. The strongest arguments for the promotion of certain railways, and for the increase of the subsidies came from the Liberal Opposition, and the greatest embarrassment the DeBoucherville Government had to contend against was, not their giving money, but their refusing it to enterprises of great value to the Province. This policy was approaching completion; it was necessary for the Provincial Government to collect moneys due by the different municipalities. Nearly two millions of the money subscribed remained unpaid, so they had to collect this money or raise an equivalent in some way, and, in addition, to float the Commissioner's railway bonds to get enough money to complete the roads. All this involved two facts: First, a quarrel with the municipalities, who were most unwilling to pay; and, next, a quarrel with the whole tax-paying community who, finding they had their railways, and that the debts would fall on the Government, wished to evade payment. That was the position of things when Mr. Letellier, last winter, brought about the *coup d'état*. On the appeal to the country the constitutional question was the strong one for the Conservatives, the bulwark against the more popular Liberal cry of increased taxation and interference with the Judiciary. These cries were not all the Conservatives had to contend against. Just on the eve of the election, they had a fearful charge of corruption made against a member of the late Government, who was now a member of this House, by a person who was a fugitive from justice, and who had almost immediately afterwards to flee the country, in order to escape the penalty of his crimes. This person was employed by the friends of Mr. Letellier and his Government, to formulate a serious charge against a member of the Government, to the effect that his influence as a member of the Cabinet had been sold to him for gain; and it was so formulated as to include other members of the Government as well. The letter containing this charge was printed and distributed in every county in Quebec, from Bonaventure to Pontiac. The

MR. WHITE.

people were asked whether they were prepared to return again to power a party which had been thus guilty. Under these influences the hon. gentleman lost his seat by a narrow majority of 16; but he was glad to know that the same constituency took the earliest opportunity afforded it, upon learning how cruelly false this charge was, of returning him by a large majority as a member of this House. That undoubtedly had its effect. In addition to that, the county of Gaspé elections were brought on in such a manner as to disenfranchise the Magdalen Islands, which usually gave from 300 to 400 Conservative majority. There was no use contesting the county of Gaspé with the Magdalen Islands cut off, and thus hon. gentlemen secured another seat. But that county had since returned the gentleman who then lost the seat. Further, they had, in the constituency of St. Hyacinthe, the Provincial Treasurer returned by a majority of 60; and, within two or three weeks afterwards, the Judge of that district, a Liberal himself, struck off 85 Liberal votes from the voters' list, showing that he was in a minority of 25 of the legal votes; and that constituency, under the approved list, had returned to this House a gentleman to support the Government, and who would, he had no doubt, when the vote on this question was taken, record his vote in favour of the motion. What were these men doing to-day in relation to this constituency, and with the approbation of the Lieutenant-Governor, who was so anxious that the rights and liberties of the people should be preserved? It was five months since the Provincial Treasurer died, and during the whole of this period the people had asked that the writs for a new election might issue. Their prayer was disregarded, and, in the meantime, a partisan municipal council had added some 300 votes to the list, in order that, when the time came, they would be able to reverse the vote given on September 17th, and return a supporter of the Local Government. Then there was the influence of the two Governments, and everyone knew what the influence, even the legitimate influence, of Governments meant in general elections. Hon. gentlemen opposite, then occupying seats on the Treasury benches, used their influence in the most open

manner, in order that Mr. Letellier might be sustained, and the election of Mr. Joly and his friends secured; and yet, in spite of all this influence, the Province, at the election, returned 34 Conservatives out of 65, giving the Conservatives a majority of three in that House. That was the position of affairs after the elections in the Province, and yet they were told that they were not to discuss the question because the people of Quebec had had it under their consideration, and had sustained Mr. Joly, who had assumed the responsibility of the act of Mr. Letellier. It was quite true that Mr. Joly managed to struggle through the Session of the Legislature. But how did he do it? There were two gentlemen elected, one, Mr. Price, for Chicoutimi, who had to undergo one of the most severe struggles,—or, rather, his friends did for him, as he was elected in his absence,—that took place during the elections. The influence of the Government in that large lumber district was necessarily strong, and yet, in spite of that influence being used against him, Mr. Price was returned. That gentleman was a strong personal friend of Mr. Joly, and, although he could not bring himself to vote approval of the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor, and absented himself from the House when the vote was taken, he, on personal grounds, supported his friend, and assisted in carrying him through the Session of the Legislature. The other gentleman was Mr. Turcotte, member for Three Rivers. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) the previous evening had read a letter this gentleman had addressed to his constituency. He had been in the previous Legislature, and, upon this question of the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor had voted, as the papers brought down would show, with the Conservative party. He went to his constituency as a Conservative, but some rumours obtained that he was not a good Conservative; and, when he found that the Conservatives, in order to make assurance doubly sure, and of obtaining some one that could be fully trusted, were contemplating bringing out an opponent, he wrote a letter than which nothing could be more strong. He said he was a Conservative and did not even dream of supporting Mr. Joly. And he stated that,

if elected, he would oppose Mr. Joly and the Government of which he was the leader. Upon that assurance the hon. gentleman was elected. On the day of the opening of the Legislative Assembly, it was still supposed he would support the Conservative party; but about half past 11 o'clock that morning a messenger called for him, and he was taken into the presence of the Lieutenant-Governor. Then arrangements were made by means of which he prostituted his position and sold himself like a sheep in the shambles to the support of the Joly Ministry. Notwithstanding these facts, they were asked to say it was a matter of no consequence how Mr. Joly got his majority, and they were asked to shut their eyes to the fact that this majority was obtained by trafficking in the honour and integrity of the public men of the country. In this way he obtained what he was pleased to call a majority, which was simply half the House with the Speaker's casting vote. In addition to this, the Lieutenant-Governor used all his influence and his personal presence in order to help his friends. He (Mr. White) would ask hon. gentleman on the floor of the House whether, if they were as evenly divided as they were in the Province of Quebec, and the Governor-General came down, and, taking his seat in the Speaker's room, sent for hon. members, and, by the influence of his position and the suggestion of reward, endeavoured to secure their support for his Government, they would for a moment tolerate such a proceeding; and he would ask whether a Lieutenant-Governor who thus acted was entitled to consideration at the hands of men who valued the Constitution under which they lived and the principles of constitutional government which it was their supposed happiness to enjoy. What were the excuses which were made for this act of the Lieutenant-Governor. He did not propose to discuss the question as to whether Lieutenant-Governors under our constitutional system possessed the prerogatives of the Crown or not, whether they were merely officers of this Government, or whether they were really representatives of the Crown in their several Provinces. He did not propose to discuss the question as to whether they had the power to dismiss their Min-

isters in the way in which Mr. Letellier had dismissed his Ministry. He knew that there were differences of opinion on that subject. He knew that in the city of Montreal a gentleman, whose position at the bar of this country certainly gave to his opinions very great weight, had taken the grounds that the Governor possessed no such powers. Another authority held that the position of Lieutenant-Governor was not the same as that of Her Majesty the Queen, or as that of His Excellency the Governor-General. That authority was no less than Mr. Justice Fournier, whose views as Minister of Justice were supported by the whole Cabinet of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Fournier made a report, when Minister of Justice, approved of by the Privy Council, recommending the disallowance of the Ontario Act relating to escheats and forfeitures. In that report, referring to the powers of Lieutenant-Governors and Provincial Legislatures, Mr. Fournier said :

"Therefore, as the undersigned believes escheats to be a matter of prerogative, and not a question of 'property and civil rights,' there seems no reason to depart from the view expressed in the Order of the Privy Council that no prerogative rights of the Crown are vested in the Lieutenant-Governor of a Province, unless under the Confederation Act, and that unless that Act can be found strictly to confer upon the Lieutenant-Governor or the Legislature of a Province, an express right to deal with any matter of prerogative, such power is not vested in either the one or the other authority."

Then Mr. Fournier gave an extract from a despatch from Lord Carnarvon, sent out, he thought, in connection with the Lepine trial in the Province of Manitoba, which was as follows :—

"The Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces of the Dominion, however important locally their functions may be, are a part of the Colonial administrative staff, and are more immediately responsible to the Governor-General in Council. They do not hold Commissions from the Crown, and neither in power nor privilege resemble those Governors of Colonies to whom, after special consideration of their personal fitness, the Queen, under the Great Seal and her own hand and signet, delegates portions of her prerogatives, and issues her own instructions."

And then Mr. Fournier gave his own views upon the limited powers of Lieutenant-Governors as follows :—

MR. WHITE.

"The only instance in which, to the knowledge of the undersigned, there is an express delegation to a Lieutenant-Governor of privileges of the Crown, is in the commission to the Governor-General, the 6th section of which is thus worded: 'And judge necessary, all powers lawfully belonging to us, in respect of assembling or proroguing the Senate or the House of Commons of our said Dominion, and of dissolving the said House of Commons, and we do hereby give the like authority to the several Lieutenant-Governors for a time being, of the Provinces of our said Dominion, with respect to the Legislative Councils, or the Legislative or General Assemblies of those Provinces respectively.'"

A Lieutenant-Governor had the power of assembling and of proroguing Parliament, but that did not, he took it, include the prerogative of dismissing Ministers. Although he was not disposed to insist upon that particular view of the case, although he thought there was very much to be said for the other view, he was, at the same time, for the purposes of this argument, prepared to admit the Lieutenant-Governor had a right to dismiss his Ministers, subject, of course, to his responsibility to the Government that appointed him. He made reference, a little while previously, to the case of Sir Edmund Head, and to the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite to secure the recall of that Governor. He desired to contrast, for a moment, the circumstances of the two cases. What had been the conduct of Sir Edmund Head, which had caused this agitation? A general election had occurred. The Government had been sustained by a large majority. A vote was taken in relation to a grant of money in connection with the seat of government. The Government were beaten, because the local feeling, in relation to the seat of government, was opposed to their policy, and the Government resigned. Mr. Brown was sent for, and they learned, from the documents which were brought down at the time, that it was intimated to him that he could not expect to have a dissolution so soon after a dissolution had already occurred. Mr. Brown declined to listen to this suggestion, and intimated that this was a matter upon which his Ministers would advise him after they were sworn in. He formed his Government and advised a dissolution; the dissolution was refused, and Mr. Brown resigning, the leader of the other party was again sent for and

another Government formed. That Government continued in the possession of a large majority; went on for three years, and carried the general elections which followed. So that they had abundant evidence to show that they had the confidence of the people of this country, and that Sir Edmund Head was practically right in the judgment of public sentiment of this country. But because he would not dissolve Parliament, because he would not accept the advice of advisers who were in a helpless minority in relation to it, this demand was made for his recall. How did that compare with the conduct of Mr. Letellier? In the papers which had been brought down to them they had a statement of the reasons—first, as submitted to the Legislature; next as submitted to the Governor-General in the explanatory case—which induced the Lieutenant-Governor to dismiss his Ministry. The first and chief reason—although after all, as he would show presently, it was not the actual reason for the dismissal—the chief pretence was the conduct of the Government of the day in introducing measures in that Legislature without his previous sanction. There was no doubt whatever, in fact they had it from the statement of Mr. Letellier himself, that whatever difficulty arose in relation to that was purely a misunderstanding. The statement of Mr. Letellier entirely acquitted his advisers of any intentional disrespect to the Crown. It would be thought that so serious a punishment of his Ministry as dismissal ought not to follow an unintentional error, as he admitted there was no intentional disrespect to the Crown. It would be admitted that there ought, at least, to be some more serious ground for so serious a penalty. But was Mr. DeBoucherville justified in assuming that he had the sanction of the Lieutenant-Governor? Look at the facts:—On the 28th January, according to the papers brought down, there was a Message sent by Mr. DeBoucherville to the Lieutenant-Governor at Rivière Ouelle, to this effect:—

“Can you send me authorisation resolution respecting finances?”

No doubt, that was a very broad request; it might have been an unwisely worded

Message; it might have tended to the misconception of the answer which came on the following day, as follows:—

“Blank mailed to-day. If presence necessary, telegraph. Return Friday.”

Upon that, two measures—the Railway Bill and the Tax Bill—were introduced by the Government. Mr. DeBoucherville was of opinion that his telegram covered both these important measures, and that he had full authority in the reply to introduce those measures. On the 29th, the day the Message was received, the Railway Bill was introduced and some proceedings in relation to it took place every day from the 29th January to the 5th February. Under the rules of the House, copies of the Votes and Proceedings were sent to the Lieutenant-Governor every day for his information. Mr. Letellier, all through his papers, intimated that he took the liveliest personal interest in everything that occurred in connection with the public affairs of that Province. The Lieutenant-Governor, it was stated, was so minute in his examination of all public papers, that he could detect the slightest grammatical error in a Statute, and certainly, it was only reasonable to suppose that he could not but have been cognisant of the proceedings in the Legislature. There was, moreover, printed in these Votes and Proceedings, the statement of the leader of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Angers, they being introduced with the sanction of the Lieutenant-Governor. Was it wise—was it fair of the Lieutenant-Governor, when he got those documents into his hands, when he saw that his telegram was misunderstood, was made to cover a much wider authority than he intended to convey—was it wise or fair of him not to have warned his Ministers of the fact, and thus enabled them to act as they considered proper? He allowed them to go on, he gave no warning of any dissatisfaction on his part until the 19th February, twenty days after the resolutions had been brought up, and during which time they had been discussed in the Legislature and at public meetings throughout the country. Never once during that whole period had the Lieutenant-Governor even suggested to his Ministry that they had assumed authority which he had no idea

of giving them. On that day there had been a conversation, during which, however, it had not been alleged that Mr. DeBoucherville had been ordered to suspend these measures. On the contrary, the statement made by Mr. DeBoucherville, and it had not been denied by Mr. Letellier, was that no such order had been given him. A conversation occurred between the Governor and Mr. DeBoucherville, in which it appeared that the former expressed his great regret at the necessity for legislation of that kind. That was perfectly proper if Mr. Letellier held that view. People might regret the necessity for particular legislation, and yet admit that necessity. Nothing further occurred until the 26th February. On that day, an application by the Lieutenant-Governor was addressed to his First Minister, asking for a number of papers in relation to this particular Bill. These papers were furnished, but even then Mr. DeBoucherville was left under the impression that nothing further than the reservation of the Bill was contemplated. They found in Mr. DeBoucherville's statement, and although Mr. Letellier objected to this statement having been made to the Legislature, he had nowhere denied the accuracy of it, and, therefore, they were bound to assume that it was accurate. On the 28th February they had this statement made by Mr. Letellier:—

"On leaving, Mr. DeBoucherville said: 'If I understand you rightly, you are hesitating between giving your sanction to the Railway Bill and reserving.' He replied, 'That is it.'"

From that it was evident he had these documents in his hands. He had taken all the proceedings necessary to enable him to say whether he desired to stop this Bill or not. That was nearly a month after the Bill had been introduced, and it was the first intimation that had been given by the Lieutenant-Governor to his advisers of certain measures in relation to the Bill. Why had all this delay taken place? Why had he allowed his Ministry to conduct the affairs of the country, during that whole month, if he intended ultimately to dismiss them? He (Mr. White) would tell them the reason. Mr. Letellier expected, by leaving Mr. DeBoucherville under the impression that there was no serious difficulty between them in relation to

MR. WHITE.

this Railway Bill, that the supplies would be voted, and then he could prorogue the House, and, having supplies for a twelve-month, he could have the elections at his leisure. Whether his Ministers were sustained or not, the patronage would still be in their hands to be used for the benefit of the Dominion Government at the elections to come off during the summer. That was the only reason for the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor in allowing a whole month to elapse, during which this Bill had been discussed in the Legislature before he took any serious steps to stop it, and dismiss his Ministry. Then there was another measure, about which there seemed to have been some difference of opinion—that was in relation to the Tax Bill. He (Mr. White) was not going to say whether that Bill was wise or unwise. If there was one thing more than another which was clearly and unmistakably within the functions of Parliament, it was the question of ways and means and supplies. It was for them to determine whether they would raise money in this particular way or any other. They had obligations to meet, the credit of the country to maintain, and they had to find means in some way for the purpose, and if they chose that particular way they had a perfect right to do so. But it was complained that they had not consulted the Lieutenant-Governor before bringing in their Bill. Upon that point they had this statement in the explanations of the Lieutenant-Governor:—

"The Premier did not, either then or since, inform the Lieutenant-Governor that the Government were in so impecunious a condition as to require special legislation to increase the public burdens."

And yet they found the following statement only four paragraphs before it:—

"The Lieutenant-Governor, from time to time, since the last meeting of the Legislature, drew the attention of the Premier to several matters respecting the interests of the Province of Quebec, among others:—

"2. On the necessity of reducing the expenses of the Civil Government and those of Legislation, in place of having recourse to new taxes, with a view of avoiding financial embarrassment."

That was the statement made by the Lieutenant-Governor to prove his intense interest in the affairs of his Province,

and the fact that he had frequent discussion with his First Minister to urge him not to levy new taxes, and to reduce the expenditure. Yet, in the fourth paragraph after that, he stated that Mr. De Boucherville had never informed him that the country was in so impecunious a position as to require new taxes. There was one feature in this document which he was sure must have struck every hon. member as extraordinary. The relations of the Lieutenant-Governor with his Ministry were necessarily confidential relations, and the Ministry had as much right to expect that, when they conferred with the Lieutenant-Governor, they were conferring with him with the most perfect confidence, as the Governor had a right to feel assured that the Ministry would maintain secrecy and confidence in relation to every communication made to them. Yet, he (Mr. White) would ask any hon. gentleman to read this clause in the Lieutenant-Governor's statement, and then say whether it was the kind of conduct which the Ministry had the right to expect from the Lieutenant-Governor:—

“The Lieutenant-Governor expressed also, but with regret, to the Premier, that the Orders passed in Council to increase the salaries of Civil Service servants seemed to him inopportune, at a time when the Government were negotiating with the Bank of Montreal a loan of half a million, with power to increase that loan to \$1,000,000, at a rate of interest of seven per cent.; and indeed, even to-day (1st of March), the Lieutenant-Governor is obliged to allow an Order in Council to be passed to obtain the last half-million for the Government, without which the Government would be unable to meet its obligations, as I was informed by the hon. the Provincial Treasurer, to-day, by order of the Prime Minister.”

It was impossible to exaggerate the ineffable meanness of that statement. Whether wise or unwise, the proceedings referred to had been taken by Order in Council, sanctioned by the Lieutenant-Governor himself, and could not, therefore, have been an element in the causes which led to the dismissal of Ministers. The increases to the salaries of civil servants might have been wise or unwise, but they were made under an Act of the Legislature, passed without opposition and with the full approbation of the then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Joly. But this confidential conversation, in the privacy of the Council Chamber, was

thus wantonly exposed in a public document, simply that it might have influence against his old advisers in the elections. Then they had the “Explanatory Case,” addressed to His Excellency the Governor-General. He did not propose to go over all the statements of that case. They had there the statement that the proclamation for the summoning of the Legislature was published without the Lieutenant-Governor being consulted at all, and he was bound to say that the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor in relation to this particular charge was not such as to entitle him to respect at the hands of any one. In the reply which he made to the petition of certain members of the late Executive Council of the Province of Quebec, he used these words:—

“While referring to these proclamations, I may observe that, by introducing words never used by me, viz.:—‘For the despatch of business,’ the Hon. Mr. DeBoucherville has endeavoured to convey the idea that I referred to the proclamation summoning Parliament ‘for the despatch of business,’ whereas it was what he terms ‘the mere formal one’ on which I desired to confer with him, before the proclamation was published.”

Now, what was the original statement which is thus said to have been perverted? Here it is:—“One was for the summoning of Parliament, which I had reserved in order to confer with you.” As a matter of fact, the proclamation for the prorogation, from time to time, of Parliament, was not a proclamation for the summoning of Parliament. Even if it were such, it was not of sufficient importance to justify a conference between the Lieutenant-Governor and his Ministers. And yet, by saying that he reserved it in order to confer with the Ministry, he left the impression that the particular proclamation here referred to, was one for the summoning of Parliament for the despatch of business. He allowed that impression to remain for nearly a year, and last year the elections were run upon it, the changes were rung in every constituency upon the enormity of the offence of a Ministry summoning Parliament without consulting the head of the Executive. The Constitution was appealed to to show that this particular act of summoning Parliament was a

special prerogative of the Crown, and that therefore the Lieutenant-Governor ought to have been consulted in relation to it. And yet no one made, on behalf of the Lieutenant-Governor, the explanation which was now made, until the untruth was brought out by the late members of the Executive Council. Then they had another charge, that relating to a councillor for the south ward of the village of Montmagny, that was dragged in for the purpose, as Mr. Letellier himself stated, of showing that he had endeavoured to impress upon his Government, long before these difficulties arose, that he was opposed *a l'outrance*, to any substitution of the authority of the Executive for that of the Judiciary, where the latter could take cognisance of any case. He said in referring to that case: "I added that from the moment a legal or even an illegal election takes place, the duty of deciding it rested with the Courts in accordance with the ordinary course of law, of which they are the interpreters." The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), in his speech last night, had referred to another case to show how utterly uncandid that statement was. That case occurred in the county of Chambly a short time ago. Dr. Martel, who was the member for that county, had been Mayor for the last five years of the municipality. The law required a formal deposit of his qualifications, and if that deposit did not take place it was competent for any ratepayer to bring a suit before the Courts to have him displaced. Yet they found the Lieutenant-Governor, who had been so scrupulous, in the Montmagny case, actually removing Dr. Martel by an Order in Council, and thus substituting the Executive for the Judicial authority, when the latter was quite competent to deal with the matter. Dr. Martel was a gentleman of wealth, who was the member for the county, and who had been Mayor for five years, and there was not the slightest doubt of his qualifications. Here they found the Lieutenant-Governor doing the very thing he had complained of his Ministry doing in the Montmagny case. It was true, however, that the gentleman who was elected in Montmagny was a special friend of Mr. Letellier's party, and the gentleman appointed by his advisers might have been

MR. WHITE.

a Conservative; but it was also quite true that Dr. Martel was a member of the Legislature, but in opposition to Mr. Letellier. He (Mr. White) would be sorry to think that there was any connection between the two facts; but it was also true that Dr. Martel was one of those who, in order to carry out the views of economy of Mr. Letellier, had voted to dispense with the residence of Spencer Wood altogether, and house the Lieutenant-Governor in some more economical manner. Thus, they saw the want of candour and the insincerity of these statements made by the Lieutenant-Governor. All through the documents ran this general current—that Mr. Letellier was annoyed, according to his own view, at the expenditures which were taking place in the Province of Quebec. His object, as he put it himself, was to induce the Government to reduce this expenditure. His object in the papers he had presented to the Governor-General, was to convince the people that, if he had done that which was, if not *ultra vires*, at least an extreme stretch of his authority, he had done it in the interests of an economical administration of affairs. Now, what was the position of the Province of Quebec? He (Mr. White) knew that it was not the business of this House to consider provincial politics or provincial finances; but, when the question of economy was put forward, and when hon. gentlemen opposite were sustaining Mr. Letellier, because, as they said, he had rescued that Province from running into extravagant expenditure, they might very well, for a moment, look at what that expenditure was. The Province of Quebec was peculiarly situated. In the first place its mixed French and English population necessitated the use of the two languages in all official proceedings, and the employment of a double staff of officials in many cases, all of which extra expenditure was not required in the Province of Ontario. He thought he had very good authority in saying that the Province of Ontario, which was pointed to by Mr. Joly and his friends as a Province economically administered, was really much more taxed than the people of Quebec had been, even if the Tax Bill had gone into effect. In the first place they were told that Ontario had a

surplus of over four millions, while, unfortunately, Quebec was running into debt. The fact was, however, that Ontario had received from the Dominion Treasury, in ten years, \$2,380,000 more than Quebec. Towards the Administration of Justice in Ontario the Province contributed 40 per cent., while the municipalities contributed 60 per cent. In Quebec, the Province contributed 95 per cent., and the municipalities only 5 per cent. Thus it was seen that, if the Province of Quebec had serious financial difficulties, they arose more from the peculiar character of the people, of their local institutions, their municipal machinery and their traditions, than from any other cause. The contributions from municipalities alone in Ontario to the Administration of Justice amounted to nearly \$2,500,000 during ten years more than in Quebec, so that, in those two items, the Province of Quebec would have had to-day a surplus of \$5,000,000, and would have been quite as well off as the Province of Ontario. He would take, as an authority upon that point, the opinion of a gentleman who would be accepted as an authority on the other side—he referred to a statement made by the hon. member for Lambton, when he was Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, who said :

“We are told that, while before the Union we were complaining of constant deficits, since that time, this Province has waxed rich by the union with it of the other Provinces, and is now able to count its surplus by millions; while the truth is, that, if we devote the revenues accruing to the Government of Ontario from general sources to the same purposes that the general revenues had been devoted to in the other Provinces, we would not only have no surplus, but would be obliged to resort to direct taxation to a considerable extent to meet our expenses.”

That was the comparative position of the two Provinces. He would take a few items of expenditure in the two Provinces, and compare the alleged enormous increase of expenditure by the Conservatives of Quebec with the increase in the same items under the Administration of the friends of the Opposition in Ontario. Civil Government in the Province of Quebec, from 1871 to 1878, had increased 24 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., while in Ontario, during the same period, it

increased 38 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The cost of Legislation in Quebec during that time, under that frightfully extravagant Conservative Administration, had increased 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., while in Ontario, under the pure and economical Administration of the friends of the Opposition, it had increased 39 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Administration of Justice in Quebec had increased by 41 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., and in Ontario 62 per cent. In the matter of Education the increase was 24 per cent. in Quebec and 55 per cent. in Ontario. He quoted these figures for the purpose of showing how little ground there was for the general charge running all through these papers, that it was necessary, in the interests of an economical administration of affairs in Quebec, that a change of Government should take place; and also to show how little Mr. Letellier was justified in stating as he did, on going to assume the Government of Quebec, that he went with the determination of using the influence of his position in order to bring about a change of Administration and a change of policy in the interests of economy in the Province. In the light of the papers before the House, he (Mr. White) thought they might fairly come to this conclusion, that if Lieutenant-Governors might, under our constitutional system, act as Mr. Letellier had acted in the Province of Quebec, then we had no security for a fair administration of the affairs of the country. Every one who knew anything of public life knew that there were times in the administration of the affairs of a country when Governments were surrounded by great difficulties, and when they required to adopt measures for the public safety or the public weal, which the popular voice outside might for the moment condemn, but which, upon sober second thought, it would sustain. And, if this House refused to condemn the Lieutenant-Governor, if it should admit that Lieutenant-Governors might seize upon such a time as that—and that was exactly the condition of things in the Province of Quebec last Session—to dismiss their Ministers, then there would be an end altogether to anything like Provincial independence or anything like the autonomy of the Provinces being maintained. There was bitterness enough in

the politics of the country, and bitterness enough in our political discussions, but, if Lieutenant-Governors were to be made counters in the game of politics, if they were to be used by the Government of the day at Ottawa to betray their advisers in the Local Legislatures, when these advisers did not happen to be in accord with the Government that appointed them, then we might well bid good-bye to the system we now possessed, and try to discover some other and better one. No Ministry would be safe as the advisers of a man who acted as Mr. Letellier had done, for he had confessed in the papers submitted that he had watched his Government, that he had taken notes of private conversations with his Ministers, in order to use them afterwards. He (Mr. White), therefore sincerely hoped that this House would, by its vote to-night, condemn the act, whatever the consequences might be to Mr. Letellier, and thus teach the people of this country that in the future they had in the Parliament of Canada a safeguard against the attempt of Lieutenant-Governors to act as Mr. Letellier had done.

MR. HUNTINGTON: It was not my intention to take any part in this debate—at any rate, at this early hour—because I judged from the length of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on the other side that we are to have on this question, as we had last year, a week or fortnight, or three weeks' debate. I am glad to see that the gentlemen opposite have been so delighted with the speech of the young member (Mr. White)—the maiden speech of the young member whose advent to this House they have been praying for for so many years. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman was able to seize this House with that magnetism which he failed to exercise in Lower Canada, when in various constituencies, he sought the opportunity—

Several **HON. MEMBERS:** No, no.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Let me say to hon. gentlemen that they are in the position of those of whom it is said: "Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad." Do hon. gentlemen suppose that anybody on this side cares for their jeers and interruptions? We are a band here—not numerous—not

MR. WHITE.

able, like the hon. gentlemen themselves, to stifle discussion—but we are strong enough in numbers even to defy the interruptions which the hon. gentlemen seem disposed to make. I would be glad in this first Session of this Parliament, when every member on the other side owes his seat to an appeal to the people to permit him to come here and improve the fiscal conditions of the country—I would have been glad to extend to those gentlemen—though I might have differed with them on the only question on which they made their appeal—I would have been glad to extend the hand of fellowship to them, and to say: For this Session let partisanship be buried; let us try to show the people either that you can do what you have promised, or that the system you have proposed to introduce is a failure. But every day and every night comes that bitter hiss of partisanship from the hon. gentlemen who have been crazed by a success which they have not earned, who are dizzy with the advantages which have resulted to them from deceiving the people of this country. And I stand here one of a little band who have fought battles with hon. gentlemen opposite before, and I repeat now, in this, my exordium, that it is of no use for them to attempt this high style of cheering their friends, and attempting to put down their enemies. I would have been glad to see even this subject which has been discussed here approached in a non-partisan spirit, because I know there are many men in the Province of Quebec who honestly believe that the Lieutenant-Governor has done wrong, and who honestly feel that there should be some remedy; but, when they send here their orators to talk in the style in which gentlemen have talked last night and to-day, when these orators forget that the fight which they are to make, should be made with the sword, like the fight of a soldier, and not with the bludgeon of a hoodlum or the dagger of an assassin, then it is time to rise on this side of the House, and tell them again that, although we are not numerous, we are not afraid, and that we will defend our friends against the unjust assaults which the multitude—the mob I hope they will not become—hurl against them. The hon. gentleman who

has just addressed the House is a new member. That hon. gentleman has been before various constituencies in Lower Canada for the past four or five years, as a young man, and some people who have not known him have called him a promising boy. Sir, we expected when he came here that he would have dealt with some modesty with the question which he took up. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has not done this ; but there is a rule in this House which supposes that young men must be dealt with gently, and I shall leave him to be dealt with by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) ; but I fear he will find his equal, if the hon. member for Halton is himself equal to what I knew him to be in former years. I can picture to myself the castigation which this young gentleman will get bye-and-bye for the unprovoked and unjust assaults which he made upon the hon. member for Holton, and which, no doubt, was instigated by the very Premier himself, who, dizzy with his own success, allows no opportunity to escape of making it felt. The hon. member for Cardwell is not the man to make an assault of that kind unless in party interest, by party direction. I could not but be reminded by his attack, when I knew the vast intellectual superiority of the one man over the other, and contemplated the punishment which must follow, of the story of the small boy with a jack-knife, about which he felt what the hon. gentleman feels regarding his seat. He undertook to carve his name on one end of a mule. The story runs that, after the lapse of some time, when the Doctor had twisted his lips round from the back of his neck, the boy revived, and said to his father : " Papa, do you think I will die ? " The father replied : " No ; but you will never again look so pretty as you did, but will have a darned sight more sense." So this hon. gentleman who comes here with a flourish, forgetting that the House is full of his equals, at any rate, and who, in his first speech, has hurled defiance, denunciation and misrepresentation of the grossest kind, will soon find his level, and be careful how he attacks hon. gentlemen unfairly, lest he may suffer from the interference, notwithstanding the encouragement, of this highly elated body of gentlemen who

like to hear anything traducing their enemies. There has always been in our politics a remarkable circumstance that, after the general elections, it is considered necessary in this Parliament to ventilate the many local questions which have arisen during them. One hon. gentleman after another gets up, and tells us how Mrs. Jones was approached by his opponent, and other like important incidents of his canvass. We have all the local scandals retailed here, among our serious deliberations in the House of Commons, upon the local trifles which attended hon. members' elections, and which resulted in their gaining their seats. The hon. gentleman is not satisfied with choosing scandals relating to ourselves, but we have all the gossip of all the Jean Baptistes and Mrs. Smiths of the people of Lower Canada, who had anything to do with the local elections—a second and not a lesser nuisance—retailed here. He tells us he knows the Lieutenant-Governor was down at the Local House, improperly interfering. How did he know ? He saw his Aide ; and, so, this hon. gentleman, who speaks by the book, only expressing the opinion insinuated by the First Minister last night, rises to tell us that the Speaker of the Province of Quebec has been bribed, and that the Governor unduly interfered by attendance at the House, when the discussions were going on and the votes were being taken. We all recognise the abilities of the hon. gentleman, but, blinded by his partisanship, and servile to the First Minister, he has simply re-echoed the voice of the First Minister last year and last night. I remember, when the First Minister led one side of the House in the old Province of Canada, when, perhaps, a similar scene occurred. The hon. gentleman has gone back to old times, but I will not recite at much length matters with which the House is not entirely cognisant from its personal experience. Sandfield Macdonald had been accused of having said something at a dinner party. I remember how one member after another rose to state what Sandfield Macdonald said at that dinner. What had been said by the hon. member for Cardwell was not so mean as ventilating what took place at a distinguished

statesman's dinner ; but it is evident that under the rule of hon. gentlemen opposite, we are returning to that state of things, and, while we remember to be gentlemen, we forget the manners which gentlemen generally display. Let me tell the hon. member for Cardwell, and hon. members opposite, that the Hon. Mr. Letellier has been a man *sans reproche* during a long public life. He has had the misfortune to differ with the hon. the Postmaster-General, and I have had that misfortune of differing with leading gentlemen opposite, but he has committed the fault or indulged in the misfortune of displeasing hon. gentlemen opposite, and they go for him with their bludgeons and stilettos, because the man who stands in their way must be murdered. They have attacked the hon. gentleman in this sense, they have brought these accusations against him of which they have no proof, and in this House they are only following out the practice which they invariably adopt towards those who stand in their way. If they dismiss Mr. Letellier to-morrow, he will still be enshrined in the hearts of the people of Lower Canada. The member for Cardwell has no right to speak as he did. He sought to get the right to speak to the people of Lower Canada on various occasions, went before various constituencies, and I admit he made a gallant fight, and a great many of his friends thought then that Lower Canada could not do without him, an opinion they have since altered ; but it was only when he went to Cardwell, and evoked the sympathies of Mr. Thomas Ferguson's lambs, that he was enabled to come to this House and stand up for the privileges of the Province of Quebec. I mention this point because I do not believe it comes with seemliness from the hon. gentlemen to speak with such pronounced bias for the Province of Quebec. I do not think his experience in that Province is calculated to make him believe he is *par excellence* the mouthpiece of that Province. I do not think that the influences he represents in this House could be vastly popular with the people he represents down there. I take issue with the remark he made that the Province of Quebec is here to seek relief. Quebec asks nothing from this Parliament. There are two currents of opinion in the

MR. HUNTINGTON.

Province of Quebec, which are equally strong ; for every one who asks an investigation, another asks that things should take their own course. The hon. gentleman talked nonsense, when he said the successes against the late Government in Quebec, at the last Federal elections, were due to Mr. Letellier's action. It is true, a gentleman in this House, the hon. member for Mississquoi (Mr. Baker) was assailed by one of his Tory friends, with a story which I never believed. My friends tell me this had nothing whatever to do with the result of that election ; but the hon. gentleman went further, and said that the right hon. gentleman had been placed in power because of the Goff scandal, because Mr. Letellier had dismissed his Ministers. The people had an opportunity to pronounce on the dismissal. The constituency of Stanstead had pronounced by a large majority to sustain Mr. Joly, and to condemn Mr. DeBoucherville. It is a well known fact that Mr. Joly has multitudes of supporters in Lower Canada, who have not yet given up their confidence in gentlemen opposite, and who sustain, even yet, the right hon. Premier. I call the attention of the House to the fact, with reference to these people in the Province of Quebec who supported Mr. Joly in the spring, and Sir John A. Macdonald in the autumn, that the power which they have given their representatives here is to be used to butcher their rights in the Province of Quebec. I believe the right hon. gentleman and his friends will be made to feel, as they ought to feel, that, if they are to thrust the bitterness of party into the local strife in Quebec, to attempt to punish Mr. Letellier and his Ministers for what the people of Quebec have condoned, or justified, there will be a divergence and disintegration which will tend to bring about that change in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite which the country will not be long before being anxious for. It is well enough to recall the high tone in which the right hon. gentleman's resolution was presented last year, starting with the declaration that there was no partisanship in the matter, and we believed he had risen above partisanship ; that, although there were local elections coming in the Prov-

ince of Quebec, he would not allow himself to be influenced by these elections, but the course he pursued in that election proved his bitter partisanship. I warned hon. members that the motion was a mere election movement, and that the Conservative party in this House would, by all means, seek an opportunity of exercising the influence of the House of Commons in the elections. I claim that the long speech of the hon. the Postmaster-General (Mr. Langevin), made last Session, was intended to be rehearsed at the elections in the Province of Quebec. We saw, when those elections came, that hon. gentlemen rushed for their respective counties where they had influence, to fight that great constitutional battle which the people decided against them. The motion was put to the House last Session and not carried; and now, when they are in the majority, and have here that power which they cannot exercise elsewhere, they come here and say, according to the hon. member for Simcoe, "We have a new Court now; we may reverse this and many other things." Does the hon. gentleman mean to say you change the law because you change the Judges? Is there nothing to be fixed which one party does that the other may not reverse. The hon. gentlemen admitted that Mr. Letellier did not do an unconstitutional act. Are you to declare now that this opinion of Parliament, pronounced last year, must be reversed now because you are in a majority? Last year, when you brought charges against me, I dared you to move for Committees. The hon. the Minister of Public Works stated: "We do not want Committees now, you are in the majority." Is the doctrine of the hon. member for Cardwell to be carried out? Are the Conservatives going to deal with public questions when they are sure they have Committees which they can control? Let us know whether the reason the hon. member for Bagot makes his motion is that he believes he has a majority of the House behind him, or whether the doctrines of the hon. member for Cardwell were those which he expected would fall on the willing ears of his co-Judges? The hon. member for Lambton pointed out that, while the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) began in a judi-

cial style, he fell to abuse long before he got through, and showed that he started with a determination to punish the Lieutenant-Governor, whatever evidence he might be able to adduce, by the passing of this vote. We, on the Opposition, have not much weight, I admit, in this House, but the country looks on, and the people, particularly those in the Province of Quebec, who have begun to feel that they were being liberated from the thralldom under which they have groaned for years, will ask, why does the hon. member for Bagot open this question? Is it a foregone conclusion that, because his friends are in power, he can do what he likes. He may have this question to answer one day, and I recommend him to take the opportunity to discuss the subject well in his own mind now. There are some subjects which should be treated in this House free from partisanship, and this is one; yet we see them maintaining their motions by all the stale literature of the last elections, that this Parliament is called upon to punish a man, because, it is said, he was a friend of those who appointed him. What evidence have you against him which was not submitted to the people of the Province of Quebec when his constitutional advisers submitted themselves to their verdict, and when these advisers were sustained? I admit hon. gentlemen say: "You did not get a majority; it was not large enough." We had a majority that astonished us very much who knew what had been the state of feeling there, and which gave us hope, and the people in the Province hoped, that the old oligarchy was about to be weakened, and that we might expect something better in the time to come, and on which the people approved of the course Mr. Letellier pursued; and, as the member for Cardwell contended, that the people took the first opportunity of punishing Mr. Letellier on account of his alliance with the Federal Government, by putting Sir John Macdonald in office. Two or three hon. members who spoke—though I do not know what their views were on other matters—asserted that gentleman was only the tool of the Federal Government. I was glad to hear several hon. members say "Hear, hear," and will bid again for their applause. The member

for Cardwell has again exhibited that bitter partisanship he always displays in dealing with Quebec questions. He could give no proof of his charges, unless the desire he had to fasten on an adversary views of which I hope he is not guilty himself. There is no evidence, actual or implied, to show the Federal Government had anything to do with the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec; and yet he, with the solemn declaration of the then Prime Minister of Canada in this House, where only gentlemen should assemble, casts doubts upon that hon. gentleman's statement, when he should at least hold his tongue when he had no adverse proofs to submit. I was rather amused the member for Cardwell should go back to the days of the double shuffle. I should think there were Conservatives in this House who would be glad to forget it. I am not going to tell what happened then, but would recommend those who have an abiding faith in the hon. leader of the Government and his friends, or who are new members and want to know what they were capable of, to read for themselves about that notorious shuffle. They may as well also consider the speech of the leader of the present Government, shortly after the fall of his former Government in 1873. He spoke in Ottawa at a dinner given him by his admirers about that time, when he was in a mood to prophesy his return to power in three months one day, and hint secession to British Columbia the next; and he said, if I remember well and—the right hon. gentleman can correct me if I am wrong—that he knew Sir Edmund Head well and admired him much, that he knew Sir Edmund would not allow George Brown to be his Minister. He admired Lord Dufferin in the same way and recognised in him like traits of character. He went on to say that Lord Dufferin might become as popular as Sir E. Head. I advise him to put that little chapter into the account of the double shuffle. I think the member for Cardwell was unhappy in that reference, but it served to show what he was capable of swallowing when the double shuffle of the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) could be thus tolerated and approved. That was not the last extraordinary act of the same party. I

MR. HUNTINGTON.

do not know if they are able to swallow the motion of the member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau). But the mouth that could swallow the double shuffle, could easily receive and pass even the member for Bagot himself, if he chose to go with it.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILL.

SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 36) To revive and amend the Acts relating to the Union Assurance Company of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the Crown Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Kilvert).

DISMISSAL OF QUEBEC GOVERNMENT BY THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

DEBATE RESUMED.

Debate on Mr. Mousseau's motion resumed.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Mr. Speaker, before you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was calling the attention of the House to the discrepancy which existed between the views of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The hon. member for Cardwell, anticipating what might be the criticisms, or, perhaps, what had been the criticisms of hon. members on this side of the House, explained why it was that the Government was to allow this question to pass *sub silentio*, while the hon. member for North Simcoe last night told us, in somewhat exhilarated terms, that now, fortunately, they had a new Court and were going to try the old cases over again. I think, Sir, when the hon. gentlemen come to consider the position in which they have placed this question which is now being discussed before you; when they realise that speaker after speaker who has risen to point out the grave question which is now engaging the attention of this House has mentioned it as the most important question which ever came

before the Legislature for discussion; when they remember that even the last speaker declared it to be second only to that other great question—I suppose he means the trade policy discussed by the present Government—when they regard the importance of this great question, they will find themselves a little embarrassed to see that the right hon. gentlemen who leads the Government, and hon. gentlemen who sit opposite, have allowed this question of vast proportions and overwhelming magnitude to come before this House without the expression of any opinion of their own. I would like to ask my hon. friends from Terrebonne, Three Rivers, Compton and Joliette (Messrs. Masson, Langevin, Pope and Baby), what is their view with regard to the importance of this great question now under discussion; whether they regard it as of importance to Lower Canada that this terrible problem should be discussed here, and they, especially my rather talkative friend the Postmaster-General, should have nothing to say on it, regarded as it is on the back benches as of such vast and overwhelming consequence? I cannot suppose that a Government, led by a distinguished statesman, who would be an ornament to England, Europe and the world, and that had the advantage of the distinguished Postmaster-General, whose statesmanship in Lower Canada was so well recognised on the Ministerial side, and the advice of his hon. friend from Terrebonne, whose distinguished qualities were recognised on both sides of the House, would allow their innocent followers to take up this question of vast proportions, and deal with it blindly without affording them some aid. I can only understand the reason given by the member for Cardwell, that their mouths are shut by the action of the last Parliament. The Postmaster-General of to-day had enough to say on it last year, when he had no responsibility, in the interval of his journeys to the Quebec polls to help his friends in the local elections; then he told us, with remarkable learning and prescience of the terrible punishment that awaited the Lieutenant-Governor for his sins. I would like to know if my hon. friend from Terrebonne has been told by his leader not to speak, and

whether there is any truth in the rumour that the Premier, who has such a regard for constitutional practice and political propriety, does not encourage the assault upon the Lieutenant-Governor. I would like to know whether the right hon. gentleman, as reported, has fulminated orders as an obstruction in the way of the glorious effort for justice now being made by his followers, and which programme was marked down before the Session commenced. When the Conservative party returned to power—not to glorify their double-shuffle or Pacific Scandal—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear; Oh, oh.

Mr. HUNTINGTON, I am glad to hear those cheers, and see there is life in the old thing yet. It appears they have a good deal to swallow before they get through this world. When they came back here, forgetting they were sent by a movement of the workmen, asking them to fulfil their promises, by turning the stones of the country into bread, I would like to know if they remembered the cry that arose with regard to this question. The Lower Canada Conservative papers disclosed the terrible things that were to happen when they came into power—the Lieutenant-Governor was to be dismissed at once—there was to be no voice in his favour, but only an overwhelming justification of Conservative doctrine on this question. But, for some reason, that recalcitrant Governor and bad man, whose irregularities had been so eloquently depicted by the Postmaster-General, although the leader of the Government is in power some time, and last year made a motion on the subject, has not yet been disturbed, and the Conservative papers have bellowed in vain. Leading hon. gentlemen opposite have not opened their mouths, even in this the most important discussion to Quebec that has ever taken place. Why this silence? Is it true the Premier put a veto on any speaking by the member for Terrebonne? The Premier, instead of being a Federalist, like, I am glad to see, the member for Cardwell, continues a Legislative Unionist. Does he still desire that legislative union he could not accomplish at Confederation? Is he play-

ing his old game now? He is a man who can afford to wait for the carrying out of his old views, and is, perhaps, taking the first steps towards the destruction of the autonomy of Quebec, in allowing his followers, whom he can silence, to take their present action. I do not know that he can silence the members for Bagot and Laval, or that he is strong enough to repress discontent in another branch; perhaps his hand has lost its old cunning, but he can silence the member for Cardwell, whose speech, it must be assumed, was made at the instigation of the right hon. leader of the Government. The motion signifies an interference with the affairs of Quebec by a Legislature, which, in one sense, at least, is hostile to its views, or, if not hostile at this moment, one that may become so, and a Legislature dreaded by Quebec when she entered Confederation. Any act of this kind sanctions the opinion that she ought to be protected in her views, interests and institutions from the overwhelming majority of this Legislature. Why has the Federal Government not interfered? Why have they set up some gentlemen to act where they dare not themselves move a finger? I fancy, if Sir George Cartier, whom I never supported, but whose memory I honour, were here, he would find the Conservative opinion arrayed against him as against us—a man who was driven by the Lower Canada Conservatives from this House;—what would he say, he who watched over the interests of that Province, whose great, darling project was that of guarding from danger of all kinds the peculiar institutions of Lower Canada, if he saw the project of the Federal Parliament's interference in the manner now proposed? What would he say to the right hon. gentleman who inferentially promoted this movement, whom he knew to be always opposed to the Federal system, and to the Postmaster-General, and the member for Terrebonne? He would say: My friends, do not be carried away by a momentary desire for victory; you may banish Mr. Letellier, but, if you set this example of inviting the intervention of the Federal Parliament, you will invite intervention detrimental to us in future, and which, at Confederation, we strove to erect all pos-

sible barriers against. Do not listen to the siren voice of certain men, associated with me and others, sent here with hostile purposes. I have seen the aides of the right hon. gentleman moving here, after a caucus of the whole party, and which we cannot refuse to believe they all approve of. I have seen this motion of one of them sustained by a long and able speech, after which another promising young man, the member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), was undoubtedly put forward to move the previous question. Why, he congratulated the House. We could still debate this question, knowing there was no danger in that to his party in Quebec, where few copies of the debates would circulate. But he saw there would be a great danger in putting the motion on the records showing the Conservative party's assault on the autonomy of Quebec, and that the Opposition submitted a motion setting forth the true doctrine. This fact could be proclaimed at every church door in Lower Canada, and the *habitant* would understand his friends had voted for a motion asking Upper Canada to interfere with his local affairs, and all the danger of that precedent. Ministers have put forward their young members to prevent the honest *habitants* from hearing the nature of the motion, and the fact of the Opposition moving to protect the interests of Lower Canada, which, for party purposes, the Conservatives were willing to risk and violate. I can understand, Sir, why these hon. gentlemen will say this will not do much harm, but it is evident the House and the country will understand that they dreaded harm when they put their young men forward to move this motion, for, if this motion amounts to any thing, it is put forward for the purpose of preventing amendment. The hon. gentleman did it last year for the same purpose. He brought his motion on in amendment to the proposal to go into Committee of Supply, where no amendment could be proposed, which would express the Lower Canadian view, and which would warn Lower Canada that they were being protected from this encroachment upon their economy. The hon. leader of the Government does not know anything about the matter, but listens quietly to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr.

White), and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), to see what kind of a case they can make out. Then the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), with his vast experience in these questions, discovered that the moving of the previous question would result as it has resulted. The attempt that was made to stifle an expression of opinion on the subject is only followed up by an attempt this year to express an opinion of which hon. gentlemen are afraid, and which is a disgraceful one. I do not see how this motion can be anything else but a motion of non-confidence in my hon. friends from Lower Canada. Are my hon. friends the Postmaster-General (Mr. Langevin), the hon. member for Terrebonne, (Mr. Masson) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Baby) so neglectful of their duties in the shades and blandishments of office that they have not a word to say in reference to her constitutional rights?

MR. LANGEVIN : Hear, hear.

MR. HUNTINGTON : The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but he dare not say anything more. I will sit down if the hon. gentleman has the courage to formulate his views upon the question. I desire to ask the hon. the Postmaster-General a fair question. Having himself declined to take a position on this matter, having left Lower Canada to the young men, as the Indians say of their braves, would he, if this motion passed, resign and let his hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) have his place? I do not know but that the hon. leader of the Government should allow the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) to take his place; but what I do know is this: if these gentlemen who teach us constitutional doctrines are in the right, and if the Government is not in a position to assert itself, if there is any want of confidence among those sitting behind them, the general impression has been heretofore that the representative of Her Majesty would cast his eye upon those who had prescience in interpreting public opinion, and probably the hon. member for Bagot will be brought to the front, and, if the hon. member does come forward, we need not expect any opposition from hon. gentlemen who ought, at least, to be willing to support him.

I think there is no possible excuse for the position which the Government took. Every one knew what the Lieutenant-Governor had done, and that the matter was discussed last Session. Now, Sir, why did not the gentlemen move when they first came into office. The hon. member for Cardwell tells us they ought to wait for the vote of Parliament. Is there any man who doubts that the leader of the Government could indicate to Parliament what its vote should be? Is there any doubt that the Government is leading Parliament in the matter? Knowing that, is there any man who will not regard this motion as a subterfuge unworthy of discussion, and as unworthy of a question of the greatest gravity? We have had a motion presented here, as I have said before, under the shield of cowardice, by a Government which we all know have dictated the terms, but who dare not indulge in an expression of their opinion. Several hon. gentlemen have made a good deal of the statement that no one dare defend Lieutenant-Governor Letellier on this side of the House. I do not think it would require a good deal of courage to defend him. I do not see why we should defend him while we take the ground that you have no right to deal with the question. I do not see why, while we condemn you for interfering, we should enter into the details of the question. That the Lieutenant-Governor's action in relieving the Province of the incubus of the late Ministry was acceptable to the people was exemplified by the elections which took place. I remember standing here last Session, and hearing the hon. gentleman say the Liberals were to be wiped out, and that, under the new régime, the poor would be made rich. The people of the Province of Quebec had been accustomed to believe in the Conservative party, and they have not yet lost their faith in it. It was on account of this that you were sustained in Quebec. In the people's dire calamity, you undertook to make them rich, and, if you do not succeed, you will not continue so hilarious as you are just now. You have undertaken to fulfil promises which I wish it were possible you could fulfil. You have made a promise which, if it were possible for you to fulfil, would make this

country, notwithstanding the prevailing depression, prosperous and happy. If you have done this under false pretences, the people of this country will not bring you into Court; but they will deal with you, in the future, as they have done with you in the past. If you are charlatans, they will know it, and they will punish you for it. I would like to ask the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), in view of the admission which has just been made, that the Lieutenant-Governor has the constitutional right to dismiss his Ministers, but that it was a question of unwisdom, where we are to draw the line. If the Lieutenant-Governor should not dismiss his Ministers when they brought down measures without his assent, when they undertook to deal with the public interest in an adverse sense, when he thinks they legislate against his views for the purpose of setting aside the Courts, if he could not deal with a Ministry which acknowledged it was under the influence of railway rings, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to tell me whether there is any line which could be drawn, and whether there is any state of things which would justify the Lieutenant-Governor coming to this conclusion. If these things were not justification sufficient, then, in Heaven's name, tell us what would be. It has been relegated, Sir, to hon. gentlemen opposite to abuse the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, but there is no man within the sound of my voice who knows the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, who does not know him to be an amiable and accomplished gentleman. Whatever mistake he has made in public life should be dealt with as a mistake. Foul insinuations have been made against him; but we have always to expect these things when our hon. friends are in power. In spite of these things, I repeat there is no man on that side of the House who does not know that he has not a colleague beside him who is more estimable in private life, or more highly regarded in public life, than this very Lieutenant-Governor. We have seen the efforts of hon. gentlemen before to crush their opponents, and we have seen the result. If Lieutenant-Governor Letellier were dismissed to-morrow, he would not suffer in

consequence. I say his name is enshrined in the hearts of those who love liberty in Lower Canada, and who prefer constitutional government to mere fealty to partisans. If this stubborn and blind majority were to secure his dismissal, they would find that there were dozens of counties that would open to him and send him back to this House, of which he would be an ornament, and to that public life of which he has been an ornament so long. Let me say a word regarding the Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec. One would suppose, Sir, if he read Conservative newspapers and followed Conservative orators, that there was some unknown man, some man without experience, holding the reins of Government in the Province of Quebec, that Mr. DeBoucherville and Mr. Angers were most exemplary statesmen. The hon. the Postmaster-General knows that in the Province of Quebec there is not a public man who does not admire the present Prime Minister of Quebec as a man of prudence, a man of ability and culture and of wealth, a man whose patriotism is recognised, and who can very well afford to laugh at the sneers and the jeers of these gentlemen who are the *nouveaux riches* of the moment, and who forget to pay respect to those who are placed over them. I saw a statement in a newspaper, the other day, that Mr. Joly was a classmate of Mr. Waddington, the present Prime Minister of France. I heard it stated that the tutor of Mr. Waddington, who had also been the tutor of Mr. Joly, was proud of educating two such *élèves*, and certainly he had just reason for his pride, for his pupils were now Prime Ministers of the two French-speaking countries of the world—one no doubt larger than the other, but each of them having battled for the same principles. Mr. Joly, being a man of intellect, wealth and position, could, if he had wished it, or been ambitious, obtained every mark of distinction possible in his native Province. We know very well that he might have taken, if he had wished to truckle to the Conservative party, and would now hold, the position amongst the French-Canadians now held by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson.) But, instead of that, Sir, he stood firmly to his

Liberal principles, and deserves the sincerest thanks of his party for the able and disinterested manner in which he has maintained the principles that they all hold so closely at heart. That there is a noble reward in store for such a man let us never fear. He might have wielded perhaps greater present power.

He might have been a King,
But that he understood
How meanly worse it was to be
Unjustly great than honourably good.

Mr. RYKERT said he was somewhat astonished at the assertion made by the hon. gentlemen on the other side that the members of the Government had obtained possession of their authority by false pretences. It came well from the hon. gentlemen to make that charge, considering the means by which they themselves had, on a former occasion, obtained power. It came well from them to talk of obtaining power by false pretences, when, after a fair trial, the people, by a verdict of the 17th September last, decided that they had been untrue to their pledges, and that they violated every principle upon which their Government was formed. The hon. gentleman talked about young members on the Ministerial side of the House presuming to criticise older and more experienced members. He thought they had a perfect right to do so; they had been sent there to represent their constituencies, and it was not because they were young that they should not assert their rights. If the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was young, his speech was that of a statesman, and, certainly, compared very favourably with that of the old parliamentarian who had just taken his seat, and he trusted that that hon. gentleman would remain young all his lifetime, if the speeches he made were evidence of his youth. The hon. gentleman had taunted the members on that side of the House for daring to express their opinions upon this question, and had dared to tell them that they were not gentlemen. It came well from the hon. gentlemen to teach morality in this House. He would ask the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), to explain to this House why he had not answered the pleas entered in the record in the suits which he had brought

against the hon. member for Cardwell, which, if true, would preclude him forever from associating in the company of gentlemen. He would ask him further to explain away the charges made against him in the celebrated judgment of one of the Chancellors of England, in the suit brought against one of the members of the Copper Company, to compel him to discharge a portion of the ill-gotten gains. Until these matters were fully and satisfactorily explained, it did not become the hon. gentleman to lecture that side of the House either on morality or gentlemanly behaviour. The hon. gentleman might have entertained the House in lecturing upon the effects produced by the patent cabinet machine in Jacques Cartier on the morals of the Province. His partner had nobly sustained the reputation of the late Ministry, in elevating the standard of political morality in the Province of Quebec. It was known to every member of this House that a suit, instigated by the hon. gentleman, was pending against the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), which would explain the reason for his venom against that gentleman. It seemed to him that the hon. gentleman might have played a better rôle—especially in view of the part which he had, during the last five years, played in the history of this country. He would briefly give his reasons why he thought he ought to support the motion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau). It was not the first time that he had had the honour of standing alongside his French friends from Lower Canada, in battling for their rights. He recollected well, when in the old Parliament of Canada, he stood in defence of the rights and privileges of the people of Lower Canada; and for the same reason he felt it his duty now to express his views before recording his vote in favour of the motion before the House. It had been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that this question should not be discussed in this Parliament. He thought they had a perfect right to discuss all questions affecting the existence of the Province, as they had an undoubted right, through the Minister of Justice, to pass judgment upon the legislation of the Provinces. They had the right, when a question of such vast importance as that brought

about by the action of Mr. Letellier arose, to express their opinion thereon; they had the right to discuss all questions in which the principle of responsible government was involved. Responsible government, as he understood it, meant parliamentary responsibility and parliamentary control—it meant that the Governor should have an Executive Council whose advice he should follow—it meant that the will of the people, as expressed through their representatives in Parliament, should be supreme, and it meant that a Parliament which controlled the destinies of the nation should have the full confidence of the people. There was no knowing how soon the same question might arise in the Province of Ontario, for they had an unscrupulous Government which, for party purposes, would readily advise the Lieutenant-Governor of that Province to play the same rôle as that of Letellier. That Government was of the same political complexion as that of hon. gentlemen opposite, and might be guided by their wise counsels and advice. This Government had, during their incumbency of office, increased the expenditure of that Province from one million and a-half of dollars, which it was in the time of Sandfield Macdonald, to the enormous amount of two and a-half millions of dollars. They had also a Lieutenant-Governor equally as great a partisan as Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, and who, should the emergency of party arise, might be advised to take a course similar to that taken in Quebec. He was surprised to find the hon. member for Lambton taking them—the Tories as he called them—to task, for daring to defend the principles of responsible government. He (Mr. Rykert) thought it was the duty of the Conservative party to defend those principles when they found they were openly and shamefully abandoned by the Reform party. He held in his hand the platform of the great Reform party in 1860, of which his hon. friend from Halton (Mr. McDougall) was the Secretary, in which the principles of responsible government were fully recognised, and he would call upon that gentleman to say whether those, the so-called Reform party, had not abandoned every one of the platforms of the party, as laid down in that memorable address. The hon. gentleman had taunted

MR. RYKERT.

them with striking a blow at responsible government. Sir Allan McNab took the same grounds, in 1836, which were now taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, while the Reform party of that day took the same position which the Conservatives had taken in this debate, and the very same position which the Liberal Government of Mr. DeBoucherville took in Quebec, last year. He would read to the House the position taken by Sir Allan McNab upon that occasion, and let them decide whether or not the very same position was taken by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) when he justified the dismissal of the DeBoucherville Government. They had admitted the principle of responsible government as laid down by Baldwin and Lafontaine, and he would ask if the course of these gentlemen, on this question, was in consonance with the views as laid down by Baldwin and Lafontaine. It was true that the hon. gentlemen opposite seemed relieved because the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) had not fully endorsed the proposition of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) in this resolution. But every member had a right to express his views on this subject. The hon. member for Halton would not be at all flattered by the compliment they had paid him. He well understood their meaning, and no man in this country had done more than he had, to show up the hypocrisy of these gentlemen. Sir Allan McNab said, in reference to the discussion upon the responsibility of the Executive Council in 1836:

“Was not the Governor sworn to uphold the British Constitution in this Province? and if his Executive Council should take a different view of matters, and give him such advice as would, if followed, lead to the overthrow of British supremacy in this country, was he not bound to dismiss them, whether they were approved of by the majority of the Assembly or not? Was a system, which had been acted upon for fifty years, to be abandoned for the mere opinion of Mr. Attorney-General Baldwin or John Rolph?”

On the other hand, the Reform party laid down quite a different rule and line of action, which, in later years, was recognised by the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, until they found that it would not be safe to apply it to their own Gov-

ment in Quebec. The leaders of hon. gentlemen of that day laid down this very wholesome proposition :

"It is, undoubtedly, the prerogative of the Crown, to select the Council; but to receive the blessings of good Government, that Council must possess the confidence of the public. That Governor must be bold, indeed, who dares to despise and reject the voice of the people, and short must be the duration of that Administration that is not upheld by the popular will."

He contended that this was the proper principle to lay down, and certainly was the one which should have been applied by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. He might, with advantage, still further quote for the information of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the language of another Reformer used in the same debate, and from which he thought very few would dissent :

"It would be as reasonable for Judges to dispense with juries, whose business it is to inform the conscience of the Court, as for a Governor to rule without responsible and intelligent advisers. It might as well be said that the Parliament is only to legislate on some affairs, as that the Executive Council is only to advise on some affairs. The very term Executive Council implied that it was to give counsel or advice on all Executive matters."

He defied hon. gentlemen opposite to show one single principle they had not openly violated. They talked much about the autonomy of Quebec, and appealed strongly in behalf of their friends in Lower Canada. He would like to know how long since they became enamoured of their new-found friends in that Province? He well recollected when the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) and his friends were parading different counties in Ontario, when their cries were about Lower Canada domination, and representation by population. They then raised the cry that Upper Canada was ruled by the priestcraft of Lower Canada. He thought he could remind them of the course they then pursued by making some quotations from the leaders of the party, while in opposition, which would satisfy them, whose interests they are now so anxious to guard, of the friendly care and regard they had in those days for their interests and their religion. He held in his hand an article from the organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite, which they would, doubtless, not

dispute, and he quoted it to show how sincere they were in favour of the Lower Canadians. It was this :—

"A few months may see the issue of a Bull from Rome which, our Government aiding and abetting, may flood the Province with a population likely to be as great a curse to it as the locusts that overran the land of Egypt, and settle the Catholic Irish in masses, so that we shall have a second Connaught, a second district of Quebec, and a second Naples, with no schools, no roads, and no liberties."

MR. MACDOUGALL : I am inclined to think that the House is under the impression that the hon. gentleman is reading from a resolution adopted by the Reform Convention of that day. I think there is no such passage in that.

MR. RYKERT : I quite agree with you, there is not.

MR. MACKENZIE : Nor anywhere else.

MR. RYKERT said he was quoting from the *Globe* newspaper of February 18th, 1856, an authority which even the member for Lambton dare not despise ; he would come to the Convention shortly. He merely wished to show how their zeal for Quebec was new born. He also found in the same article the expression that the "alliance of Radicalism in Upper Canada with Popery in Lower Canada could only be maintained by treachery and deceit ; nothing but evil can result from it." That was what they thought then. Now he would read what the Reform party used to think of the people of Lower Canada, and he alluded to it in order to draw the attention of the House to the anxious manner in which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) interested himself in the affairs of Lower Canada. On page 43, of this celebrated platform, he read the following paragraph in reference to Lower Canada :—

"In his speech on introducing it, Lord John Russell, after declaring that the Assembly of Lower Canada, 'used the weapons of Hampden in support of the principles of Strafford' that they were 'extremely exclusive, extremely hostile to all improvement, to the general extension of British enterprise,' &c., &c., explained the scope and object of the measure in these words : 'For these evils, for this evil spirit—there seems to be no better remedy, no more obvious or safe mode of proceeding in order to put down this system of monopoly

and exclusion than to admit the inhabitants of both countries to send members to one Legislature, the French race to be represented by persons of their own opinion, but depriving them of that preponderance of which they have made so ill a use."

That was the opinion these gentlemen then held of their friends in Lower Canada. They desired to have them placed by themselves; they had made such ill use of their rights and privileges that the Reform party thought it would be for the interests of the people of Ontario to curtail the rights and privileges of the people of Quebec. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Huntington) had charged the Government with cowardice in reference to this question. He (Mr. Rykert) was not aware of any exhibition of cowardice on the part of the Government on this question up to the present time. The Government had not yet expressed an opinion upon it, nor had they been required to do so. No doubt they would when the proper time came, and when it suited their convenience, explain their position on the question in the House. It was for the House to say what should be done in this matter, and he trusted the Government would carry out whatever instructions the House might give them. If the House chose to say that Mr. Letellier should be dismissed, he trusted the Government would carry its wishes into effect. The people of Quebec surely had a right to come on to this House, if they wished to demand that justice should be done in a matter where their Lieutenant-Governor had violated and ignored their rights. If the Government would not do them justice in this matter, where could they appeal but to this House from the Government. This House had the right to say whether the Lieutenant-Governor should be dismissed or not. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) had said that this question had been tried three times. He (Mr. Rykert), however, denied that it had been tried by the House of Commons last Session. The question was not brought fairly before the House, it having been brought up as an amendment to the Committee on Supply. No wonder the hon. gentlemen opposite complained of the previous question being moved, because it left them no way of

MR. RYKERT.

escaping from a fair and square vote upon the question. It had also been said that the electors of the Province of Quebec had passed judgment upon this question. He was not prepared to admit that the result of the last Quebec local election was the verdict of the people on the matter, because at that time there was not a fair expression of opinion at the polls, but this question was complicated with many others of great local interest. He contended that they had a right to discuss this question in Parliament, both on constitutional grounds and upon the grounds of expediency, and he was prepared to show that, from a constitutional point of view, Mr. Letellier had acted wrongly, and in utter defiance of constitutional principles. There was no doubt that, at the time he dismissed his Ministers, they had the confidence of the House, and the Lieutenant-Governor was constitutionally bound to be guided by his Ministers under those circumstances. He (Mr. Rykert) would now proceed to prove his position by quotations from learned writers, which would show conclusively that Mr. Letellier had acted improperly and unconstitutionally in dismissing his Ministers, and he should have consulted Parliament, and if he found that Parliament had not confidence in them, then he could have dismissed them and appealed to the people. He found that Mr. Todd, in his valuable work, expressed these views:

"Ministers, before agreeing to assume the responsibility of office, must be free to stipulate for permission to carry out such a policy as they may deem essential for the public good. Security against abuse, in either case, is afforded by the necessity for mutual agreement upon a line of action that will satisfy their own sense of right, and will be likely to obtain the approval of Parliament."

And still further on, this same author defined the position of the Governors in respect to their constitutional advisers—the language was plain and unmistakeable. He said:

"The Sovereign should carefully avoid giving expression to any opinions at variance with those entertained by his responsible advisers, unless, as in 1783, he is prepared to take the consequences of their resignation or dismissal. Moreover the substance of any such conversation should invariably be com-

municated to the Prime Minister with as little delay as possible in order to prevent any future misunderstanding or inconvenience."

That Lieutenant-Governor Letellier should have recognised his Councillors and been governed by their advice was also clearly proved by the authority of Mr. Hearn, a well-known writer on Constitutional Government. At page 114 of his work the following language was used :

"The foundation on which the doctrine of our modern constitutional system rests is very simple. It consists in the extension to the discretionary power of the Crown of that rule of its official expression which controls the exercise of its legal powers. It supposes that in the former, as well as in the latter case, the King will act officially through and by the advice of some acknowledged servant or councillor."

This again met the present case and afforded abundant proof that the Lieutenant-Governor acted in defiance of constitutional authority. The same position was maintained at page 115 of the same work :

"In every act of State the King is guided by the advice of his councillors; and on their removal, he is guided by the advice of Parliament."

And again at page 167 of the same work they read :

"The proper conduct of parliamentary government implies that the King shall not retain any servants whom Parliament advises him to dismiss; and that he shall, while he retains them, give his recognized servants his full confidence and be exclusively guided by their advice."

But they need not go beyond this country for opinions to guide them upon the question of parliamentary practice and governmental responsibility. The speech of Lord Dufferin at Halifax had already been referred to, but he would refer to it again because he was recognised as a great authority on constitutional law, and his opinions must have great weight, not only in Canada, but in England. Those opinions were strongly in favour of the position taken by the Conservative party in Quebec on this question :

"I believe in Parliament, no matter which way it votes, and to those men alone whom the absolute will of the Contederated Parliament of the Dominion may assign to me as my responsible advisers can I give my confidence. Whether they are the heads of this

party or that must be a matter of indifference to the Governor-General. So long as they are maintained by Parliament in their positions, so long is he bound to give them his unreserved confidence, to deter to their advice, and loyally to assist them with his counsels."

Could there be any clearer definition of the course which the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec should have pursued? Surely his functions were not greater than those of a Governor-General. If this authority would not satisfy hon. gentlemen of the fallacy of their arguments on this question, it was difficult to say what would. He would, in order to render the case clearer, again quote from the same statesman, who lately delivered a speech at the Reform banquet, in England. The language would lead one to believe that the late Governor-General had this very question in view at the time he delivered his speech. He said :

"My Lords and gentlemen, I freely confess that I should not consider it a compliment to the head of any self-governing community if he were credited with the exhibition of any personally-invented policy or any independent initiative of his own. (Cheers) Although it must be admitted that the functions of the head of a Colonial Executive do not entirely coincide with the attributes of the Crown in this country—although it is true that it is occasionally desirable that he should make his influence felt, and even control the current of events—his touch should be so light and so impalpable as to escape general observation, and exempt him from all suspicion of a desire to meddle or tamper with the privileges of a self-governing body. (Loud cheers.)"

If Lieutenant-Governor Letellier had followed that advice, he would not to-day be arraigned before the bar of public opinion. Now, looking at the question from a public point of view, was it wise for him to take the course he did? Had it been shown that the Ministry had violated one single principle of responsible government? The Lieutenant-Governor knew that his Ministers had a majority at their back, and no one could point to a single instance where they had violated the principles of responsible government. The Lieutenant-Governor had not been able to show that they had committed any act whereby the rights and liberties of the people had been invaded. Did he show, in that memorandum, that the people had petitioned against the Government? On the contrary, they had

evidence to show that the people, by their verdict, were satisfied with the course of the Ministry. The Lieutenant-Governor alleged six reasons why his Government should be dismissed. The first was in regard to the filling up of a blank. It seemed to him (Mr. Rykert) that, if there was any difficulty about the blank at all, it was the fault of Mr. Letellier, in trusting his Ministers with a blank. He must have trusted them for some object, and it ill-became him to find fault with them for having filled up that blank as they did, especially since he must have known, a short time after, how the blank was filled. He further complained that they submitted important measures to Parliament without his consent. But what right had the Governor of any country to make this requirement of his Ministers, when they were backed up by a majority of the people? It could not be shown by any principle of responsible government that a Ministry was bound to submit its every act to a Governor, so long as that Ministry was in accord with a majority of the people. Mr. Letellier made the flimsy excuse that the Railway Bill was contrary to the principles of law and justice. But what right had the Lieutenant-Governor to talk about law and justice so long as his Ministers were sustained by the House? Another reason given for the dismissal of the Cabinet was that they were enormously increasing the public expenditures. What would become of their friend, Mr. Mowat, in Ontario, if the Lieutenant-Governor of that Province should put into force the same rule that Mr. Letellier had in Quebec? He would have to turn right-about-face at once. The whole excuse of the Lieutenant-Governor was paltry in the extreme. At page 52 of the documents, he admitted that his reasons for their dismissal amounted to nothing; that his Ministry had done nothing improper, but, on the contrary, that, though they had acted in opposition to himself, it was not wilfully, but by error. In his letter of March 1st, the first clause knocked the bottom out of his whole argument, for he said :

"The Lieutenant-Governor, taking into consideration the communication made to him verbally (27th February), by the Premier, and also taking into consideration the letter which

the Premier then gave to him, is prepared to admit that there had been no intention on the part of the Premier to slight the prerogatives of the Crown, and that there was only on his part an error, committed in good faith."

He thought this language was so condemnatory of the Lieutenant-Governor himself that this House must see that he had made no case for himself. It had been charged that the Lieutenant-Governor was acting in collusion with the late Government of the Dominion. The members of that Government had not answered this charge, and dared not answer it. This charge had been made both in the press and by the member for East York (Mr. Boulton), and up to this hour not a single man of them had denied the accusation. All the circumstances of the case pointed to the complicity of those gentlemen with the Lieutenant-Governor, and it remained for them to prove their innocence by some other means than those they had adopted so far. If the hon. gentleman had been sincere in dismissing his Ministers, why had he not dismissed his present Ministers? If it was necessary to dismiss them for that trivial offence, why did he not dismiss the Ministry now because they did not summon Parliament? His object was undoubtedly to keep the Province in the hands of the Joly Government. If he had acted towards Mr. Joly as towards Mr. DeBoucherville, his course would have been a simple one, namely, if the Ministers refused to call Parliament together, to send them to the right-about-face. He felt it to be his duty, as representing an Ontario constituency, to offer his protest against the action of the Lieutenant-Governor, and to record his vote in favour of the resolution condemning his conduct, he did not care how strong that resolution might be. Before closing his observations, he would like to quote the language of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, himself, on the 13th August, 1873, before an audience in this city: "The public should come to the support of the majority of Parliament who had been outraged by the arrogant conduct of the Executive. If the Crown has the right to exercise its power as has been done to-day, there is no longer any necessity for a Parliament. We might

MR. RYKERT.

revert to the system of absolute monarchy. The British flag has been insulted by the Executive to-day." The hon. gentleman thus stood condemned out of his own mouth, and, applying that language to his own conduct, this House was justified in passing as strong a vote of censure as it was possible to prepare. Hon. gentlemen had said the question was not discussed at the late general elections. He said it was discussed. In his own constituency, the question was largely and freely discussed, and the people felt that the Government would be derelict in its duty if it did not support a motion of this kind. Hon. gentlemen had said it was the National Policy that had carried the elections. In his constituency he had discussed not only the National Policy, but the policy of the Administration, and their past record. The people believed they had been guilty of violating their pledges, that their whole record had been a record of false pretences; that their acts would not bear public scrutiny, and that they had openly violated every principle of responsible government.

MR. LAURIER: I do not rise with the view to answer the speech of the hon. member for Lincoln, because I do not see anything in his speech to be answered. When the hon. gentleman first began his speech, I took a blank sheet of paper and a pen to take up any points made against the Opposition in this House; but I had not occasion to use my instrument at all. The first part of his speech was on subjects which had no reference to the motion before the House, and the last part of it, which had reference to the motion before the House, has been answered time and again. I also waited for some time to see if any of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would rise to tell us what would be the policy of the Government on this question. Perhaps the fact that the motion which is now before the House was last year presented by the leader of the Opposition, the present Premier of this Government and is not renewed by him now, may be taken as some evidence by the House that, whatever may be the future conduct of the Government upon this question, if their own feelings had been followed, this matter would not

have come a second time before this House. I beg to remind the House of this: that the motion which was made last Session, this identical motion which we have now before us, was negatived by a large majority of this House. I say, at the outset, when this motion was negatived by a large majority of this House, the majority did not then assert that the principle involved in this motion was not true any more than they would assert that it was true; they did not assert that the conduct of Mr. Letellier was wise any more than it was unwise; that it was constitutional any more than it was unconstitutional. The House carefully and distinctly abstained from pronouncing any opinion upon the conduct of Mr. Letellier. The House held, at the time, that there was no occasion for it to interfere in this matter, and that, under the *régime* under which we now live, the Provinces are free and independent, not only one of the other, but of the central power as well. This House affirmed that, whenever any provincial differences arose, they should be settled by the application of the principles of responsible government, with which every Province is endowed, and decided that this matter, which affected solely the interests of the people of Quebec, should be left to their judgment; and to them alone it appertained to decide whether or not the act of Mr. Letellier was wise and constitutional. At that time, the people of the Province of Quebec had not decided upon it; they had just been seized of the question. The elections had not taken place, but were in progress; they have since taken place, and, whatever may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite, the result had been to uphold the action of Mr. Letellier.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. LAURIER: What are you here for, if you say no? If your Government had not been defeated, why should you be before this House? Your very motion is the best evidence of what I say. If your course had been supported by the people, you would not seek, at the hands of this House, the vengeance which you are now seeking. I affirm what I have already said, that the people of the Province of Quebec, who alone are interested

in this question, have decided that, in their opinion, whether that be right or wrong, the act of Mr. Letellier was just and constitutional. If such be the case, if this question has already been once before the House, if this House has already declined to interfere in this matter, and decided to leave it entirely in the hands of the people of Quebec, and if the people of the Province of Quebec have decided upon it, is it not but proper that this question should be laid at rest forever before this House? I do not hesitate to say that this matter would have for ever remained at rest before this House had it not been for another event which has since taken place, namely, the Dominion elections. We have had it from the mouths of hon gentlemen opposite. The result of the general elections has been to displace the majority from the Liberal to the Conservative ranks, and now that a new element is brought into the House, a new attempt is made to get the new majority to do what the old majority would not do, to substitute the will of the Dominion for the will of the Province of Quebec. Even without the language that fell from the lips of some hon gentlemen opposite, I would have taken this motion as a slur upon the majority of the former House. The idea conveyed by it, not, it is true, in language, but as clearly as if expressed in words, is that the Liberal majority which sat on the other side of the House last year, deliberately refused to do justice in the premises; that, since the party ousted from power at Quebec happened to be the Conservative party, and the party called to power happened to be the Liberal party, the Liberal majority in this House allowed their better judgment to be biased by their political feelings. As one of that majority which ruled last Session, I do not object that this accusation should be thrown at us, provided that the same standard of measure should be applied this time again. And, if this motion is to be affirmed, if the Conservative majority in this House is to do what the Liberal majority would not do last year, if they are going to ride over the Provinces, if either the majority which insisted last year upon respecting the right of the Provinces to self-government, or the majority which this year may in-

fringe upon these rights; if either majority, I say, are to be branded as being actuated by improper motives, I have no objection to that, and we will cheerfully await the judgment of impartial men, and impartial history. Before going further, let me make one observation. The elections in the Province of Quebec last year took place upon the issue raised by the act of Mr. Letellier, and upon no other issue. At the very outset of the campaign, in a speech delivered in the town of Lévis, by Mr. Chapleau, the present leader of the Opposition in Quebec, he stated that this question of the dismissal of the Ministry by Mr. Letellier was the only question which the people should look at. He used very forcible language. I have not the speech before me, but I kept the exact words in my memory, which has not failed me. He put it, that, whatever might have been their failings as Ministers, even if they had been defaulters and thieves, they had been dismissed improperly and illegally, and it was the duty of the people of Quebec to restore them to the places from which they had been dismissed. On the other hand, Mr. Joly, the present leader of the Government, accepted the issue upon that ground, and that ground alone. He said to the people that he fully endorsed and accepted the responsibility of the act of Mr. Letellier—that it was an extraordinary act, but that it was justified and called for by the circumstances of the case. As I stated, the result was that the act of Mr. Letellier was upheld. I need not remind this House that everyone of us has his seat upon an issue in the consideration of which the question now before the House did not count for anything. I heard the hon. gentleman from Cardwell say that this question had been voted upon, at least in the Province of Quebec, on the 17th September. I take issue with this. This is the first intimation I ever had of it. Whatever may have taken place in the Province of Quebec, I am quite sure it never was discussed in the other Provinces. Let me now ask it of hon gentlemen from the sister Provinces; let me appeal to their fairness and justice, even if this House had the authority to interfere in this matter, would it be fair and just to the Province of Quebec for this

House to interfere in the matter, since the people of the Province of Quebec are alone affected by this act; since they alone are to suffer from it, if it be unwise; since they alone are to benefit from it, if it be wise; since they have held it, in their estimation, to be wise, would it be just, would it be wise, would it be constitutional for gentlemen of the other Provinces to condemn what those interested in it have approved? I might ask it also of my more immediate countrymen, of those of fellow-origin and fellow-language; I might ask them if their conduct, on this occasion, is patriotic? Is it patriotic in them to ask the aid of the sister Provinces, since their views have not prevailed at the polls, in order, under their united action, to crush the expressed will of their own Province? What they are driving at is to obtain a mere party triumph, and, to do that, they are ready to sacrifice the vested rights of their native Province. In order to obtain a mere party triumph, they ask the aid and co-operation of a foreign power,—because I hold that the Federal power, in purely Provincial matters, is a foreign power—they ask the aid of a foreign power, forgetting that, whenever a party in any country, in order to obtain a triumph over a rival party, calls in the aid and co-operation of a foreign power, the invariable consequence has always been the enslavement of the whole country. I do not apprehend that so fatal a result would follow from the act of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the result would be that a breach would be opened in the principle which we have always looked upon as the bulwark of our Provincial liberties. And just look at the justice which is meted to Mr. Letellier in this case. Last year, when the motion was brought up, and when it was asked that it should be brought in the shape of a substantial motion, so that it might be opened to an amendment, they would not do so, but insisted in bringing on the motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply, so that the true resolution at which the House might have arrived was prevented from going on the Journals of the House. And this time, as soon as the motion is made, my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet) stands up and moves the previous ques-

tion. It is true, in moving the previous question, he was kind enough to say that he did not mean to stifle this question; he was also so strict as to give a precedent to show that the moving of the previous question would not prevent free discussion. What then did he want to prevent? It was that the opinion elicited by this free discussion should not go down upon the Journals of the House. He knew that the motion could be met successfully with an amendment which, perhaps, might have been carried by a majority of the House, and, in order to get a verdict, *coûté que coûté*, against Mr. Letellier, he prevented the possibility of an amendment being made. No doubt a good many gentlemen from our sister Provinces have given this question but little attention, and the papers brought down a very indifferent perusal, and have derived their knowledge of the case mostly from the indictment of Mr. Letellier drawn yesterday and to-day. Perhaps they think he has perpetrated a great crime, and proved false to the cause of liberty. If they look at those papers, however, they will find there is another side to the picture which has been exhibited to them. They will find that the hon. gentlemen who have dilated at such length on the conduct of Mr. Letellier, might have dilated, at some length also, on the conduct of his advisers; they will find that, if the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was extraordinary, the conduct of his advisers was still more extraordinary; they will find that, if the conduct of Mr. Letellier has but few precedents in British parliamentary history, that of his advisers has none at all. They will find that his advisers systematically trampled down the Royal prerogative, the liberty of the people, and the civil rights of the people; that the Government of Quebec was fast falling into the hands of an oligarchy which completely disregarded the Royal authority, and remembered the people only to put new burdens upon it. They will find that this oligarchy was itself ruled by rings, the greedy appetite of which had to be fed from the Public Treasury; and that the Treasury had to be replenished by the people at the price of their civil liberty; that since the days of King John no such attempt was ever made on

the liberty and civil rights of the people in any part of the British empire. Mr. Letellier, to the long array of charges against him, might answer in the language of the old Roman, who, being brought to the forum, to answer an accusation, merely said: "I swear I have saved the country." But the parallel could not go further; the historical character to whom I have just alluded had committed a crime, while Mr. Letellier has committed no crime. He exercised a right he had the abstract power to exercise. It is said the exercise of it was unwise; but, in the estimation of the people of Quebec, that unwise act has saved the country. This opinion is not held simply by a political party, but is shared by the great majority of the people, which no one knows better than the Premier himself. He is aware that thousands who voted for him in the late elections supported Mr. Letellier's views, and his present Ministers, and would do so again. Before I dismiss this branch of the subject, I will call attention to the Blue-book containing the petition of Messrs. Chapeau, Angers and Church, asking for his removal. I call attention to this because it may serve to show the character of Mr. Letellier's advisers, and what justice he must have received from them. They set forth that:

"In his communication to his Excellency the Governor-General, respecting the aforesaid dismissal, Mr. Letellier made statements, unsupported by and in contradiction with the official documents, to which they relate, and that in the opinion of the undersigned, viz.: the petitioners, such erroneous statements could not have been made by mistake or failure of memory."

No more grievous charge could be made against any gentleman brought up under British ideas of honour, according to which a gentleman's word is sacred. Now, what were the facts? These statements were submitted in connection with those of Mr. Letellier in his memorial to Lord Dufferin, to the effect that his authority had always been completely disregarded by his advisers, and, as an illustration of his charge, he instanced two proclamations which had been published without his signature. The petitioners allege that that statement is untrue, as they say Mr. Letellier well knew, and that, in fact, the proclamations, when they were published, bore his sig-

MR. LAURIER.

nature. What is Mr. Letellier's answer to this charge of wilfully and designedly alleging an untruth? He says his attention was called to the publication of those proclamations by his Private Secretary; that, thereupon, he wrote to Mr. DeBoucherville, who came and acknowledged the error, and that, in his presence, and, in order to set the matter right, he appended his signature to the original proclamations. Here is a complete defence, which, I insist, shows the bad faith of the traducers of Mr. Letellier. If the charge against him had been true, they were bound, in honour, to call the attention of the House and His Excellency to the fact, and to demand the evidence of Mr. DeBoucherville, Mr. Letellier since gave him as having been witness to his appending his signature to the proclamation. If they could not have maintained their charge, they were bound to admit their error. Their rejoinder was unworthy of leaders of a great party; their answer was a mere quibbling of lawyers, such as would not be expected from men of honour. They say, in their reply to his explanations:

"Dealing with that part of the Lieutenant-Governor's answer which bears upon one of the charges contained in the petition, and in which he states, in contradiction to official and authentic documents, that he signed the proclamations referred to 'after their publication,' the undersigned represent that this explanation is of no value, in presence of the facts established by the proclamations bearing his signature, and the dates at which they were signed. It is difficult to understand how the Lieutenant-Governor can bear evidence against his own signature, and expect that his statement upon the point can be credited."

In their rejoinder, they do not reaffirm their accusation, viz., that the proclamations were signed before their publication, but they say that Mr. Letellier could not be admitted to affirm the fact that he had only signed them afterwards. If they had been in earnest in this, they would have called for Mr. DeBoucherville's evidence; and now, when it appears that Mr. Letellier signed the proclamations *ex post facto*, his enemies attempt to deny him the benefit of the fact, and charge him with an untruth. If the charge made against Mr. Letellier had been true, it would have been of the most damaging character, but, being not true, the charge must rebound

with equal force against his traducers. But, whether Mr. Letellier's action was constitutional or not, a far more important question, to my mind now arises :— Has this House authority to enquire into that act and condemn it? If this motion was proposed simply to elicit a purely abstract expression of opinion which would remain barren of result, we might have discussed it to our heart's content, just as we might discuss any other question which any hon. gentleman might choose to bring; just as we might discuss the recent events in France and the causes which led to Marshal MacMahon resigning the Presidency. But, if this motion is intended to be, as indeed it is, a pregnant motion, if it is to be followed up, if passed, by the censure and dismissal of Mr. Letellier, then I submit respectfully and earnestly that this House has no authority to enquire into and condemn his conduct. I affirm that proposition and invite its discussion. Of course I would not go the length of saying that we never could in any case interfere in Provincial matters, and no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will affirm that we would have that right of interfering in every case. Since then, we will agree that this House has the power to interfere in some cases, not in all; where is the landmark to be found, where is the line to be drawn, up to which it must be legitimate for this House to interfere and beyond which it would be criminal for it to do so. I think the answer has been given by the House on several occasions. The Constitutional Act gives the Federal Executive the power of disallowing Provincial laws. This power being given to the Executive, it follows that the exercise of it is brought within the jurisdiction of this House, to which the Executive is responsible. The doctrine is now well settled that this power of disallowing Provincial laws is to be confined to those cases only where Provincial Legislatures may have stepped beyond their jurisdiction into prohibited ground; that this power is to be exercised only for the protection of Imperial or Federal rights which may have been invaded by Provincial Legislatures, but never to afford relief to any section of the community in the Province which may deem itself aggrieved by that legislation. The

doctrine is now well settled that, if Provincial Legislatures keep within the jurisdiction which is allotted to them by the Constitution, however odious their laws may be, however despotic and tyrannical, however desirous both the Executive and the Government might be of affording relief against such laws, yet this House will not interfere, because interference in such cases would be a violation of the Federal principle, and, in all such cases, the aggrieved portion of the community must seek, and can find, its relief in the application of the principle of responsible government. The people can agitate and they can vote, and a people who can vote has in its hands the instrument whereby to redress all its grievances, the weapon to avenge all its wrongs; and those who believe, as I do, in the efficacy of responsible government know that these weapons are amply adequate, and that, with them, truth and justice will prevail in the end. If such be the rule for legislative acts, such must the rule be with regard to administration, because administrative acts are, as legislative acts, subject to the judgment of the people, who may pronounce upon them in a regular way. Now, as regards the Lieutenant-Governor, under the Constitution, the law says that he shall be removable for cause; but what can a cause be? I believe that these causes of removal can well be offences of a personal character, but never offences connected with the discharge of duties of an official character. If, for instance, the Lieutenant-Governor, by some grossly dishonourable conduct, brings the dignity of the Crown into contumely, this and similar offences might be causes of removal; but, if he sticks within the circle of his functions, however tyrannical his acts may be, he is not removable, because he is covered by ministerial responsibility. He is amenable to the people, who can set him right, if they believe him wrong, and undo what he has done. If it were otherwise, if the House had power to interfere because the Lieutenant-Governor had erred in the discharge of his official duty, it would be an infringement on the principles of responsible government, and an invasion of Federal rights. It has been stated, ever

since this discussion has been commenced, that the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec acted arbitrarily, without the advice of his constitutional advisers. If such be the opinion of this House, it was not the opinion of the Legislature of Quebec. The Legislature of Quebec on several occasions expressed its opinion that the act of Mr. Letellier was within the exercise of his functions, and covered by ministerial responsibility. The question has been brought several times before the House, and the opinion in each case has been precisely the same. On the 8th March last, a motion was made for a petition against Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, to be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, the Senate and House of Commons. A point of order was raised upon the ground that the petition was injurious to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. The Speaker, on that occasion, gave the following ruling :

“ It is an essential principle of monarchical constitutional government that the Crown can commit no wrong. The Lieutenant-Governor represents the Crown in our Legislature. It is therefore necessary, that there should be, near the Sovereign, near the Lieutenant-Governor, advisers, Ministers, who always bear the responsibility which can never be laid on the Crown, and to the continuance of that responsibility there can be no limit. And, although use is made of the term ‘ Lieutenant-Governor ’ in the Addresses, as also in the measures submitted to the House, from the very nature of our Constitution these words are addressed only to the Ministers who are responsible to the Assembly. The person even of the Sovereign, in his representative, is never brought in question. In the present case, the complaints contained in the motion, apply to the advisers of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor,—and I must, therefore, declare it in order.”

And to this ruling, both sides of the House assented. In the month of June last, the Legislative Council of Quebec—and I may say that there is not a more Conservative body under the sun—declared the same doctrine ; it was moved and agreed to “ That His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor was advised to dismiss his Ministers in March last, at a time when they enjoyed the confidence of both branches of the Legislature.” Now, here we have an opinion of both branches of the Legislature of Quebec that Mr. Letellier was fully covered by ministerial responsibility. I ask, therefore, if the

MR. LAURIER.

act of Mr. Letellier, so covered by Ministerial responsibility, is an act subject to the censure of this House? Can Mr. Letellier be responsible at once to his Ministers, who are responsible to the House of Assembly, and at the same time to the House of Commons? But it will be said that the responsibility of Mr. Letellier's Ministers is a pure fiction. This fiction however, is the very life of responsible government. If you do not acknowledge it this time, what will prevent you from acknowledging it elsewhere? If you acknowledge this time, you are bound to follow it to its legitimate consequence, which is the judgment of the people, and no other judgment. Now it has been said that Mr. Letellier's act has not been approved by the people. I desire now to say a few words on this question. In approaching that subject, I feel a good deal like a professor of a college, who once said he wanted to prove, by a long disquisition, the light of the sun at noon. One pupil at once said it was sufficient for him to look at the sun. In a like manner, it will perhaps be sufficient for hon. gentlemen to look at what now exists in the Province of Quebec, in order to be satisfied that Mr. Letellier's Government had a majority. When a vote of want of confidence was brought against the Joly Government, upon the Address, it is true that the motion was carried by a vote of 32 to 31. This vote, however, was taken not in a full House, and at that time another motion was immediately brought in, affirming the confidence of the people in the new Government, which motion was affirmed in a full House. But that was not yet the best evidence. The best evidence is this : On the 8th March, Mr. Angers, the ex-Attorney-General, moved the following amendment to the Supply Bill :—

“ That the Bill be not now read ; but that the reading thereof be suspended until such time as justice shall have been rendered to the majority of this House, inasmuch as, when the resolutions upon which the said Bill is based were adopted, the Cabinet charged with the public business enjoyed the confidence of this House and of the country ; whilst the present Administration does not possess that confidence.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the true constitutional remedy. If an injustice

had been done, there was a true legal remedy in the hands of the people of the Province. If the supplies had been refused, Mr. Letellier would have been compelled to take back his old Government or resign his position. But, Sir, when the new House, fresh from the people, elected upon this very issue, met again, the supplies were voted. Is there a man in this House who will say that justice has not been done to the late Government of Quebec, since they themselves have been condemned by the tribunal to which they appealed. I hold, Sir, that this motion, now in your hands, cannot be carried if there is any sense of justice in the House. The premises of the motion do not warrant the conclusion. In the language of the mover and seconder, it is expected this motion is to be a vote of censure on Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, to be promptly followed by dismissal. If Mr. Letellier had committed a crime, what more could you do? He is not charged with having acted arbitrarily, but only with having committed an unwise act. Who will believe that an unwise act deserves such punishment as dismissal? If the motion is carried, it will be the first time a great deliberative body shall have attempted to punish a man for a fact which is given as nothing but an error, and not a wilful crime. The matter in dispute at the present time is simply relating to the exercise of the prerogative. Last year, the hon. the present Premier did not dispute the prerogative, but he merely argued that the exercise of it was, in all cases, unconstitutional. The doctrine of hon. gentlemen opposite has never yet been formally recorded in the British Parliament, and all the authorities have been, so far, contrary to it. There are numerous authorities to show that the sovereign, whatever his name be, can dismiss his Ministers for cause, and I would beg upon this subject to cite the opinion of Lord Brougham. He said this :

"If they were torn among themselves by endless dissensions, if they differed from the Sovereign, if their measures were evidently ruinous, if dishonour abroad and disaster at home marked the whole tenour of their government, any of these might be constitutional grounds for their dismissal; and, above all, if there happened to be a general feeling of distress, and disapprobation throughout the country, that would be a sufficient ground for such a procedure."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose Mr. Letellier had this authority in view when he dismissed his Ministry. I suppose he had in view this, that he could dismiss his Ministry if there happened to be a general feeling of distrust and disapprobation in the country, and that there was a general feeling of distress and disapprobation the result of the appeal to the country has shown; the fact that the dismissed gentlemen came back from the elections in an actual minority was sufficient evidence of it. If Mr. Letellier acted upon this authority to justify him in what he did, who will dare to censure him? But it is insisted that he was not justified in the exercise of the prerogative. This doctrine, however, has not yet been found recorded in the journals of the House of Commons of England. Therefore, I say, Mr. Letellier has acted in good faith, and he has good authority to do what he did. If he acted in good faith, though he may have acted unwisely and unconstitutionally, will there be found a majority in this House to say this man is to be censured and dismissed because he may have acted unwisely? Again, I appeal to the sense of justice and of fairness of hon. gentlemen from the sister Provinces. It may be that, upon this occasion, I would not be justified in making this appeal, but they have been appealed to in the name of liberty, and it is also in the name of liberty that I appeal to them. It would be a very serious thing for this House to step beyond its jurisdiction. I have cited from Lord Brougham to show that the action of Mr. Letellier was justified. You may say that, though he has followed the opinion of Lord Brougham, he has acted unwisely. So be it. He has appealed to the people, and you may say the people have acted unwisely. I say, So be it, again. But what right have you to substitute your wisdom for the wisdom of the people of Quebec? It may be that our notions of right and wrong may not be equal to the standard of other Provinces, though I am not prepared to admit that. But, whatever may be our standard in this respect, whether low or high, what I ask in the name of the Province to which I belong is that we should be allowed the privilege of being governed according to our own standard—that we should be allowed the privilege of being

badly governed, if being governed by ourselves meant bad government; but, at all events, to be governed by ourselves. This I ask in the name of liberty and self-government. There can be no doubt, Sir, of one thing, and that is that, if this motion is carried, it will be an invasion of the principles of Federal government. It is a matter of regret, Sir, that this, the first attack upon Federal government, should have come from the Province of Quebec. We were reminded yesterday, by the hon. member for Halton, that, if we have to-day a Federal form of government, it was owing in a great measure to the peculiar position of the Province of Quebec, which is so different to the other Provinces, on account of its origin. I remember, at the time this system was put in operation, it was extolled to the sky for this very reason, that it gave to the people of Quebec a free, independent and untrammelled Government. I have in my hands now a pamphlet which was issued in 1867, as the campaign sheet of the Conservative party of the Province, for the first general election which took place after Confederation. The very first page of the pamphlet contains this outburst of enthusiasm:—

“ Since the first of July, 1867, Lower Canada is now ruled under a new mode of government; it is no more Lower Canada, it is the Province of Quebec; with this old French name, which has been restored to us, we have been given a French Governor, and all truly patriotic souls have thrilled with joy, and with a noble pride, when the newspapers have told us that the cannon in the old citadel of Quebec had roared its great voice to salute the first French Governor since 1760. We have been severed from Upper Canada; our name is the Province of Quebec; we have a French Canadian Governor, the second since the establishment of the country; we shall have our own Government and our own Parliament, where everything shall be done by and for the French Canadians, and in the French language. One must be a renegade, or, what is the same thing, an annexationist, not to be moved to tears, not to feel the heart beating with an indescribable joy, and with a very legitimate pride, at the thought of those glorious results of the patriotism and the indomitable energy of our statesmen, of our political leaders, who, one hundred years after the conquest of the country by England, have decided the latter, already impressed by our heroism and our loyalty, to restore us to ourselves, to restore to us our complete autonomy, and to confide the sacred trust of our national traditions to a Government chosen amongst us, and composed of our own.”

MR. LAURIER.

Who do you think was the author of these lyrical strains? Why it was no less than my hon. friend the member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) *quantum mutatus ab illo*. Why the very man who thus rejoiced in 1867 that we had been restored to ourselves; that the sacred trust of our nationality had been confided to a Government of our own; that we had been separated from Upper Canada, that very same man is now asking, not only Upper Canada, but Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the islands of the Atlantic, and the islands of the Pacific, to come to our aid and protect the sacred trust with which we had been entrusted. I remember, Mr. Speaker, the time when our alliance with Upper Canada was looked upon as the bugbear of Lower Canada; it was looked upon as a demoniacal alliance, the source of all our evils. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Bagot was in earnest at that time, when he so rejoiced at being relieved of an alliance with Upper Canada, and if he is in earnest now when he is asking the people of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, and the other Provinces, to take a part in our Provincial affairs, he must feel somewhat like the man of the Scripture, who, having had a devil expelled from his body, had his body re-entered by that same devil, and seven more. Now, Sir, if we, the people of Quebec in whose favour this Confederation has been established, are to be the first to attack it; if we are to be the very first to lay a sacrilegious hand upon the sacred ark of our liberties, how long can we expect that the system will be maintained? If we are to be the first to attack the Federal system, the gun of the citadel at Quebec will have again to roar its great voice, to ring the death-knell of our provincial liberty. Sir, I need not repeat here that the federative union of these Provinces was effected on that principle, on account of our peculiar position in the Province of Quebec; for this we are indebted to our fellow-citizens and to the Mother Country. I have often asserted, and I do so now, that we in Quebec will give way to none in our honour for our Mother Country. There is not, on the face of the British Empire, any class of Her Majesty's subjects more devoted to the British Crown than Her Majesty's sub-

jects of French origin. The attachment we have for the British flag springs from a different cause from that of other British subjects. But, if the cause be different, it is equally powerful. The attachment of our fellow-subjects of English origin springs from nature, while our attachment springs from the heart, from gratitude. We love the British flag, because under it we have found liberty and happiness. At the same time, we are the descendants of France, of that great nation which has placed itself, with England, at the head of modern civilisation; we have derived from our origin peculiarities, characteristics, institutions, which we look upon as a national inheritance, and to which we fondly cling. I am bound to say, Sir, that our national institutions have ever been respected by our fellow-subjects of British origin, and I have no doubt that, if the safeguards which we have in the Federal system were removed, we would not experience from our fellow-citizens any other than the uniformly kind and generous treatment that we have always received. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the circumstances which existed in 1867 still exist in 1878; those circumstances which induced our statesmen in 1867 to give us a Federal form of government and not a legislative form, still exist. Our legislators at that time thought it best to give us a Federal form of government, more cumbersome and more extensive though it be, on account of the superior liberty which it gives to the people; and, so long as the system shall be in operation, it will be the duty of every patriot to see that its principles are maintained in letter and spirit. Looking upon this motion as I do, and as, indeed, it must be looked upon, as an invasion of the fundamental principle of Confederation, I deem it to be the duty, upon this occasion, of every patriot to vote down this motion, which, if carried, would strike a most severe blow at the principle which binds these Provinces together.

MR. LANGEVIN: The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House was perfectly right in ending his speech as he has done, by speaking as he has spoken of the flag of England. He was sure that, when he spoke of the flag of Eng-

land in the way he did, he felt that he was only echoing the common feeling of this House, the common feeling of the whole country, and the common feeling which prevailed among all the races in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman knows well, and the House and the country generally that we all respect that flag; that we all love it. There was a time when that flag was first hoisted on the Citadel at Quebec, that the population of that Province did not love that flag. Then it was not our flag; we had the white flag of France, under which our ancestors had shed their blood, and it was quite natural that that flag should be prized by us. But, Sir, when the fortune of war replaced the flag of France by that of England, the French-Canadians, the Roman Catholics of the Province of Quebec, who formed the whole population of that Province, knew that the latter flag was then their flag, and they felt they should cherish and respect it as much as they had the flag of France. After that flag had been placed on the Citadel of Quebec, the French-Canadians were called upon and fought under it, against even the flag of France, and they fought as good British subjects. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing surprising about our regard for the British ensign, once we knew that under it our rights and liberties would be protected. But the hon. gentleman should have gone further, when he was speaking of the love of the people of the Province of Quebec for that flag; he should have stated that it was not only a question of affection with us, but that we knew that, wherever the flag of England was, there liberty would be found. In 1867, when I had the honour to be in England, with my three friends and other hon. gentleman that are on my right here, to settle the terms of Confederation, I was asked by two members of the British Parliament, "Well, why do you not ask for your independence?" I answered these gentlemen, that the flag of England had been hoisted on the citadel of Quebec by British hands; that we had learned to cherish and defend that flag, and that it was not for the Province of Quebec to haul down that flag; that, if it were to be hauled down, it must be by England herself. But that history

taught us that, whenever the flag of England was hoisted in any particular part of the globe, England never brought it down. The system of Confederation was approved by the Queen of England, and it is in the name of the Queen of England, it is in the name of the principles of responsible government, that the Province of Quebec claims that the Lieutenant-Governor of that Province has violated those principles, and should be censured for that offence. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down states that that violation of responsible government should be settled by the people of the Province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should have made distinction in this matter. There are matters that belong to the Province of Quebec and the Legislature of that Province, and others that belong to this Parliament. The hon. gentleman says that the late Government did not censure the Joly Government or dismiss the Lieutenant-Governor, and that, in doing so, they recognised that they were not responsible. He would have us understand that the Lieutenant-Governor was amenable to the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, and responsible to that Legislature only, that he was not an officer of the Federal Government, and that, therefore, we had nothing to do with the Lieutenant-Governor, and he asked what would be said of us here if we, being members of this House, were to bring down a resolution to censure the Governor-General of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman, in thus speaking, had apparently forgotten that the Governor-General is not responsible to this Parliament, that he is responsible only to the Queen of England. But we, the Ministers of the Crown, are the servants of this Parliament, and are responsible to it. I am surprised to see the hon. gentleman, especially this young and talented member of Parliament, the member for Quebec East, he a Liberal, he a man who has been christened the Young Papineau of this period, defending the course of Mr. Letellier, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec. What would the great Papineau say if he were to appear in this House—would he recognise that gentleman as one of his followers? He would say: "You are defending tyrannical acts instead of defending the

privileges of your Province, the privileges of your people." He would say: "For thirty years I have fought against the enemies of Lower Canada, for thirty years I fought the great battle of the rights of the people, but now you are neglecting the rights of your Province; you are destroying the liberties and the honour of your race." But, Sir, these gentlemen are carried away by their political proclivities when they want to defend their case. They consider that, because the Lieutenant-Governor, has fought by their side in political warfare, his acts, however bad, should not be censured. Mr. Speaker, that is poor statesmanship; they should rise above this humiliating position. This man—this gentleman, has violated his trust, and trampled upon the liberties of the Province of Quebec, and will be censured and condemned. Mr. Speaker, this is not a question for the Province of Quebec alone; it is a question affecting the whole Dominion. To-day it is our people that suffer, and that are trampled upon—it is the liberties of the people of Quebec that Mr. Letellier has destroyed as much as he was able to. But, Mr. Speaker, to-morrow it may be the people of the large Province of Ontario—it may be the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or any other of the Provinces. What affects the rights and privileges of the Province of Quebec affects the rights and privileges of all the Provinces, and, therefore, the appeal that is made to this Parliament is made, not on behalf of the people of Quebec alone, but on behalf of all the people of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) says: "Why do you come to this House?" We come to this House, because it is the only place where this matter can be settled. Since my right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald) presented his resolution in the last Session of Parliament, the people themselves settled this question, so far as they were able to do so, at the polls, but their decision has been disregarded, and, therefore, we come again before this House. Since that resolution was presented last year, there has been an appeal to the people by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, and that appeal has resulted against him. A clear majority of three was returned against him; but Mr. Letellier and his new advisers—as

has been stated in this House, and is, in fact, now a matter of history—bought one of these three members, and another—I cannot believe that he could be bought, he has always been so upright and true a man that I cannot bring myself to believe that he allowed himself to be corrupted—but, at all events, he turned his back upon the electors who had returned him as a Conservative, and, instead of resigning his seat, instead of telling his constituents that he could not fulfil the duty with which they had entrusted him by voting with the Conservatives in the Legislature, he did not fulfil the trust reposed in him, and voted with the Joly Government. The result we have seen, and, by the purchased vote of the Speaker, the Joly Government had a majority of one in the Legislature. But, when the question of the constitutionality of the act of the Lieutenant-Governor was squarely put before the House, Mr. Price did not remain in the House because he could not declare that act constitutional, and, consequently, Mr. Letellier was condemned by a majority of one. But, since the resolution was proposed in this House last Session by the right hon. the leader of the Government, what have we seen? We have seen these same arbitrary and tyrannical acts of Mr. Letellier, for which the resolution proposes to condemn him, continued ever since, and he has been doing all he can to trample upon the constitutional liberties of the people. A few months ago, the Treasurer of the Province died. Though politically opposed to me, he was a gentleman for whom I had the greatest respect. His seat became vacant, and what did Mr. Letellier do? He who proclaimed himself so solicitous for the rights and privileges of the people; he who was so scrupulous in defending the rights of the people, to go before the Courts of Justice instead of being ruled by the Executive Council; did he call upon the electors to choose another representative to replace the Treasurer? No; but for several months that seat has been vacant, because Mr. Letellier knew quite well that the electors would choose a man who would vote against his Government, and therefore give the majority to the other side. We find the Liberals on the other

side of this House defending him to-day as the representative of Liberal institutions, as a model Lieutenant-Governor, although he has thus trampled upon the political rights of the people, by keeping them so long unrepresented in the House, in order to retain for his Government a majority of one. I know that it is in accordance with the principles of gentlemen on the other side to defend Mr. Letellier, but I am surprised at seeing the young and promising member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) taking the position he does. But that hon. gentleman has not defended Mr. Letellier; he could not do so; but he does all he can to prevent the passage of this resolution. And what is the argument he uses? He says that, if we pass this resolution, we shall endanger all the institutions of our Province, and that we are calling upon the other Provinces to interfere in the internal affairs of the Province of Quebec. But when should we call upon the Dominion Parliament to interfere? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) cited Lord Brougham as an authority to show that we should only interfere when the Lieutenant-Governor had committed a personal offence, but not when his offence was a political or constitutional one. But could any circumstances arise, when it would be proper for this Parliament to censure him? Suppose he should refuse to sanction all the Bills passed by the Legislature. That is not a personal offence; he has killed no one, he has robbed no one, but he only refuses his assent to the legislation. The hon. gentleman says we cannot touch him, that he is a constitutional Lieutenant-Governor, and no doubt he is one exactly after the hearts of the gentlemen opposite. Still, I do not think this House will be of that opinion. I think it will declare that the Lieutenant-Governor, being a Federal officer, is responsible to Parliament, and therefore the remedy for this abuse must be in this House—and evidently it must, since there is no remedy in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) says there is no precedent for the conduct of the DeBoucherville Government. No, there is no precedent, because no one could ever suppose that a Lieutenant-Governor would so dare to violate his pledges, and trample upon

the constitutional rights of his own Province, for the sake of helping his own party into power in the Dominion, because there is no doubt, that if the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec had known what he knows to-day—what he knew on the 17th of September—that his friends in this House would not occupy the Treasury benches, but be found in much smaller numbers on the other side of the House, I have no doubt that he would never have done what he has. But he played his rôle, he accomplished the object for which he was sent there, and he did it in such a way that the people of the Province of Quebec have risen,—not in arms, for they are a quiet, law-abiding people,—but they have risen in indignation, and now demand justice and relief at the hands of this House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), in speaking of Mr. Letellier, says the latter can now say with the noble Roman of old, “I have saved the country.” Well, that is a very strange way of saving his country by destroying the liberties of the people. Instead of saving his country, he has written a black and painful page in its history, and I am certain that, if he could re-write that page to day, he would re-write it in a far different manner. The hon. gentleman says this resolution is a first attack on the federative principle. It is exactly the contrary. The resolution has for its object the defence and safety of the Federal principle. We desire to preserve the autonomy of the Province. We want to preserve the rights and privileges of the Local Legislatures, but we desire to teach the Lieutenant-Governors, at the same time, of each Province that they must not go beyond their functions, and try both to reign and govern at once. They must be taught that, while they have certain powers, their advisers have also certain powers under the Constitution. They must be taught, also, that the representatives of the people have certain rights and powers which must be respected, and which no Lieutenant-Governor is at liberty to ignore. When Mr. DeBoucherville and his friends were the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor, they had behind them a majority of eighteen or twenty in a House of sixty-five members. That was a very large majority, compara-

tively equal to the one the Government here is supposed to have in this House. The people of the Province had not presented a single petition against that Government. There had been no demonstration in the country against the Government; it was supported by the people of every section, and by the people of both nationalities. There was no dissatisfaction with the Government whatever, but Mr. Letellier wished for a change. He wanted to be surrounded by his political friends. We have heard quoted numerous high authorities to show that, under our Constitution, a Lieutenant-Governor should have no politics, but should occupy a neutral position between parties, like the Queen in Great Britain. Therefore, Mr. Letellier had no reason whatever for dismissing his Ministers. I do not intend to go through all the documents that have been laid before the House; they have been very ably reviewed by the hon. mover and seconder of the resolution, and by my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), whom I compliment most heartily on his maiden speech. I will not enter into those details, but I may say that it is amply proved by those documents that the Lieutenant-Governor had no right, and no reason whatever for dismissing his Ministers. We see by those documents that, when he thought he had a ground of complaint against them, Mr. DeBoucherville came to him and explained the matter, and told him that, if there had been anything wrong, or if there had been any appearance of neglect, there was certainly no intention on their part to disregard the prerogatives of the Crown, and the Lieutenant-Governor fully accepted that explanation and excuse. Nevertheless, he had that little memorandum-book of his, in which he marked down all the little circumstances, saying to himself: That will be a good point against them pretty soon, when I mean to put them out. The Lieutenant-Governor came one day across a little Bill (No. 19) with a blank in it. He sanctioned it, as he did also another Bill (No. 20), which was introduced in order to fill a blank in the first one. But the same thing has occurred in this Parliament, and also in the late Legislative Assembly under the Union, and more than once. Such little errors occur al-

most unavoidably, but are they reasons for dismissing a Government? But there is another reason given for their dismissal—the grammatical error. Well, that shows that Mr. Letellier ought to have been appointed Superintendent of Education instead of Lieutenant-Governor; but, at all events, I do not think it was a sufficient cause for dismissing a Cabinet. And so on, to the end of the chapter, all the alleged reasons are of the same puerile character. At the last moment, without any warning, he turns his Ministers out of doors, and then he brings forth his little memorandum-book, in which he has entered all the private and confidential communications of his Ministers, and says: I will show this book to the world, and let it see what my Ministers have done in the secrecy of their official position. I need have no fear of contradiction, because their mouths are closed. They cannot divulge what passed between us without my permission, and that permission they shall not have. On the 30th of the month, after the dismissal had taken place, he complains in his explanations that he never authorised the Ministers to make any explanations on their part. Suppose he did not; these were not the causes for dismissal, inasmuch as they occurred after it; and therefore this complaint was an afterthought of the Lieutenant-Governor, who saw that, in common parlance, he had not a leg left to stand upon for his defence. I do not want to occupy the time of the House by going over the ground already gone over by my hon. friends; but the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), the late Postmaster-General, has taken a fancy to me, and of course I thank him very much for his attentions. Probably he takes this interest in me because I happen to have charge of the Department over which he presided, and I can assure him that I conduct that Department to the very best of my ability. But the hon. gentleman says that he finds fault with the hon. member for Cardwell for having gone to Ontario to be elected. Well, he tried to minimise my hon. friend, to show that he was such a young man—a boy, in fact—that it was rather premature on his part to come forward and make a speech on a question of this kind. The speech of my

hon. friend from Cardwell would be a credit to any member of this or any House, even of the House of Commons in England. He knew the subject well, put his points admirably, and made a very good impression on the House. What fault can we find with the hon. gentleman for having gone to Ontario? It shows that he was well known and appreciated, that the people of Ontario were liberal enough not to mind that the hon. gentleman lived in Montreal, or elsewhere out of the Province; but they said, "He is a talented man," and they elected him by a handsome majority; and we are all proud to see him here. Did not the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) also go to Ontario, not to be elected, but to try to mesmerise the electors of Ontario? He did not succeed; his mesmerism was rather weak, and his arguments fell unheeded on the electors. The hon. gentleman also went to Argenteuil. We all remember his famous speech there, which was a new departure, a new programme for the electors of the Province of Quebec. He wanted to do what he said this evening, to destroy tyranny in the Province of Quebec, the oligarchy in the Province of Quebec, and he wanted to destroy the religion of the majority in that Province. That was his object. But, afterwards, he had to come down to this House, and was called to account by both sides; his own friends were so excited and disgusted with it, that he had to rise and try to explain his speech. The explanation was as bad as the speech itself. He had no business to bring these religious questions before the electors or before Parliament, because those questions were not before the country. In the Province of Quebec, we agree perfectly well. The religion of the majority there is the Roman Catholic religion, but we never interfere with those who profess another religion than ours. They adore God as they please. They have their own churches, and there is no more interference by us with them than by them with us. The result was that his speech fell flat on the country, and to-day Quebec sends a majority of thirty-one members to support this Government. The hon. gentleman alluded to my speech last year on this question. It appeared that

speech did not meet the views of the hon. gentleman, and he stated it was not for the House, but for the country. My speech was made for the House of Commons. Not one single copy of it was sent to the country until several months after the elections were over. I spoke my sentiments and protested at once against the doctrine of the then Government who wanted to protect Mr. Letellier in this arbitrary and unconstitutional act. The hon. gentleman said: "What evidence have you against the Lieutenant-Governor that was not put before the electors at the last local election?" I say to you that the Lieutenant-Governor has continued to commit his unconstitutional acts since. For example: Why did he not compel his Ministers to do their duty? He was so particular about the De Boucherville Government, that, when any of its members went out of town, he at once telegraphed them that, if they were not back on a certain day, they would have to abide by the consequences. But the Joly Government may do as they please, leave any number of constituencies without being represented; that suits him perfectly well, because it maintains Mr. Joly with a majority in a Parliament which is not complete. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) said it was true there was a majority of one against Mr. Letellier, 32 against 31, but the House was not full. No; Mr. Price stayed away in order not to vote. But will it be said that, because one member was absent, the vote given was not the vote of Parliament, or that it would not have been its vote, even if more hon. members had been absent. It is almost impossible to have a full House; there never was one here during the last Session. In the British House of Commons there never has been a single instance, during the past two hundred years, when the whole of the members of the House were present. The hon. member for Shefford asked what were my views on the question. They are the same as expressed last year. I am of opinion that the act of Mr. Letellier, if left without censure by the House of Commons, will be a precedent of great danger, not only to Quebec, but to the Provinces of the whole Dominion; that the great respect which the people have

always had for responsible government would be shaken; that, if the act be not censured, the Confederation Act is a sham. I am not afraid of the verdict which would have been given by the Parliament of England if this question had come before it. They know too well how to respect their institutions to allow it to pass uncensured, and I know that in England they respect our constitutional charter, and that we would have had justice. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) speaking of the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) asked, Why has he turned coward? I have no doubt, Sir, you did not hear that remark. He would not have used such a word outside Parliament. Neither the hon. member for Terrebonne nor any of his colleagues on this side, nor, I believe, any member of this House, ever turned coward—that is the view we should all take as gentlemen. The hon. member for Shefford knows my hon. friend for Terrebonne made a speech last year on the subject, to be found in the *Hansard*, condemning the action of the Lieutenant-Governor, and, this year, he has not changed his principles. We on this side continue in the same mind as last year on this subject. I do not believe the word coward should have been applied by even that hon. gentleman to any hon. member of this House. He also asked, if Sir. George Cartier were alive what would he say to-day of his followers? That hon. gentleman knows too well what my late lamented friend would say; it would be this: "I find my friends, whom I left in 1873 in the path of honour, as always, defending the great principles of constitutional government for which I fought with all my friends before the Constitution of 1840 was granted; you are defending the principles I fought for and the liberties of Quebec defined in that great Confederation Charter that I signed with my name,—and, I doubt not, the hon. Baronet signed with his blood; for, I have no doubt but the great mental labour it cost him injured his health and hastened his death, and brought him to an early grave. That was the answer he would give the hon. member for Shefford. He, as well as the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has made an appeal to the

other Provinces on the subject of this motion, not to interfere in the business of Quebec. The hon. member for Shefford has gone so far as to threaten us with the future, and also about the tariff in this connection. He says we were elected to carry the tariff measure, and he ridicules our position; he tried to show we are delaying it, afraid to bring it down. The hon. gentleman has become a lamb, but only within a few days. He has fought against us all his life, and since the elections and from the beginning of the Session has been hostile; but let him not try to make the House believe that, if this motion had not been brought forward, he would have helped us to pass our tariff. He has forgotten his past—he would have fought us to the knife. No doubt he would have found fault with our tariff, but the House will pass it, for the country wants it. The appeal made to this House by the friends of the motion is not for interference in the internal affairs of Quebec, but is in favour of the great principles of constitutional liberty and government in this country. If the acts of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec had been done by the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba or Prince Edward Island, I would have fought their battle in the same way. We are all in danger; our liberties are in peril. To-morrow we may have an election in Ontario that I hope will give a majority to the party that in this House possesses it. The Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario is a Liberal; suppose he took his Government from the minority, and ordered new elections, taking the same means to carry them as in Quebec were used—what would the great Province of Ontario do? What would the people say? I know their answer. I think we, French, English, Irish and Scotch in Quebec, would be more lenient and moderate than our friends in Ontario, who would not remain tolerant as long as we have been. I think they would find ready ways and means of bringing their Lieutenant-Governor back to his proper place and duty. Our people have set a great example of moderation and respect for the laws; they have applied to this House, and I hope, I am sure it will respond to their confidence by passing this resolution, which is now under consideration.

MR. GEOFFRION said it was not his intention to address the House on this question, nor would he had it not been for some expressions from the last speaker (Mr. Langevin). He had no doubt used them without premeditation. He said that members of the Quebec Legislature had been bought, which accounted for their changing sides. If that was an evidence of purchase, would it not apply to many of his colleagues and supporters who had been Liberals in other days? Had they been bought by the Tories? The Ministers of Finance and Agriculture were once proud to be called Liberals; so was his hon. friend the member for Richelieu (Mr. Massue) who had been a candidate against the late Sir George Cartier. Did their change of politics mean their purchase? He was sure, in reflecting upon these facts, that the hon. the Postmaster-General would not, had he thought over his offensive remark, have made it on the present occasion. If all the members of his own party, formerly Liberals, were counted out, the Opposition would have a majority of the House. The Quebec members who had changed sides and given support to Mr. Joly's Government, had assigned good reasons therefor. Whether their reasons were good or bad, was a question only for their constituencies. The hon. the Postmaster-General denied this was purely a Quebec question; he said it was not a question of privilege. He (Mr. Geoffrion) asserted it was a question of great importance, and denied the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec should be impeached for his action, or dismissed. They had a precedent. He remembered that some of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches had to take the responsibility for a similar course—that Mr. Cartier, before his constituents assumed the responsibility for the dismissal of the Brown-Dorion Administration. From first to last the old Provinces of Canada supported that. It was true his hon. friend from Richelieu (Mr. Massue) was then a friend of the Brown-Dorion Administration—at that time opposed to Sir George E. Cartier. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) said that Mr. Letellier had condemned himself by giving his reasons to the Governor-General. This was a strange way of saying a man condemned himself. He

(Mr. Geoffrion) did not believe anybody would condemn the Lieutenant-Governor for thus submitting his reasons and giving to the Governor-General an opportunity of approving of his conduct. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) also said that, if the Government had not made the proclamation in which the name of the Lieutenant-Governor was used, it would have been all right, because it was a very small thing and of no importance. He would like to know what would be the result if a man forged a note for the small sum of \$50; would it not be forgery? The hon. gentleman also said that they ought to oppose this action, as a blow at the constitution of Confederation; and that they ought not to permit any such act of despotism. He (Mr. Geoffrion) looked at the question from a different point of view. He was in favour of local legislation on the part of the different Provinces, and in this matter the people of Quebec had endorsed the action of the Lieutenant Governor, as much as they could judge by the expression of opinion on the floor of the House. As a representative of the Province of Quebec, he condemned such interference. He could understand why the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, who, at the time of Confederation, was for legislative union, should favor the motion. He could quite understand why that hon. gentleman brought such a death-blow to Confederation, as a political organisation. But he would ask hon. members who had rights and interests to protect to pause before they gave such a vote as they were asked to give on this occasion. If such a vote were to be carried, it would, in effect, destroy the independence of Local Legislatures and of Local Governments. It had been said by one of the previous speakers, that they ought to give a death-blow to despotism. That was what he intended to do by voting against the move sought to be made by this motion. There was no greater act of despotism than the interference by the people of the Dominion with the affairs of the Province of Quebec, and he would ask the representatives of the smaller Provinces how they could excuse themselves if they took advantage of this pretext to destroy the principle of local self-government. He called the

MR. GEOFFRION.

attention of hon. gentlemen to the consequences which would follow if that motion were adopted by this Parliament. Believing that the greatest evils would result from such an interference, he had decided to oppose the motion for bringing local affairs before this Parliament, and the interference on the part of this Parliament with local affairs.

MR. LANDRY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes before
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 13th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 45) To authorise the Government of the Province of Quebec to construct a bridge over the Ottawa River for the use of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, and Occidental Railway; and for other purposes.—(Mr. *Holton*.)

Bill (No. 46) To incorporate the Yarmouth Dyking Company, of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Killam*.)

Bill (No. 47) To extend the corporate character and powers of the Direct United States Cable Company to the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)

Bill (No. 48) To amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Rochester*.)

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.

NAME ADDED.

MR. MACKENZIE moved that Mr. Cameron (South Huron) be added to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF QUEBEC GOVERNMENT
BY THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Mousseau's proposed motion, that it be *Resolved*, That the dismissal by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec of his Ministers on the second day of March, 1878, was, under the circumstances, unwise and subversive of the position accorded to the advisers of the Crown, since the concession of the principle of responsible government to the British North American Colonies; and of the proposed motion of Mr. Ouimet, and which motion was: That the question be now put.

MR. LANDRY said that this question was not a new one; it had occupied public attention during the last eleven months, it had been discussed under different circumstances, and at short intervals, in the Quebec Legislature, it had been brought before this House, and the people, especially the people of the Province of Quebec had, during the general elections in May and September last, heard pleaded before them this great and important question, which was so intimately connected with the political future of their Province and the very existence of their liberties. In this solemn hour of the history of the country, it was the whole people of the Dominion that came to vindicate by the voice of the people of Quebec, their most sacred rights. That people had no need of indulgence, or of favours. What they asked for was justice and justice alone, and who could refuse this justice? No one; none, at least, of those who had fought for our constitutional liberties, none of those who cherished the institutions under which we lived, none of those who clung to responsible government, none of those, in short, who placed the interests of a people above the wretched plottings of a handful of intriguers. And what was indeed this great trial that was being prosecuted before the nation's representatives, if it was not an open contest between intrigue and those popular rights which it was hoped would obtain a brilliant and decisive triumph? He declared that the action which had been taken had not been

dictated either by hatred, or by partisan or personal interest. What was the issue? It was the public condemnation by this House of an act that had struck a blow at popular rights. To obtain this justice it was not necessary to have recourse to party spirit in order to raise the tempest that was to swallow up the man whom party spirit had made guilty. Success, obtained at such a price, would be shameful. The movers in this matter were acting upon a principle the force of which all hon. members on the other side would have to admit. Those gentlemen, at least those from the Province of Quebec, had, at one time, for leader a man whose mighty voice cried out: "Let the country perish rather than a principle." Continuator of his work and enthusiastic admirers of his acts and principles, his political children of the hour were, in their turn, crying out: "Let the country perish rather than our friend, Mr. Luc Letellier de St. Just." But the Conservatives, the political descendants of the Lafontaines and the Baldwins, the children of Cartier, the supporters of his illustrious friend and former colleague, their much respected leader to-day, answered with one accord: "Rather let a man perish and let the country be saved." The name of this man mattered little. He had no name for the people of Quebec, the moment he stood up as an enemy of their institutions and as a contemner of their rights. Let him disappear and the Province of Quebec would be saved, and the Constitution avenged. He would borrow the very words of the Hon. Mr. Letellier, and say to this House:—

"It is desirable, under the present circumstances, to speak with all possible calm, notwithstanding the popular excitement, which is a national excitement. The question to be examined is to know whether the Executive Council can interpose the Royal prerogative between them and the Parliament, and thus prevent the free exercise of the popular will. This prerogative ought not to be made use of in order to overthrow popular liberties, but should follow the course of events conformably to the interest of the people."

By these words, pronounced in 1873 before a Liberal caucus, immediately after the prorogation of Parliament on the 13th August, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, then Mr. Senator Letellier, had, six years before-

hand, prepared the ground upon which this debate was engaged. For one, he thanked him for having furnished them with this arm that he was then wielding with an almost ferocious joy, and that he now saw, with deep despair, turned against himself. His words of yesterday were his own condemnation of to-day, and if this House adopted the motion, as he had no doubt it would, they would have established that which Mr. Letellier desired so much to know in 1873, and the people would learn with joy that :

“ The Royal prerogative of the Crown should not be made use of to overthrow popular liberties, but should follow the course of events conformably to the interests of the people.”

The House and the country knew very well that the charter, or written Constitution of Canada, had been granted by England herself, in 1867, when Confederation was established. What did the British North America Act say, for that was the first document to be consulted. In the very preamble he found that the Canadian Constitution was to repose on exactly the same principles as that of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. England had given us a Constitution, and she wished that henceforth Canada should be a Dominion having a separate existence. She had said : “ This is your Constitution,” and she had added : “ This Constitution reposes upon the same principles as my own kingdom. I give you the fruit of my own existence. My Constitution is the work of centuries, the result of the deep study of my great men. The Constitution I give you is a faithful counterpart of it ; it reposes on the same principles.” This should make Canadians rejoice. “ We are,” to quote the very words of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), “ a happy and free people ; and we are happy and free, thanks to the liberal institutions that govern us, institutions that we owe to the struggles of our fathers and to the wisdom of the Mother Country.” Under the Constitution, Canada, divided in the first place into four Provinces, now counted seven, without counting the vast territories of the North-West to which the Parliament of Canada had given, a few years previously, a separate organisation. Canada had its

Constitution, and each of the Provinces entering the Union had also the benefit of a special Constitution. These Constitutions should be compared together in order to fully understand the questions now before the House and the difference that existed between the working of the Federal Constitution and that of the Provincial Constitutions. It would be seen from the British North America Act that it was to the Queen herself that were attributed the Government and the Executive power of Canada, and that the Queen moreover formed part of the Parliament of Canada. She had the entire Executive power and had an essential part in the Legislative power. But our gracious Sovereign could not come here in person to govern her loyal Canadian subjects, nor to exercise, in common with the Senate and the House of Commons, her legislative attributions. The 10th section of the Imperial Act made provision for this by delegating this power to the Governor-General, who was the representative of our august Sovereign, the personification of Royal Authority. What was the first duty of the Governor ? He was to summon Privy Councillors who were to be his advisers. The King reigned but did not govern : such was the rôle of the Governor. A man who had been Governor of Canada, the noble Earl of Dufferin, had himself marked out, in unequivocal terms, this first and imperative duty. He had said :

“ My only guiding star in the conduct and maintenance of my official relations with your public men is the Parliament of Canada. In fact, I suppose I am the only person in the Dominion whose faith in the wisdom and the infallibility of Parliament is never shaken. Each of you, gentlemen, only believe in Parliament so long as Parliament acts according to your wishes and convictions. I, gentlemen, believe in Parliament no matter which way it votes—and to those men alone whom the deliberate will of the confederated Parliament of the Dominion may assign to me as my responsible advisers can. I give my confidence. Whether they are the heads of this party or of that party must be a matter of indifference to the Governor-General. So long as they are maintained by Parliament in their position, so long is he bound to give them his unreserved confidence, to defer to their advice, and loyally to assist them with his counsels. Whenever, in the vicissitudes of party warfare, they are replaced by others, he welcomes their successors with an equally open and loyal regard. Such private friendships as he may

have formed he may have a right to retain. As a reasonable being he cannot help having convictions upon the merits of different policies, but these considerations are abstract, speculative and devoid of practical effect in his official relations. As the head of a constitutional State, as engaged in the administration of parliamentary government, he has no political friends; still less need he have political enemies. The possession, or even to be suspected of possessing either, destroys his usefulness."

He quoted the 12th section of the British North America Act, which enumerated the powers that the Governor possessed, whether he acted under the advice of his Council, or on his own responsibility, and pointed out that there was nothing plainer than this section, which pointed out clearly the very sources whence were derived the diverse powers granted to the Governors of Canada, and which were not mentioned in the British North America Act. The first source of power that was found in looking over the past, was the very Act that the British North America Act had replaced in 1867. He spoke of the Union Act, passed in 1840, by the British Parliament, which provided that all powers, authorities and functions, which were previously vested in the respective Governors or Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces, with the advice, or with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of such Provinces respectively, or in conjunction with such Executive Council, or with any number of the members thereof, or by the said Governors or Lieutenant-Governors individually and alone, should, in so far as the same were not repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the provision of that Act, be vested in the Governor of the Province of Canada, with the advice, or with the advice and consent of, or in conjunction, as the case might require, with such Executive Council, or any members thereof, or by himself, individually and alone, in cases where the advice, consent, or concurrence of the Executive Council was not required. This section was completed by the following one, which indicated, in express terms, the manner in which the Governor was to act on his own responsibility, in case the advice of his Ministers should not be required, and provided that all the power and authority vested in him, should be exercised in conformity with, and subject to, such orders, instructions

and directions as Her Majesty might, from time to time, see fit to make or issue. The 45th section of the Union Act referred to a former Act passed under George the Third, in the thirty-first year of his reign. This Act of 1791 was none other than the Constitutional Act that was granted to Canada by England, twenty-eight years after the Treaty of Versailles. He had read it attentively, and he had failed to discover therein aught that gave to the Governors of Canada other powers than those already specified by the Union Act of 1840, and the British North America Act of 1867. On the contrary, he found that in those days the powers of the Governors were much more restrained than they were now. The Governor could do nothing without having a special authorisation from the reigning Sovereign, who granted it under his own hand. The appointment of Legislative Councillors, the summoning and prorogation of the Houses, could not take place without an authorisation given under the Sovereign's own hand. That was the nature of the Constitutional Act of 1791, and it would convince all those who were acquainted with the present working of responsible government how greatly the powers and initiative of the Governor were at that time limited. He was speaking from the standpoint of the Statute. But there was another Act to be consulted. By going back to the fourteenth year of the reign of George III, it would be found that during the seventh Session of the thirteenth Parliament of Great Britain, in 1774, an Act had been passed, the 83rd of the Statutes at that time, which was entitled: "An Act for making more effectual provision for the Government of the Province of Quebec in North America." But in this Act, as in the one that replaced it, nothing was found that gave to the Governors other powers than those already mentioned. The Act of 1867, by which a Constitution was granted to Canada, defined the powers of the Governors, and referred to the Act of 1840. The Act of 1840 referred, in its turn, to the Act of 1791, and the Act of 1791 to that of 1774. These three latter Acts did not confer on the Governors of Canada any other powers than those he now possessed

under the Act of 1867 ; this Act, on the contrary, going further, in this respect, than the preceding ones. The Act of 1867, the British North America Act, was the veritable charter of Canadian liberties ; it was the fruitful source from which flowed the rights and powers of the Canadian people, and those whom the Royal authority sent to preside over the destinies of one of the most beautiful of her colonies were obliged to draw from this source the spirit of their duties, and the Royal Instructions, showed in the most conclusive manner, that the source of the Governor's power was the British North America Act. He was still speaking from the standpoint of the Statute, but it was time to distinguish between two things that were not to be confounded, and to study, in the distribution of the Governor's functions and in the exercise of his duties, what he would define as the double character and the double action of a Governor. According to his idea, there were two persons in a Governor. There was the representative, the delegate of our beloved Queen, what he would call the personification of Royal authority ; there was also the public servant, appointed by the British Crown to protect and defend, in a far-off land, the interests and the glorious prestige of this Crown, whence his authority was derived. King and servant,—King in the colonies, servant of the Mother Country,—not responsible to this House for any of his acts, whatever they might be, but responsible to the British Parliament. The most competent writers on constitutional law confirmed this doctrine. In his work upon Responsible Government, Lord Grey said :—

“ But there was this most important difference between a Colonial Governor and an English Sovereign of the Houses of Plantagenet or Tudor, that the former was responsible to a distant and, generally, an impartial authority, to which the colonists could always appeal to relieve them from a Governor who abused his power.”

Hearn said :—

“ Although he is the first subject in the colony over which he presides, and is entitled to all the consideration which the great confidence reposed in him by his Sovereign demands, he is in strict law merely an agent of the Queen, exercising in her name and on her behalf under certain strict instructions some of the

Royal prerogatives. His authority is derived and is strictly limited. He, like every other agent, has, from the very nature of the case, a double relation, one to his principal, another to the party with whom he transacts the affairs of his principal.”

Grey, he thought, summarised the question :—

“ The Governor is the King's servant. His commission came from him and he has only to execute the powers conferred upon him by this commission, to wit, to execute the laws of *Minorca*, subject to the instructions of the King in Council.

He believed that by these extracts he had shown, in a manner not to be refuted, that the powers of a Governor were limited, and that, in present cases, the Governor had no other authority than that conferred on him by the British North America Act, or that which he held under the commission of the Queen herself. This principle being admitted—and no one could deny it—it remained to be shown that a Lieutenant-Governor had no other authority than that conferred upon him by the same British North America Act, or that he might receive from the Governor-General who granted him his commission. For him, as for the Governor-General, there were two sources whence he derived his authority, the law and his commission. By the British North America Act, all powers, authorities and functions which, under any Imperial or Canadian Act, were, before or at the Union, vested in or exercisable by the respective Governors, or Lieutenant-Governors, of the Provinces were, so far as the same were capable of being exercised after the Union, in relation to the Government of Ontario and Quebec respectively, rested in the Lieutenant-Governors of Ontario and Quebec respectively, with the advice, or with the advice and consent of, or in conjunction with the respective Executive Councils, or any members thereof, or by the Lieutenant-Governor individually, as the case required. The British North America Act did not, in any way, confer upon the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec the power of dismissing his Ministers. This power had not been given to him by the Act of 1840, nor by that of 1791, nor by that of 1774 ; nor did he hold this power under his commission, or under the Royal instructions given to the Governor-General, in which

mention was made of the Lieutenant-Governor. It must then be concluded the Lieutenant-Governor had not the legal right of dismissing his Ministers. But, if he had not the legal right, had he at least the constitutional right, for the law and the Constitution were two things entirely distinct. This distinction had been perfectly established by the hon. leader of the Government about a year ago, when discussing the motion he had drawn up, and which the representatives that the people had recently chosen were again called upon to seriously meditate. The question, therefore, was this: Had a Lieutenant-Governor the constitutional right to dismiss his Ministers, and, if so, had Lieutenant-Governor Letellier constitutionally exercised this right in dismissing the De-Bouchervillé Cabinet? He would suppose that a Lieutenant-Governor had unquestionably the right to dismiss his Cabinet—it was a mere supposition, and he did not pretend to decide the question; moreover, it mattered little, for the purposes of this debate, whether the supposition was well founded or not. He would maintain, as a principle, that a Lieutenant-Governor was a Federal officer, who could not have more constitutional rights than those of his superior the Governor-General. Therefore, the Lieutenant-Governor could not do that which the Governor-General would not have the constitutional right to do. But the Governor-General was himself an officer of the British Crown, and he had proved, in beginning his remarks, that his powers were limited. And even supposing that he, who represented the Royal authority in Canada, even supposing that Lieutenant-Governors possessed all the rights appertaining to the British Crown, neither the one nor the other could, in this case, go beyond the limit marked out by constitutional law, and that the British Sovereign herself could not overstep, if she wished to remain a constitutional Sovereign. And what was this boundary line, this wall raised up to protect popular liberties? The most reliable authors in constitutional law, the most eminent statesmen of the British Empire, spoke of it. By consulting their works and their opinions, it would be found that they were all agreed upon this important

constitutional question of the forming and dismissal of a Ministry. Todd, in his "Parliamentary Government in England," said:

"For the Sovereign can always dismiss a Ministry and summon another to his Councils, provided he does so not for mere personal considerations, but for reasons of State policy which the incoming Administration can explain and justify to the satisfaction of Parliament."

He also cited, at length, from May's Constitutional History of England, vol. I., pp. 126 and 138, and from Bagehot's English Constitution, p. 283. When Lord Grey was Secretary of the Colonies, in the days of Lord Elgin, these were the instructions that he gave to Sir John Harvey, Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia. They were to be found in his work, entitled "The Colonial Policy and Lord John Russell's Administration," p. 209 of the first volume:

"It had appeared from Sir John Harvey's report on the state of affairs in Nova Scotia, on his assumption of the Government, that the Executive Council was incomplete, that there was reason to doubt its being able to continue to conduct the affairs of the Province with advantage, and that he had been urged by the members of the Opposition, with whom he had been in communication, to dissolve the existing Assembly, in the belief that by so doing a new Assembly would be elected, in which they would have a majority, showing public opinion to be in their favour. With reference to this state of things, I transmitted to Sir John Harvey the following instructions, which, it will be observed, involve principles of general application to all colonies having a similar form of Government:—'I am of opinion that under all the circumstances of the case, the best course for you to adopt is to call upon the members of your present Executive Council to propose to you the names of the gentlemen whom they would recommend to supply the vacancies which I understand to exist in the present Board. If they should be successful in submitting to you an arrangement to which no valid objection arises, you will, of course, continue to carry on the Government through them, so long as it may be possible to do so satisfactorily, and as they possess the necessary support from the Legislature. Should the present Council fail in proposing to you an arrangement which it would be proper for you to accept, it would then be your natural course, in conformity with the practice in analogous cases in this country, to apply to the opposite party; and should you be able, through their assistance, to form a satisfactory Council, there would be no impropriety in dissolving the Assembly upon their advice; such a measure, under those circumstances, being

the only mode of escaping from the difficulty which would otherwise exist, of carrying on the Government of the Province upon the principles of the Constitution. The object with which I recommend to you this course, is that of making it apparent that any transfer that may take place of political power from the hands of one party in the Province to those of another, is the result, not of an act of yours, but of the wishes of the people themselves, as shown by the difficulty experienced by the retiring party in carrying on the Government of the Province according to the forms of the Constitution. To this I attach great importance; I have therefore to instruct you to abstain from changing your Executive Council until it shall become perfectly clear that they are unable, with such fair support from yourself as they have a right to expect, to carry on the Government of the Province satisfactorily, and command the confidence of the Legislature. Of whatever party your Council may be composed, it will be your duty to act strictly upon the principle you have yourself laid down, in the memorandum delivered to the gentlemen with whom you have communicated—that, namely, of not identifying yourself with any one party, but instead of this, making yourself both a mediator and a moderator between the influential of all parties.”

Instructions had been given us from time to time by the Mother Country. This was what Lord John Russell had written in 1839, to the Right Hon. C. Poulet Thompson:—

“DOWNING STREET, Oct. 14, 1839.

“It is necessary that the representatives of Her Majesty in the Provinces should not commit any act of bad conduct, and that no private interest should come in competition with the public welfare. If the Governor should oppose all the legitimate propositions of the Assembly, and if the Assembly should constantly have recourse to its power of refusing the supplies, everything would suffer. The Governor should not oppose the views of the Assembly except when the honour of the Crown and the interest of the Empire are deeply affected.”

“I have the honour to be, &c.,

“J. RUSSELL.”

In 1856, the Governor of New Zealand, wishing to know exactly what line of conduct to adopt with respect to his Cabinet, submitted to the British Parliament his views upon the matter. Here was an extract from this precious document:—

“April 15th, 1856.

“Here are the views of the Governor upon his relations with his responsible advisers:

“1st. In all matters under the control of the Assembly, the Governor will be guided by the advice of the gentlemen who are responsible to that body, whether in accordance with his own opinion or not.

MR LANDRY.

“2nd. In matters pertaining to the prerogatives of the Crown and Imperial interest, he will be happy to receive their advice; but if he differs in opinion from them, he will submit his opinions to the Secretary for the Colonies, &c.

“THOMAS GORE BROWN.”

And the Colonial Office answered as follows:—

“DOWNING STREET, 1856.

“After mature consideration, Her Majesty’s Government approve the principles upon which you intend to act; which principles are clearly expressed in our issue of the 15th April.

“(Signed) “H. LABOUCHERE.”

But there was no need of quoting so many and such high authorities. This doctrine was known and accepted in Canada. It had been clearly stated, and by whom? Precisely by one who might have feared to see his liberty restrained by the exercise of popular liberty, but who, appointed by Royal authority, had come to build around this great constitutional tree which sheltered our rights a protecting wall, against which, in 1873, the noisy anger of a whole political party spent itself in vain. What was the answer that Lord Dufferin gave to these men who were hungering after power, and who were mere puppets in the hands of American capitalists? What did the noble Lord say to the deputation that came, on the 13th August, 1873, to ask him not to follow the advice of his responsible Ministers? Here were his words, that they found in the official documents of the House:

“You then proceed to urge me, on grounds which are very fairly and forcibly stated, to decline the advice which has been unanimously tendered to me by my responsible Ministers, and to refuse to prorogue Parliament; in other words, you require me to dismiss them from my counsels; for, gentlemen, you must be aware that this would be the necessary result of my assenting to your recommendation.

“Gentlemen, the situation we have been discussing is one of great anxiety and embarrassment, but I cannot but hope that, on a calm retrospect of the various considerations to be kept in view, you will come to the conclusion that, in determining to be guided by the advice of my Ministers, on the present occasion—in other words, in declining to act as though the charges which have been advanced against them were already proven, and in adhering to arrangements upon the faith of which many of your colleagues are absent from their places, I have adopted the course most in accordance with the maxims of

constitutional government, and with what is due to those whom the Parliament of Canada has recommended to my confidence."

He would now give the clearest and most succinct recapitulation possible of this great question, to wit, the line of conduct the Crown ought to follow with regard to those whom popular confidence had designated as the advisers and responsible Ministers of the Sovereign. Here, again, he would borrow the words of Lord Dufferin, who had set forth this constitutional principle before an attentive and intelligent audience that had enthusiastically manifested its approval :

"My only guiding star in the conduct and maintenance of my official relations with your public men, is the Parliament of Canada. I, gentlemen, believe in Parliament, no matter which way it votes, and to those men alone whom the deliberate will of the confederated Parliament of the Dominion may assign to me as my responsible advisers, can I give my confidence."

This doctrine had been sanctioned by high authority for the British Government by the pen of the Earl of Kimberley, had given their solemn approbation to the conduct of Lord Dufferin, and in order that nothing might be wanting in this unanimous concert, he would quote this last strain brought by a far-off echo ; it was in *L'Événement* of the 12th of September, 1874, that it was to be found :—

"What are they (the Lieutenant-Governors) to do when they are without a Cabinet, as Lord Dufferin after the resignation of Sir John, and Mr. Caron after that of Mr. Ouimet? They must then, without paying any attention to the opinions or ideas of the Government they represent, call upon the leader of the party who has unquestionably the majority of Parliament to form a new Ministry."

Did the House know who was the author of this profession of constitutional faith? It was none other than one of the present responsible advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, and who, before the treason of the 2nd March, 1878, was one of his irresponsible advisers. He was then called Mr. François Langelier, advocate. He now styled himself the Hon. Mr. Langelier. The treason of the 2nd March and the political whirlwind that followed had made of him a Commissioner of Crown Lands, and now that Liberal extravagance had emptied the

Treasury of the Province, and that the office of Treasurer had become a sinecure, public rumour had it that the author of the lines just quoted had been put at the head of the Finance Department. He thought that he had established to the satisfaction of the House the true constitutional doctrine. By the foregoing study the following principles were made evident :—1st. The Governor-General was the Queen's delegate, but he did not represent here all the powers of the Sovereign ; 2nd. A Lieutenant-Governor was a public officer, to whom the Queen, on one hand, and the Governor-General on the other, granted certain powers defined in his commission ; 3rd. Outside of their commission, the Governor-General and the Lieutenant-Governors had no powers except those conferred upon them by statutory and constitutional law ; 4th. From the double standpoint of statutory and constitutional law, the Queen had more power than the Governor-General, and a Lieutenant-Governor had less than the Governor-General ; 5th. The Sovereign, he whose powers were the greatest, was obliged, in his dealings with his Ministry, to respect the will of the people clearly manifested through Parliament. The Governor, having a double duty to perform, a duty to the Sovereign and a duty to those whom he governed on behalf of the Queen, should so govern the colonies as to respect the popular will as clearly expressed by Parliament, without compromising in any way the interests of the British Crown. The same principle should guide the Lieutenant-Governors. That was what had been demonstrated by the Royal Commissions, by the Statutes and by competent writers on constitutional laws. What remained to be shown? Hardly twenty months ago, on the 26th of June, 1877, in the Music Hall at Quebec, a numerous audience was gathered together in order to listen "to the recognised leader of the Lower Canadian Liberals," to use the words of the author of the introduction to the "Speech on Canada's Political Liberalism." What did this leader say then?—

"We French-Canadians are a conquered race. It is a sorrowful truth to tell, but it is the truth. But, if we are a conquered race, we have also made a conquest, the conquest of liberty. We are a free people; we are

in a minority, but all our rights, all our privileges, are preserved. Now, what is the cause of this liberty? It is the Constitution which has been obtained for us by our fathers, and which we enjoy to-day. We have a Constitution which places the government of the country in the hands of the people; we have a Constitution that has been granted us for our own protection. We have not more rights, nor more privileges, but we have as many rights, and as many privileges as the other races that form with us the Canadian community."

He would congratulate the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) on having spoken in this strain, and for having publicly proclaimed on this memorable occasion that "We have a Constitution that places the Government in the hands of the people, a Constitution that has been granted us for our own protection." He regretted, however, that this expression of opinion of the recognised leader of Lower Canadian Liberals had not penetrated as far as Spencer Wood, and struck the attention of the Jove who there sat in state, and wished that at each motion of his terrible brows the Province of Quebec should be seized with fear and trembling. He regretted that these sound notions of constitutional law had not been known, or had been forgotten, or held in contempt, by the man whose odious conduct no one could defend. And what had been this conduct? for that was the subject next to be examined. Since 1867, when Confederation was established, the Province of Quebec, left to herself, had found in her own strength and in her own resources, the elements required for her development, her prosperity, and her well-being. Her sons were living happily, conducted, as they were, by prudent legislators and honest Lieutenant-Governors, protected by wise institutions, learning to love the sweet tranquility of a new political life, they, who lately had known all the tempests and rigours of politics, were growing attached, by bonds of noble affection, to the Mother Country, that gave them liberty, hailing with respect the Royal Standard that protected them, and ready to defend, at the price of their blood, the traditions of a glorious past, and the inestimable advantages of the present situation. How long did this happiness last? Three times, in 1867, in 1871, and in 1875, the

MR. LANDRY.

people were called to the polls, and three times during this first decade of the Confederation, or, rather, of the self-government of the Provinces, the people of the Province of Quebec had to choose their legislators. They exercised their electoral rights under the eye of the law, and in accordance with constitutional principles, and three times the people had to congratulate themselves upon the wisdom of their choice. On the one hand, the Federal Government had sent to the Province of Quebec, as Lieutenant-Governors, men of the greatest capacity, men whose names did not raise the anger of the people, whose antecedents were a warrant of the wisdom and the loyalty that were to be expected and required from them. He had known these men who the Canadians of the Province of Quebec, without any distinction of origin, would always remember. They were two. One of them had gone down to the grave, wept by the people; the other still lived, respected by all. They were two; and the people of the Province of Quebec pronounced with pride the names of Sir Narcisse Fortunat Belleau, and of the lamented René Edouard Caron. Who had succeeded to him whom death had taken so soon from his people? In the month of December, 1876, there arrived in Quebec, coming from this very city, the delegate of the Mackenzie Administration. He had come with the undeniable mission of governing the Province of Quebec according to the views of the Federal Government; he had come with the solemn warning that, if he did not conform himself to the views of the Federal Executive, he would expose himself to dismissal, the only punishment worthy of such a grave offence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. LANDRY asked what signified these recriminations, what was the meaning of these denials? Had he stated something that he was not able to prove; had he not expressed the opinion of Mr. Letellier's friends? He would make one quotation. He regretted, for the sake of the hon. gentlemen who had contradicted him, to be obliged to take from their own hands the shaft that he was going to shoot at

them. This was what the Hon. Mr. Langelier, now one of the responsible Ministers of the present Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, had said in *L'Événement* of the 7th September, 1874 :—

“The Lieutenant-Governor is the officer, the representative of the Federal Executive in the Local Government. He is there to govern the Province on behalf of the Federal Government. He should therefore govern it according to the views of this Government.”

And Mr. Langelier added, further on in this same correspondence, still speaking of the Lieutenant-Governor, the following :—

“He must endeavour, in his conduct, to conform himself to the views of the Federal Executive, whose officer he is. If he does not do so, he will be negligent of his first duty as a public officer, that is, fidelity to his legitimate superiors, and he will expose himself to dismissal, which is the only punishment worthy of so grave an offence.”

And still further on, in the same correspondence, entitled “The position of Lieutenant-Governors,” Mr. Langelier added these words that were so full of meaning, and explained so well the subsequent action of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, that he would draw the particular attention of the House to this audacious and singular interpretation of constitutional law :—

“We believe that he (Lieutenant-Governor Caron) will bear in mind that at this moment (in 1874) he is not the representative in the Government of the Province of Quebec, of the Conservative party, but the officer of a Liberal Government. He must, in forming his Cabinet, endeavour, as much as he can, to make the views of the Federal Ministry prevail, whilst summoning Ministers that will command the confidence of the Province. It is evident that he would be guilty of a grave dereliction of duty were he to do what the Conservative wire-pullers desire; he would be guilty of such a serious breach of faith towards his superiors that he would be unworthy of the position he occupies, and would render his immediate dismissal a duty for the Federal Government.”

In a subsequent correspondence, published in *L'Événement* of the 12th of September, 1874, five days later, consequently, Mr. Langelier came back to the charge, and said, speaking of this famous doctrine that he had just enunciated :—

“Well, this doctrine, far from repudiating it, we find it so unquestionable that we do not understand how it can be seriously discussed. If any fault can be found with it, it is because it does not go far enough in the enumeration of the duties of the Lieutenant-Governor towards the Federal Executive.”

Those were the opinions entertained in 1874 by the very men who, in 1876, were to become the illegal advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, and whom a violation of constitutional government had made the present advisers of the same Lieutenant-Governor. He was right then in saying that the present Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, Mr. Letellier, had come to Quebec with the solemn warning that he was to govern the Province according to the views of the Federal Executive as an officer of a Liberal Government. That was what he had done. His whole conduct was there to prove what he said. From the very day that he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, until the day when, trampling under foot the Constitution and the rights of the people, he dismissed a Ministry that the votes of the people had put in power, he had secretly worked in the interests of his party, and he had been constantly waging a disloyal war upon his Ministers. The documents submitted to the House gave the official history of this shameful proceeding. He would not make any comments thereon, he would not enter into the details of this internal struggle wherein the man who pretended to be invested with the prerogatives of the Crown, cravenly entrenched behind an inviolability that he thought would never end, struck under shelter at those whom the popular will had given him as his responsible advisers. There was a fact, however, that he could not pass over, for it alone pictured the man who had been imposed upon the Province and brought to light all the turpitude of his conduct. He alluded to the well known fact, known in the official documents under the name of the Montmagny affair. He owed to the electors of this beautiful county the great honour of representing them in this House, and he thought he would be believed when he said that he knew, in all its details, this question that the Lieutenant-Governor, were it only out of respect to himself, should never

have mentioned in the hearing of intelligent people. These were the facts. On the 8th of January, 1877, an election took place in the south ward of the village of Montmagny. There were two candidates, Mr. Jules Belanger, and Eugène Fournier. A ballot was asked for and granted, and the president of the meeting began the registration of the votes. The election was illegally closed by the president, and Mr. Eugène Fournier was proclaimed elected councillor. This election was contested. The councillor, Eugène Fournier, came before the Court and declared that he did not maintain the validity of his election. The Court forthwith rendered judgment, ordering a new election, but after notice given, as required by law. What was this notice? It was only necessary to consult the Municipal Code of the Province of Quebec. The law required that the notice given should be a public notice, failing which there could be no meeting. But how was public notice given? The law thus indicated it:—

“Every notice given under the provisions of this code, or for the orders of a municipal council, or for municipal purposes, must be drawn up and published or served in accordance with the formalities prescribed in this chapter.

“Every public notice convening any public meeting or for any object whatever, must be given and published seven clear days before the day appointed for such meeting or other proceeding, except in cases otherwise provided for.”

Such was the law. Now what were the facts? The election ordered by the Court was to take place on the 19th of February. The public notice required by law ought to have been given and posted up on the eleventh of the month at the latest. This notice was not given until the 17th, in the evening, that was to say that between the day of the publication of the notice, the 17th, and the day of the holding of the meeting, the 19th, there was wanting, not only the delay required for public notices, but there was not even the delay required for the serving of a special notice. Therefore, according to law, there had been no public notice given, and, as a consequence, the meeting could not be held on the 19th, and it was not held. On the morning of the 19th February, before the hour appointed by the Court

for the holding of the meeting, Mr. Eugène Hamond, whom the Court itself had appointed president of the said election, received the document which he read:—[*Vide* Return 19, House of Commons, p. 104.] In the face of such a document the president of the election could not plead ignorance. The law was there with its formal and imperative provisions, and the president was told to do his duty. Captain Hamond had done his duty. After having ascertained, to his entire satisfaction, that the public notice, as required by the 362nd clause of the municipal code, had not been given, he refused to hold or to preside at a meeting that the same clause of the law declared could not take place. In such an event, it was the duty of the presiding officer at such election, or of the secretary or treasurer of the Corporation, to inform the Lieutenant-Governor of such fact or facts by a letter addressed to the Provincial Secretary, within fifteen days after the time fixed for such election. And here again he remarked, with pleasure, that Captain Hamond had done his duty, as was shown by a document which he read:—[*Vide* Return 19, p. 104.] The law then provided that the Lieutenant-Governor, as soon as such information was communicated to him, should appoint from among the qualified persons in the municipality, an equal number of councillors to the number required to be elected, or a sufficient number to complete the number of councillors required. Invested with the powers granted him by the law, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council was preparing to appoint a councillor, and to fill, by an executive act, the place that the meeting of the electors might have filled, had it been legally convened. But the Liberals of Montmagny were in a flutter, and they gave themselves an immense amount of trouble, and this House would be not a little surprised to learn all the details of this charming intrigue, which had procured the county of Montmagny an unexpected visit from the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec. On the 19th of February, the very day appointed by the Court for the meeting that was to elect a municipal councillor, after the statement made by Captain Hamond that he could not legally hold any such meeting or preside over it, a few jokers

of the village met together in a room, allowed one Bernatchez to proclaim himself president, *ex officio* it would seem, and there unceremoniously, and with closed doors, unanimously declare that Mr. Eugène Fourrier should be municipal councillor. In testimony whereof he referred to a report:—[*Vide* Return 19, p. 106.] This singular document was sent to the Lieutenant-Governor. Here began the working of two distinct influences, opposed one to the other, and originating in two different directions, the one having its source in a sound interpretation of responsible government; the other of parasitic growth, springing up in the foulest depths of society. Which of these two influences was the Lieutenant-Governor to submit to. The sequel would show. He (Mr. Landry) lived in the county he had the honour of representing, and he took enough interest in local and municipal affairs to know, from day to day, any event that might affect his electoral division. Now, in those days, it was said in the county: "We will have for municipal councillor the one appointed by the Government." And the Liberals made answer: "Beg your pardon, gentlemen; if you have the Government on your side, we have the Lieutenant-Governor on ours. Mr. Letellier is our man, and he will never consent to sign the Order in Council." Not only was the Lieutenant-Governor thus spoken of, but he was confidentially written to. Persons from the county went up to Quebec, and knocked at the door of Spencer Wood, and they were admitted into the gilded parlours, into the inmost secrets, into those little plottings, that were but the prelude to that deeper plot that was to end in the *coup d'état* of the 2nd March, 1878. That was what had been said and done in his county, and he was ashamed to confess that the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec was the leading spirit in these petty intrigues. It was stated in Mr. Letellier's factum that, on the 3rd of March, Attorney-General Angers recommended the appointment of Jules Belanger, who was accordingly appointed on the 7th of the same month. What took place with respect to this appointment, between the 3rd, the day on which the recommendation had been

made, and the 7th, the day upon which the appointment was made? The Lieutenant-Governor himself had told the House, and he would quote his own words:—[*Vide* Return 19, p. 13.] The responsible advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor had got the best of it over his secret advisers. But the latter renewed the attack, and, headed by the Lieutenant-Governor himself, who animated them, they made another attempt. Mr. Bernatchez, *ex officio* magistrate that had already been referred to, wrote, not to the Provincial Secretary, but to the Lieutenant-Governor himself, a letter, which bore the date of the 10th of March, 1877; but he thought that it was a little after midnight, and that it was on the morning of the 11th when Mr. Bernatchez signed it. [*Vide* Return 19, p. 110.] And it must not be thought that this letter was mailed and sent to the seat of government. Oh, no. But Mr. Bernatchez took his letter, read it over attentively, compared it with a rough copy that a grey-headed lawyer held in his hand—for this had taken place at Montmagny, on the 10th of March, in the middle of the night, in the dwelling of a peaceable advocate—the letter read, the lawyer took it and gave it to one of his relations, who was in the waiting-room. Now, if the House would like to know who this relation was, he would state that it was, in the first place, the lawyer's cousin, and, in the second place, the cousin of all the cousins, the Lieutenant-Governor himself, Mr. Luc Letellier de St. Just, who had gone down on the 10th of March, 1877, one Saturday evening, to the county of Montmagny, there to work, under cover of darkness, against his own Ministers, being aided in this shameful action by the Mayor of Montmagny and several other individuals whose names, out of respect for this House, he would not mention. The Lieutenant-Governor spent the whole of the following Sunday at Montmagny; he was waiting to leave as he had come, during the night. Mr. Bernatchez's letter did not arrive at Quebec until the 13th, and, in order to get it to the Provincial Secretary's office, it had to be sent for at Spencer Wood. It would be remarked that this letter merely informed the Lieutenant-Governor that Eugène

Fournier had been sworn, and had taken his seat as councillor. This assertion, however, did not prevent the Lieutenant-Governor from knowing a great many things, and of being well acquainted with what was going on at Montmagny, at least if his factum was to be believed, for a statement was therein made which he would read :—[*Vide* Return 19, p. 14.] He would have occasion to revert, in a moment, to this inordinate love of the Lieutenant-Governor for his great principle of non-intervention of the Executive in matters appertaining to the Courts. But he would not now go outside the Montmagny affair. This letter of the 10th of March, written under the dictation of the Lieutenant-Governor himself, was submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown, and their report was brought to the knowledge of the Lieutenant-Governor :—[*Vide* Return 19, p. 107.] Mr. Bernatchez received a reply in accordance with this opinion. But the secret advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor redoubled their efforts, and finally triumphed by having the appointment of Jules Belanger set aside. Such was the whole history of this Montmagny affair. And now he maintained that, on that occasion, the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was unconstitutional, and a culpable intervention in the exercise of the judicial power, and that, further, that conduct was abnegated by the subsequent action of the Lieutenant-Governor himself. It was unconstitutional, because it granted to certain individuals an influence which belonged only to the advisers of the Crown. That was an opinion which was upheld by all writers of any weight on the subject of constitutional law. He could not quote them all, but would read what Todd said on the subject, at page 50 of the first volume of his work :

“ They (the King's friends) formed a distinct party, but their principles and positions were inconsistent with constitutional government. Their services to the King were not even confined to counsel or political intrigue, but were made use of so as to influence the deliberations of Parliament. By their means the King caballed against his Ministers, thwarted their measures in Parliament, and, on more than one occasion, effected their overthrow. By the encouragement which he afforded to these irregular practices, it is undeniable that George III violated a foundation principle of the Constitution, and hindered the progress of parlia-

mentary government, which, when faithfully carried out, should foster and promote reciprocal confidence between the Sovereign and his responsible advisers.”

And May added :

“ As he governs by responsible Ministers, he must recognise their responsibilities. They are not only his Ministers, but also the public servants of a free country.” [May's Constitutional History of England. Vol. I, p. 25.]

Not only was the action of the Lieutenant-Governor unconstitutional, in that it gave to irresponsible advisers a degree of influence which was not, but should have been, possessed by the only advisers whom the people gave to the Crown, but it was also culpable intervention, in that it arrested the action of the judicial power. And yet, in his memorandum, Mr. Letellier said and maintained in every line that his invariable principle was that the executive power should never be substituted for the judicial power. What took place in the Montmagny affair? The effect of executive intervention was precisely to arrest, or rather to prevent, the exercise of the judicial power, as was proved by Articles 346 and 350 of the Municipal Code. What were the facts? The pretended election of Fournier took place on the 19th February, 1877; to contest it, the petition, or at least a copy of the petition, would have to be presented within thirty days specified by the law, that was to say, between the 19th February and the 21st March. But they had no cause to contest it, because the Government, not recognising it, had proceeded, by the appointment of Belanger on the 7th March, to fill up the vacancy which existed in the council of the village of Montmagny. But on the 27th March the revocation of the appointment of Belanger came upon them. The delay for contesting the election of his opponent had expired on the 21st. Consequently that intervention of the executive authority deprived them of the power of contesting, and causing to be annulled the pretended election of Fournier. The action of the Lieutenant-Governor was therefore an act of culpable intervention, as it prevented the exercise of judicial authority. But there was more yet; and the very principle on

which the Lieutenant-Governor pretended to rely, in March, 1877, had since been trodden beneath His Honour's feet. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) proved that to the House when he related the history of the Chambly affair. He (Mr. Landry) could give a further proof of the assertion. In 1875, he solicited the votes of the electors of the county of Montmagny; a majority sent him to the Local House of the Province of Quebec. His election was contested and annulled, and the Court, not unanimously, but by a majority of those composing it, found him personally guilty of corrupt practices. For the present, he should say nothing of the composition of the Court, nor of the singular judgment rendered by it. He knew how to wait, and the future would indubitably point out his line of action. Suffice it to say, for the moment, that he never accepted that judgment. He had to submit, that was all. By the provincial law, a person found guilty of corrupt practices by an Election Court could not, for the next seven years, hold any office in the gift of the Crown. When he was found guilty of corrupt practices, he was a Justice of the Peace. Serious doubts were raised as to the penalty prescribed by the law. He resolved to have these settled by appealing to the Courts for a decision on the subject. He acted as a Justice of the Peace, and at once caused that official act to be contested. A suit was instituted, and the following question came before the Court: Is a law which renders a man incapable of holding an office under the Crown, when passed by a Provincial Legislature, within the legislative power of that Provincial Legislature? That case was still pending before the Courts. What was the action of Mr. Letellier, who had declared that his unalterable principle was non-intervention of the executive power in all matters within the province of the judicial authority. The following document condemned and branded him:—

“ PROVINCE OF QUEBEC,
“ SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
“ QUEBEC, Aug. 5, 1878.

“ SIR,—I have the honour to inform you that by Order in Council approved on the 2nd inst., His Excellency has been pleased to cancel your appointment as a member of the Council

of Agriculture, as you have become incapable of filling that office in consequence of the judgment rendered in May, 1876, in the matter of the controverted election for the Electoral District of Montmagny.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir,

“ Your obed't servant,

“ PH. J. JOLICOEUR,
“ Assistant Secretary.

“ A. C. P. R. Landry, Esq.,
“ St. Pierre, Rivière du Sud,
“ County of Montmagny.”

If this was not intervention by the executive power of the most direct nature in a matter not only within the purview of the judicial power, but also which had been brought before the Courts, where it was still pending; if this was not an abnegation by his own action of that persistent declaration of principle which he unceasingly paraded, then he (Mr. Landry) was willing to admit that Mr. Letellier was the most logical of men. He referred this singular proceeding of the Lieutenant-Governor to the enlightened judgment of this House and of the country to decide upon its real value, and to classify it according to its deserts. His conduct throughout the whole of this Montmagny affair, stamped as it was with unconstitutionality, contempt of his advisers, and culpable intervention of the executive authority, would, in his opinion, suffice to obtain from this House the condemnation of Mr. Letellier de St. Just. That was not the only grievance. Several members of this House had discussed, with great force and perspicuity, the other questions resulting from the documents now before them. To review them again would be to trespass upon the patience of the House. There was a fact, however, on which he felt bound to lay stress. When Mr. Letellier turned out a Ministry sustained by a majority of twenty-two in a House of sixty-five members, the representatives of the people, before the formation of the new July Administration, availing themselves of a right which the Constitution conferred upon them, communicated to Mr. Letellier the opinion of the Legislature of Quebec. It had been maintained—Mr. Letellier himself had written it in so many words—that the Lieutenant-Governor might choose any Prime Minister he pleased since Mr.

De Boucherville had declined to advise him on the subject. But Mr. Letellier had forgotten, or rather he wilfully ignored, under those serious circumstances, the following, which he would quote from Bowyer in his work on Constitutional Law, page 137 :—

“ It follows that the two Houses of Parliament have a right to advise the Crown on all matters of State, including the unfitness of particular persons to be Ministers of State. The two Houses of Parliament cannot point out to the Crown what persons shall be placed in office, any more than they can appoint Ministers and other public functionaries, because that would degrade the dignity as well as destroy the independence of the Sovereign and the balance of the Constitution ; but they are bound to advise the Crown to dismiss evil or incompetent councillors ; and of their doing so, either expressly or by implication, there are many instances in one history.”

In accordance with these principles, both Houses of the Quebec Legislature, the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, passed a resolution by a large majority of both those Houses, advising the Lieutenant-Governor not to select his Ministry from among the ranks of the minority. Did Mr. Letellier listen to that constitutional admonition ? No, he was deaf, and forfeited the right to cite, in his favour, Mr. DeBoucherville's silence. Who in this House would venture to believe that Mr. Letellier would have listened to the advice of his ex-Prime Minister, when he refused to hear the voice of a whole people regularly expressed through that of its representatives ? Here, again, Mr. Letellier had broken through our Constitution, and had entirely misunderstood the principles which should prevail in the formation of a Ministry, especially in a country enjoying a Constitution which vested the Government, as had been written by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), in the free suffrages of the people. He thought the House was now fully in possession of the facts, and had laid before it a complete statement of the case. He thought the only conclusion that could be arrived at was that Mr. Letellier was guilty, and that the motion of censure that had been placed in the Speaker's hands by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) should be adopted. Nobody in this House had yet dared to venture upon a justification of Mr. Letellier's conduct,—nobody had yet said

MR. LANDRY.

that he did right. He was not surprised at that prudent reserve, and he thoroughly understood why Mr. Letellier's defenders did not defend him at all. Instead of meeting the question straight in the face, instead of coming boldly forward and declaring that their man acted constitutionally, instead, in short, of defending Mr. Letellier's great political action, that great *coup d'état* which substituted an individual for responsible government, what did they find the Liberals saying ? That Mr. Letellier acted right ? Not at all. They told them they could not try this man, and, in support of their assertion, they adduced the four reasons following :—1st. Because the people of the Province of Quebec had already given a decision on the question ; 2nd. Because the Legislature of Quebec had likewise decided ; 3rd. Because the Federal Parliament itself, last year, gave a decision on the subject ; and lastly, because the interests of the Province of Quebec, its autonomy, precluded the intervention of the Federal power in Provincial questions. He should reply to these objections. As to the first, it was true that they had received the verdict of the people at the general elections in the month of May and the month of September last. But that verdict was in favour of the Conservatives in both instances. To be thoroughly convinced of this, it was only necessary to examine into the general and special characteristics, and the result of those two elections. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) yesterday evening maintained, and he added every possible emphasis to his assertion, that the general elections in May last were upon the basis alone of the constitutional question, that what the people of the Province of Quebec had to do was only to decide upon the action of the Lieutenant-Governor, and that upon that constitutional basis the action of the Lieutenant-Governor had received the approval of the people. He (Mr. Landry) did not share that opinion, and he regretted that he had thought proper to attempt to deceive this House by that assertion, which could not stand for a single instant before the documents which he was about to produce. In a manifesto signed by Mr. Joly himself, published in *L'Événement*

ment, of the 28th March, 1878, and scattered broadcast throughout every county in the Province of Quebec, Mr. Joly said :

"The new Cabinet declares that it abandons the Bill for the imposition of new taxes; it proposes to meet the engagements of the Province, and to carry out the undertakings to the execution of which the public faith is pledged by a system of economy and retrenchment which will relieve the people from the imposition of fresh burdens."

And, over his own signature, Mr. Joly concluded with these significant words :—

"Our opponents saw but one method of repairing the faults which they had committed during their prolonged administration—direct taxation; we see another means, which we have decided to adopt—economy. The Province must decide between the two."

Thus the new Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec himself decided the grounds of the struggle in the month of May last. "Behold taxation," he said, "and behold economy; the Province must decide between the two." And now let the hon. member for Quebec East venture to repeat in this House that the struggle took place exclusively on the constitutional question. Would he give his chief the lie? Would he give the whole "Reform Association of the District of Quebec" the lie? There was an association bearing that name at Quebec, and he did not think he was mistaken when he asserted that the president of that association (Mr. Larue) was now a member of this House. On the day following that on which Mr. Joly published his manifesto, the Reform Association likewise published, on the 29th March, a long election manifesto, and that curious document concluded with the following paragraph, which showed with what pains it was endeavoured to hoist the paternal Mr. Letellier upon his pedestal of glory and affection for the people :—

"His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor thought that an increase of taxation might be avoided. The Crown believed that the majority of the people were opposed to measures which were brought forward without its sanction; the Lieutenant-Governor felt that it was impossible to sustain the action of his Ministers; * * * the Legislature was then prorogued, to be immediately dissolved, and now the sole and only question which the electors of the Province of Quebec have to decide is this:—Do they desire a system of enormous

extravagance or a system of wise economy, with an entire abandonment of Mr. De Boucherville's taxation policy?"

And in the face of these two documents, one signed by the Premier of the new Administration, and the other by the President and members of the Reform Association of the district of Quebec, the speakers on the Liberal side, one after another, assured them that the contest was upon the constitutional question. To make assertions of this description, something more than audacity was requisite, and he quite failed to understand how a man who had any regard for his reputation for veracity could, as the hon. member for Quebec East had done, bring forward an assertion which was contradicted by facts, and by the very signatures of his leaders and political friends. The May contest, therefore, was not upon the constitutional question, but upon the taxation question, a most unpopular one, as all would admit. In spite of this, the Joly Government was defeated before the people, who refused that Government a majority. And yet what influence was there not brought to bear? Since the commencement of this Session, it had fallen to him to make motions in this House for the production of certain documents. In this connection they had had some explanations, and he did not think he was making too strong a statement when he declared that he should be in a position to prove before a Committee that the most barefaced corruption was practised in the county of Rimouski, and that the Joly Government succeeded in carrying that county only by means of public moneys blindly expended. Notwithstanding enormous corruption, notwithstanding numerous promises of remission of statute labour, and of the impossible deepening of certain harbours, such as that of Matane for instance, notwithstanding the prospect of having a wharf at every point, notwithstanding the whole influence of two Governments, anything but scrupulous in the means which they employed, nothing less than the casting vote of the Returning Officer was requisite to decide the victory. That casting vote was that of a Conservative, but it was given in favour of the Liberal candidate, and this proved that

there were more than the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly who could vote against their opinions and the dictates of their consciences. In the county of Portneuf another member of the Joly Administration was elected, but his election was contested in consequence of most outrageous corruption, which the enquiry now going on was bringing to light in a manner which was most humiliating to Mr. Joly. And what was not done in the county of Gaspé? A man from the county of Megantic was selected as returning officer, and sent two hundred leagues from his home with special instructions. And what were those instructions? The seven or eight hundred electors of the Magdalen Islands were by the returning officer relieved from voting, and, thanks to this little retrenchment which took off 600 votes from the Conservative candidate, the county of Gaspé went Liberal. At St. Hyacinthe, the late Mr. Bachand got himself elected by a majority of 60 votes, and, some days later, un-pitying justice removed from that borrowed diadem 83 Liberal pearls. Mr. Bachand had been dead for five months, and the Liberal Government of Quebec had not yet ventured to call upon that electoral district to send another representative in place of the one removed by death. And in his own county of Montmagny, promises of every possible description, each more fallacious than the last, were flashed before the eyes of the electors, and he himself heard the Liberal leaders declare that, if the candidate of the Joly Government should succeed in carrying the county, three months would not pass away without gigantic works being commenced to deepen the harbour of Montmagny, and draw thither all the trade of England—to say nothing of that of China. The three months had passed away, and the trade of England had not been turned from its former channel. In all the counties of the Province, the law was disgracefully trampled under foot by this Government, which pretended to be its guardian, and, in spite of all, in spite of the hostile influence of two Governments, in spite of the most outrageous corruption, in spite of intimidation and violence reduced to a system, Mr. DeBoucherville's party, the Conservative party, came out of that

MR. LANDRY.

desperate struggle with a contingent of 34 votes; that was to say, the victory was theirs, and the people of Quebec energetically condemned the conduct of their Lieutenant-Governor by that majority of three votes, which was theirs when nightfall closed the first day of May. The people were a second time consulted in September last, and in that new struggle between the Conservative party and the Liberal party, they, in the Province of Quebec, at least, saw the question of the *coup d'état* again brought before the people. They discussed it afresh at the same time that they were labouring with heart and soul to secure the triumph of the National Policy. They had succeeded on both these points, and the people had sent them here on a two-fold mission, to labour for their welfare and to secure from this Parliament the punishment of the man who had trampled upon the rights and liberties of the people. Could it now be asserted that the people of the Province of Quebec had so pronounced themselves upon the question before this House, as to preclude any action on its part? Certainly not; and, if the people of Quebec had given a verdict at all, every one must admit that the sense of that verdict was to compel them to grant them the measure of justice they claimed, and which they had pledged themselves to, at every public meeting. The Legislature of Quebec had also dealt with this matter, and it was claimed that this House was thereby precluded from dealing with it to-day. When the Quebec Legislature met, after the general elections, in the month of May last, the first question the Legislative Assembly had to decide was the choice of its Speaker. The people had condemned the act of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, by electing 34 Conservatives to 31 Liberals. The Joly Government were therefore beaten in advance. In order to parry the blow, the Lieutenant-Governor himself threw open the doors of Spencer Wood to admit two members, Messrs. Price and Turcotte. These two gentlemen had presented themselves as Conservatives and were elected by Conservative counties. Mr. Price, it was true, was in Europe when the county of Chicoutimi selected him as its representative, but everybody knew that his brother presented

him to the people as the candidate of the Conservative party. Their friends went into the county and carried on, against the speakers and candidates of the Liberal party, one of the most hotly-fought contests ever witnessed in the united counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. The Conservatives were victorious with the people. As to Mr. Turcotte, the Province of Quebec understood the matter perfectly well, and, if any member of the House had the slightest doubt as to the politics, at that time, of the member for Three Rivers, the letter he would now read must make the matter perfectly clear :

"THREE RIVERS, 2nd April, 1878.

"MR. EDITOR,—I have never given authority to any person whomsoever to publish or announce through the press that I would support the Joly-Bachand Government. I never even thought of it. I intend to canvass the electors as a Conservative, consequently I shall be opposed to the Joly Government.

"ARTHUR TURCOTTE."

This frank declaration earned for Mr. Turcotte the honour of an election by acclamation in that good city of Three Rivers, which seldom refused to extend that advantage to those who boldly affirmed their principles. Well, Messrs. Price and Turcotte were invited to Spencer Wood, and the Lieutenant-Governor himself, throwing aside all dignity and sense of honour, purchased with the money of the Province at least one of those members, and induced them both to vote for his new Government. And yet Mr. Turcotte had then just written another letter which must be his eternal condemnation, and which stamped the brow of that traitor with shame and dishonour :

"THREE RIVERS, 30th May, 1878.

"MY DEAR FRIEND,—You know me to be a Conservative and that I mean to remain a Conservative. I have accepted the candidature of the Joly Government because I know it has the majority, but if only my vote were wanting to cause me to be elected I would vote against myself.

"Yours truly,

"ARTHUR TURCOTTE."

The opening of the Houses took place on the fourth of June.

"The Conservative members," said the papers of the day, "met at ten o'clock in the Committee room at Quebec. Messrs.

Price and Turcotte were absent from the meeting. Some one assured the meeting that Mr. Price would not vote in the election of a Speaker, and at half-past eleven Mr. Turcotte wrote, in presence of a Conservative member, to Mr. Joly, that he refused the Speakership. The cause was, therefore, safe, the defeat of the Ministry certain.

"On receipt of Mr. Turcotte's letter, Mr. Joly announced to his friends his determination to resign. A correspondent of the *Witness* published the fact, and was not contradicted.

"The sitting of the House began at three o'clock. An immense crowd filled to overflowing the galleries, the lobbies, and the neighbourhood of the House of Assembly. Mr. Price was in his seat, and Mr. Turcotte occupied a seat behind Mr. Irvine.

"At two o'clock, Mr. Chapleau and some of the leading members of the Conservative party were informed that Mr. Turcotte had given in—that he had withdrawn his letter of refusal, and that Mr. Price supported him for the Speakership.

"Mr. Joly nominated Mr. Turcotte, and made a few remarks, which revealed his embarrassment and sense of shame. Mr. Chapleau replied, and, in a crushing speech, gibbeted the Judas who will carry to his latest hour the brand of his dishonour and his treason.

"The vote was taken. The House divided equally : 32 to 32. Mr. Turcotte voted for himself, and took possession of the Speaker's Chair, in the name of the Joly Government—the Government which, in order to secure his election, he had bound himself to oppose.

"What had occurred after Mr. Turcotte's letter informing Mr. Joly of his refusal? No one can say precisely, but one thing is certain : Mr. Turcotte was taken at noon to the residence of the Lieutenant-Governor, and, when he left that plotting place, his mind was made up to betray his promises, his friends, his pledges."

Since they were considering this sad page of their annals, he could not refrain from quoting the strong expressions used by Mr. Fabre, now a member of the Liberal party, on the 14th October, 1863, in stigmatising the conduct of another traitor, less guilty than Mr. Turcotte rendered himself on the 4th June last. If the names were substituted one for the other, that of Turcotte for that of O'Halloran, and that of the Joly Government for the Government of that day, nothing could be more appropriate :

"We ask all who put country before party, we ask all honest men, of whatsoever party they may be : is there one page of our history they would more gladly blot out than that which shall tell the story of these two months of Session and these few months of power ; was there ever a Session in which intrigue and

corruption so openly triumphed over principle and honour, where the country was so openly sold to Judases by political Jews? Show me the man of honour, the Canadian, outside the corrupt sphere of the present Government, who has not felt a pang of shame, as a citizen of Canada, at the fall of Mr. Sicotte, and the conspiracy hatched against the reputation of our public men by the present Ministry, and who would not, at any price, were it even the sacrifice of his every political aspiration, have averted the shame, the indelible blot on our race, our country, our history?

"After such a crime it seemed impossible for the Ministry to fall any lower; but they surpassed themselves in the purchasing of O'Halloran. This is the first time in a constitutional country that such a bargain, which its authors have barely disavowed, for form sake, before the public, has determined the fate of a Ministry.

"Thanks to God, such crimes cannot be accomplished with impunity in a country such as ours. Mr. O'Halloran is paying the penalty of his treason. Degraded as he is, he was unable to bear the contempt of his colleagues, and left Quebec the day after his vote; but everywhere he goes he will find himself an object of public contempt. He will be repudiated by his constituents; he has lost any position he ever held amongst his fellow-citizens, and that he is not already out of the House is simply because there is no law for the punishment of such an act of treason as his, but he is beyond the pale of society. This is the proper way to deal with traitors in a free country whose only safeguard is public opinion."

Those words needed no comment. After the first vote which divided the House of Assembly into two parties of equal strength—32 to 32,—came the debate on the Address. The Conservative party moved a vote of censure against the Joly Government; the motion was adopted, and the Joly Government condemned, because it had been formed out of the ranks of the minority, and was still supported only by a minority of the representation. But it must not be forgotten that there were two Houses in the Quebec Legislature—the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly. The formation of the Joly Government was condemned in both Houses; in the Assembly by a majority of the members, and in the other House by an all but unanimous vote. And, in the face of all this, were they to be told that they could not deal with the motion now before the House? Those who said so did not quite know the position they took. Did they mean, perchance, that they must not intervene to-day, because the Legislature

of Quebec had pronounced in favour of Mr. Joly's Government, since the latter was still at the head of affairs? The answer to that was, that it was in spite of that condemnation, that Mr. Joly was clinging to office, and that a moment's success did not, in any way whatever, justify the crime which had been committed. Did they, on the contrary, maintain that they must not intervene because the Quebec Legislature had deemed it sufficient to condemn the formation of the Government, without destroying its existence, and that that course taken by the Provincial Legislature would be itself condemned, if this House undertook, to-day, to censure the act of the Lieutenant-Governor. In that case, it would be easy to answer that they had a right which the Provincial Legislature in no way possessed,—that they could censure the Lieutenant-Governor, inasmuch as he was an officer of the Dominion, while the House of Assembly of the Province of Quebec had not even the right to pronounce irreverently the name of the Lieutenant-Governor, who was, so far as that House was concerned, nothing less than the personification of the Crown. The position taken by the Quebec Legislature could not, then, in any way impede the course of action of this House. On the contrary, its twofold condemnation of the Joly Government on the ground that he had formed it from the ranks of the minority, could not but urge on the performance of the duty which devolved upon this House to-day, of punishing the man who was the instigator and the perpetrator of that culpable violation of the Constitution. Their opponents had a third objection, but a most feeble one. "You should not," they said, "adopt the motion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) because the House has already, in April of last year, dealt with a precisely similar motion." In other words, the case has been decided and cannot be taken up again. As a matter of fact, he maintained that Parliament had not pronounced. Was Parliament a Parliament if they took away the Senate? Now, if the House of Commons did not consent last year to condemn the unconstitutional act of Mr. Letellier, the Senate did not hesitate to do so. Could it be said, in the face of

conflicting decisions, the one by the Senate and the other by the House of Commons, that Parliament had pronounced. And, if they maintained, in view of the resolution of the House of Commons, that Parliament had decided in the negative, why could he not maintain that Parliament had pronounced in the affirmative, and offer as his proof the decision of the Senate? Parliament then had not pronounced. But, taking for a moment the decision of the House of Commons, leaving aside that of the Senate, he maintained, further, that the House of Commons itself, by its vote of last year, did not pronounce itself on the merits of the question now before it. The young members of this House had read the speeches delivered last year, and they were heard by all who then sat within these walls. What did those speeches tell them, from first to last—and he now referred only to speeches made by those who undertook to defend Mr. Letellier? They alleged that it was inopportune for them to give an opinion upon the merits of the motion then submitted to the House. The people of Quebec were in the midst of an electoral contest, and it was not by any means proper to express an opinion which might bias that of the people, either to one side or the other. Was their doing so passing judgment on the merits of the question, declaring the guilt or innocence of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec? He was correct, therefore, when he stated that the Federal Parliament had never pronounced an opinion upon the question now submitted for them to deliberate upon; but, had it done so, had it condemned or absolved the Lieutenant-Governor, he maintained, in turn, that they had always the right of asking from this Parliament that it should turn its attention to the redressing of their grievances. Todd said:

“The two Houses of Parliament collectively represent the whole community, and are the Great Council of the nation, whilst Ministers are merely the Council of the Prince. They are, therefore, entitled to approach the Sovereign with advice or remonstrance upon all affairs of state, and, in regard to every grievance under which any subjects of the realm may be suffering, it (Parliament) may investigate the conduct of public officers.”

Now, the Lieutenant-Governor was a Federal officer, as was clearly shown by section 58 of the British North America Act. They had, therefore, and always had, the undeniable right to examine into, and pass judgment on, his conduct, and this was what they were doing to-day. And, as for those who opposed them to-day, and hindered them in the exercise of this right, what had they done, Session after Session, in the Quebec Assembly? They asked for the abolition of dual representation. Session after Session, in this House, they asked for the adoption of the system of voting by ballot. Were they disheartened because, once, twice, or five times even, the House here, and the Assembly at Quebec, had rejected their request? No; but, constant in their hope, they returned to the charge, and nobody denied their right to do so. The meanest elector in the country might require his representative to introduce a Private Bill into this House, and, if this Private Bill did not pass this year, he could come back again next year, and every subsequent year, so long as it remained unpassed, and nobody here could complain of his exercising this right. But, because the people of an entire Province were suffering from an infringement of their rights and privileges, their voices were not to be heard; they did not wish to grant to them, collectively, what they would not dare to refuse to the humblest of their members individually. He could not bring himself to believe in such a denial of justice, and, if there was among the members of this House a single man who could support such a line of conduct, let him rise from his seat, in order that the people might learn who he was, and never send him back to these precincts again. He came now to the last objection, which their opponents had formulated almost in these words:—“The interests of the Province of Quebec are concerned in preserving her autonomy, and will not permit of Federal intervention in Local affairs.” This was the most specious of objections, and could not stand a moment. No one advocated more strongly than he did the policy of non-intervention in Local affairs by the Federal power, but was it common sense to describe in such terms the vote of censure which they were shortly going to

pass? What was the position of a Lieutenant-Governor? He had already defined it, when he stated that a Governor had a double rôle to play,—one character in presence of his principal, the other when dealing with those with whom he transacted business in the name of his principal. He was irresponsible to the Province. Since we had responsible Ministers, it was the latter who answered to the people for all the acts of the Administrative. But it was none the less true that he was a Federal officer, and, consequently, responsible to the power that appointed him,—that was the Dominion Government. But it was the duty of this Government to watch attentively the actions of all those on whom they had bestowed any place or office, whatsoever, in the government of the State. Why should a Lieutenant-Governor, alone, escape this surveillance and this responsibility?—was it because he had more important duties to fulfil, and that the least negligence in performing them would entail the most serious consequences?—was it because he received a higher salary, that he ought to go unpunished, when he failed in his duty? But what did the law say on this subject? Mr. François Langelier would himself answer, and he took his reply from *L'Événement* of the 7th September, 1874 :

“According to section 59 of the Union Act of 1867,” said the Honourable the Commissioner of Crown Lands, if he is not yet the Treasurer of the Province, “according to section 59, the Lieutenant-Governors appointed after the first Session of the Parliament of Canada” (and they are all to-day in that position), “cannot be dismissed before they have served five years in office, except for reasons which must be communicated to them in writing within the month following their dismissal.

“The law does not enumerate these reasons, and in strictness the dismissal of a Lieutenant-Governor would be legal, whatever the cause assigned might be. But, still, the responsible advisers of the Governor-General should render an account of the dismissal to the Senate and to the House of Commons, and cause them to be satisfied with the reason given, since the law requires that the Governor-General should communicate it to them as soon as possible.”

This simple extract proved indubitably that the Liberals themselves recognised as belonging to the Dominion authorities this right of interference, which the law gave them. If the Dominion authorities

MR. LANDRY.

possesses the right of interference, who could hinder them, when they wished to exercise this right? It was perfectly ridiculous to speak in this place of the dangers with which their autonomy was threatened, when the question was simply the punishment of a prevaricating official. The Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec had violated the Constitution, and there were some who wished this attempt to go unpunished. But it was in the name of their autonomy, which he wished to ruin, that he (Mr. Landry) asked the House to adopt the motion now before it. To let the act go unpunished would be to nourish a continual threat, and the maintenance of the Lieutenant-Governor in a position of which he was unworthy would be a constant source of danger to their autonomy. The leader of the last Administration knew perfectly well what sort of a man he was giving the Province, when he sent them Mr. Lac Letellier to be Governor over the Province of Quebec. The reputation of this public man was perfectly known to all, and, if the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had forgotten it, he might have referred to what his friend the Hon. Mr. Fabre said about Mr. Letellier, when he wrote on the 14th October, 1863, the following lines :—

“Mr. Letellier excites every day the admiration of his friends, and the Upper Canadian members do not hesitate to place him immediately below Mr. Sandfield Macdonald as an intriguer. This virtuous democrat, this railer at all past Governments, has revealed himself, during this Session, as being a master in the art which he for so long made light of because it was of no advantage to himself. His admirers never cease praising the fertility of his resources, his breaking loose from all scruples, and his absolute contempt for laws and political probity. Mr. Dufresne (of Ibergville) who has great skill in intrigues, and whom it is not easy to astonish, is occasionally in extasies over his assurance. Mr. Letellier thinks that everything can be bought, he judges of all public men by his own feelings.”

This was the man they gave the Province of Quebec as a Lieutenant-Governor, with the solemn warning to govern the Province of Quebec according to the views of the Dominion Government, and with the positive assurance that he would be dismissed if he did not do so. He had been faithful to his mission, and

had consequently kept the interests of the Province subordinate to those of the Mackenzie Administration, and to day, in order to rescue him from the ruin which awaited him, they dragged in the autonomy of the Province. What mockery! Still one more quotation and it would be the last. It would establish that the *coup d'état* of the 2nd of March, by the avowal even of the only authorised organ of the Liberal party in the district of Quebec, was carried out with the sole object of serving the interests of the Liberal party at Ottawa, in order to give it peaceable possession of power for five years to come. *L'Événement*, thank goodness, did not justify the attempt, and the Liberals did not secure from the *coup d'état* all that they had reason to expect from it. This was what the Hon. Mr. Fabre said in his *L'Événement* of the 30th October, 1878:—

“In order to remain masters of the field in our Province, it would have been necessary for the Liberals to have reckoned upon, under all circumstances, a coöperation which they never found in Ontario. The Liberals of Ontario understand politics in a different manner to what they do. They abandoned them, for the first time in 1864, at the time of the coalition which resulted in confederation; they never coincided completely with their views, they never understood their peculiar situation. This time, with giving them up, they left them to fight it out as they best could, without putting them in a position to utilise the resources which power possesses in order to entrench a position always threatened by the Conservative influences which are so strong in Lower Canada. So completely is cohesion wanting that the very attempt of the 2nd March found Mr. Mackenzie almost hostile, and obtained from him only an insufficient coöperation.”

It was not those who had worked without ceasing against the autonomy of their Province who ought to invoke, to-day, this reason for allowing to go unpunished an act outraging their liberties and their interests to such a degree. And, besides, who asked to-day for the intervention of the Federal authority, if it was not the Province of Quebec herself? Out of 65 members, sent by her to this House, 48 were united, 48 had agreed to claim this act of justice, which they asked for to-day, and which this House would assist them in obtaining. With what right could the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) speak in the name of the Province, when the Province had re-

puated almost all the candidates from his party, and he himself had seen die upon the field of battle, all the friends whom he went to succour during the last general elections. They had more right than he had to speak in the name of the Province of Quebec, seeing that they formed a large majority in this House, and it was in her name that they asked for justice. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had attempted, but in vain, to deliver a eulogium on Mr. Letellier, and nobody would believe him when he said that the name of Mr. Letellier was cherished in the memory of the people, and that, if he was dismissed, he would find many counties ready to open their arms to him, in order to send him at once to this House, of which he would be the ornament. The hon. member might have completed his information, and have told the House whether it would be as a movable or an immovable—an epithet which had been already applied to him and some of his colleagues. They had not the same fear or hope as the hon. member for Shefford. The past was there with its unimpeachable lesson and testimony. Many a time had Mr. Letellier asked from popular confidence a place among the representatives of the nation. He offered himself in Kamouraska, and Kamouraska had invariably choked him off each time that he offered himself as a candidate. He tried his fortune in L'Islet, and L'Islet betrayed his hopes. He now preferred appointments by the Crown to elections by the people. If he desired, as the hon. member for Shefford insinuated, to try the latter, let him then descend into the arena. They were ready to meet him, and to conquer him. The people would know what to do, and one of their greatest delights would be to contribute directly towards sending back into private life this man, who was never formed to understand obligations and honour in public life. When closing his address yesterday, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) said that it was necessary to respect the holy ark of our liberties. He (Mr. Landry) was completely of this opinion; but what the hon. member ought not to forget was the punishment which those deserved who raised a sacrilegious hand against this

sacred ark. In the time of David, at least so they learned from the Holy Scriptures, they went one day to look for the sacred ark in the house of Abinadab. During the journey the ark swayed. One of the sons of Abinadab, Oza, laid his hand upon the ark. And the indignation of the Lord was aroused against Oza, said the Scriptures, and He smote him on account of his rashness, and he died there before the ark of God. The hon. member for Quebec East would allow him to complete the comparison which he had himself begun, and to tell him that in the Province of Quebec one man had been found who had laid his hand on the sacred ark of their liberties, not to prevent its falling, but in order himself to cast it down and to trample it under his feet. Like Oza, Mr. Letellier deserved to die, politically speaking, and he was confident that in the interests of the Province he would receive this punishment, which he deserved, for having substituted personal government for responsible government. This was why the Lower Canadian members in this House asked for the carrying of the motion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau). Let but the House grant them this act of justice, and the whole Province of Quebec, far from complaining of Federal interference, would have nothing but blessings to bestow upon an honest Parliament, a just Parliament which, rising above party interests, would have come to her assistance, and saved her Constitution so shamefully trampled under foot.

MR. RINFRET said that he could not allow the motion of the hon. member for Bagot to pass without making a few remarks. Many speeches had been made upon the subject, the newspapers had discussed at length this question of the Lieutenant-Governor, and he did not claim to come with new ideas, or new arguments. If he rose to address the House, it was because the county he represented was more directly interested in the debate than many others, for it had the honour of being represented in the Local Legislature by the First Minister of the Province of Québec. He would not conceal the fact that he was glad to speak after the distinguished speakers who had interested the House on this motion, for

the really difficult part of the debate, that relating to the legal and constitutional questions, had been discussed on both sides with so much clearness that it was now easy to form an opinion upon the subject. Indeed, it seemed to be admitted on all hands, and, moreover, it had been admitted in 1878, by the hon. leader of the Government, that, in dismissing his Ministers, the Lieutenant-Governor had not overstepped the bounds of legality. He would not speak of the *apropos* of exercising the Royal prerogative. He believed, as a general rule, that this Parliament should not interfere in this matter since the Lieutenant-Governor had not exceeded the bounds of legality. He could only be judged by the Province of Quebec, of which he was the head; he was only responsible to public opinion of which he was the personification. There was only one way of being judged by the Province of Quebec, and that was to appeal to the people through responsible Ministers. It was known that the Joly Administration had come victorious out of this appeal to the people. The people had approved by their verdict the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, and he thought that this Parliament had not the right to oppose their sovereign will. But he would suppose, for a moment, that this appeal to the people had been unfavourable to the Joly Cabinet. Did it follow that the Federal Parliament should interfere? He thought not. The only consequence of this disapproval would have been the resignation of the Administration and the submission of the Lieutenant-Governor to the will of the majority. In case the Lieutenant-Governor had refused to submit, the Legislature would still have had the means of settling the question, and that was to refuse the supplies. He had thus shown that, by the act of the 2nd March, the Lieutenant-Governor had not rendered necessary the intervention of the Federal Government on the political affairs of the Province of Quebec. If the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec had not respected the popular verdict, or if he had brought about a state of affairs as difficult as the one now existing without an appeal to the people, he would heartily approve of his dismissal, for he would then have

virtually gone beyond the limits of legality, and because he could not have proved to any one that, in doing as he had done, he had acted on behalf of the people, and according to the will of the people. He would explain himself. The Lieutenant-Governor had really one reason for existing, and this reason, this only end of his existence, was the sanctioning of the acts of both Houses, as well as the sanctioning of popular decisions. In these two acts the Lieutenant-Governor represented the people of his Province. That was to say that in the first case he accepted, on behalf of the people, the decisions of Parliament, and in the second he accepted the resignation of Ministers. In both cases he was supposed to act on behalf of the majority, and any intervention on his part, whether sanction or refusal to sanction, which was not supported by a real majority, would be arbitrary and tyrannical. But every one knew that, after the dismissal of the DeBoucherville Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor had appealed to the people, and that the people had sustained him; events had shown that he had been really the personification of the popular will. As long as the acts of a Lieutenant-Governor were the personification of the popular will; as long as his sanction, or, what was the same thing, his refusal to sanction, was the faithful echo of the people's will, it seemed obvious to him that any interference with the Lieutenant-Governor would be interference with the majority of the Province of which he was the head, and with the constitutional rights of this Province. That was what had been recognised by the House during the last Session, and it was in accordance with this principle that they had thought fit not to interfere. There was another reason, upon which he would dwell a moment. This reason interested in a special manner the population of the Province of Quebec, which had a different origin than the population of the rest of the Dominion. The only end of Confederation, the only reason for its existence, was the preservation of the autonomy of the Provinces. The Dominion was composed of several Provinces, each having an absolute control over its own institutions. These Provinces were united together for the better protection of their commercial in-

terests. It was evident that the preservation of their autonomy was especially important for the French-Canadians, whose origin, language, and religion were different from those of the majority of the Dominion. He did not wish by this to insinuate anything against his fellow-citizens of another origin; indeed, they had always treated the French-Canadians with that liberality and that absence of narrow-mindedness that characterised the British nation. He was, moreover, ready to admit that, in the efforts Sir George Cartier had made to maintain the autonomy of his Province, he had shown himself to be a true French-Canadian and a patriot. He had no need to recal what had been said upon this subject in honour of the memory of the late leader of the Conservative party. He wished only to show that the aim of Sir George Cartier was to maintain the Province of Quebec entirely independent of the Federal Parliament; otherwise it would have been more logical to establish the Legislative Union, which was a system of Government less complicated and much less costly. This independence of the Province of Quebec would be secured only inasmuch as every act of the Executive power could not be controlled by the Federal Parliament. It seemed to him obvious that the head of a Province could not be dismissed for acting on behalf and in the name of the Province, and whose acts had been approved of by a vote of the people of this Province, without injuring the institutions of this Province. He thought that, in the case now before the House, the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor would strike a fatal blow at the autonomy of the Province of Quebec; for it would be sanctioning the principle that the Federal Parliament had the right to interfere in the affairs of the Provincial Legislatures. Sir George Cartier and his followers had, in order to make Confederation acceptable to the people, represented it as a system that was to secure to the Province of Quebec her autonomy and the absolute control of her particular institutions. It had been always maintained that such was the aim, and that such would be the result of Confederation; and he was astonished to-day to see those who called themselves the followers of Sir George

Cartier, to see those who had professed, until this moment, his principles upon the question of the autonomy of the Provinces, striving to demolish what he had built up, and willing to put into the hands of the Federal Parliament, those rights and privileges that their leader had told the Province of Quebec had been guarded at the price of many efforts and much struggling. Therefore, he thought that all those of the Province of Quebec who, like him, had faith in their institutions, and were ready to oppose anything that might jeopardise these institutions, should resist such a step, as it would authorise the majority of this House to interfere in the political affairs of the Provinces. The result of this interference would be the ruin of Provincial autonomy, and would lead them directly to Legislative Union.

MR. MILLS said he would begin his observations by taking some notice of what had been said last night by the Postmaster-General. He commenced the discussion of the history of England, and repeated some chapters that were quite new to him (Mr. Mills)—some facts that English historians had failed to record. He, thereupon, asked that hon. gentleman, as quietly and courteously as possible, when did the events he mentioned transpire? The Postmaster-General, in a brawling passion, invited the hon. Speaker, with great vehemence, to call him to order. The hon. gentleman had for some days been nursing his wrath, and it had broken forth with unusual violence. If he understood the rules of this House, he had not violated them. If any hon. gentleman wished to put a question to the member having the floor, with the view of gaining information, it might be to shorten the discussion, with the consent of the member, the question might be properly put. It might be done either by asking the hon. gentleman who had the floor, whether he would allow the question, or, if the question was more concise, he might simply put it. It was then open to the hon. member to answer or not; but there could be no irregularity if the question was courteously put. They could not look at a page of the reports of the debates here, or in the English House of Com-

MR. RINFRET.

mons, without observing that it was constantly done. He (Mr. Mills) alluded to this matter because he knew the Postmaster-General had acted similarly before. He had made an indignant attack upon him for putting a question politely, looking all the time to his friends in the House in order to elicit a demonstration or protest against the assumed offence offered him. He could not help admiring the dignity and grace with which the hon. gentleman manifested his indignation on that occasion. It might be he did not intend what was said to be taken as sober history. It might be they were the preliminary preparations for a lofty flight, but the pinions of the Postmaster-General were not formed for flight. He had said a great deal in his speech about the flags of England and France and other matters equally irrelevant. He had discussed a great many subjects that had no bearing on the question in hand. His incivility towards himself (Mr. Mills) was the only thing that called for his special notice. He would not say one word at this moment as to the manner of putting this question, nor would he say whether it was the proper one to discuss here, but he invited the attention of the House to the manner in which it was supported. Was the conduct of Mr. Letellier a matter that should have been brought before Parliament in the way done, and was it proper that Parliament should take the initiative in directly reviewing and censuring his conduct, was suggested by the discussion. He (Mr. Mills) thought that a fair answer to this suggestion would present itself by looking at the character of the arguments made in defence of the motion. It was defended by efforts to defame the members of the Local Legislature and the Local Administration of Quebec—by representing the Legislature as venal—its members as men elected to support one party, but who had given their support for a corrupt consideration to the opposite party. What was the evidence of this? Granted that it was true, why was it introduced here at all? Why, in discussing the conduct of Mr. Letellier in the discharge of his official duties, was the conduct and character of the members of the Local Legislature dragged into the discussion? Because hon. gentlemen opposite obviously felt that the fate of the

Lieutenant-Governor was indissolubly united with that of his Administration. In their appeal to the country, they felt that it was necessary to show that the new Administration, who had assumed the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor's acts, on appealing to the people had not been sustained. Why was it necessary to do that, or bring up in this House the conduct of the Local Legislature? Was it not improper to force upon them that discussion? The gentlemen who had brought it up felt it was impossible to conduct it to its legitimate conclusion without reviewing the acts of the Local Administration, and sitting in judgment upon the Legislature it led. He could tell hon. gentlemen that they had taken a dangerous road. What was done in order to take that line with a hope of success? It was said the Speaker of the Quebec Legislative Assembly had been elected a Conservative and turned Liberal, and must, therefore, have been bought. He (Mr. Mills) remembered when the hon. Speaker of this House (Mr. Blanchet), before Confederation, sat on the Liberal side, which he had seen proper to quit. He had occupied his present dignified and distinguished position by the common suffrage and consent of hon. gentlemen on both sides, but the gentlemen on the Liberal side were not going to charge that hon. gentleman with mercenary motives in becoming a Conservative. He would ask, had the Liberals charged him with acting corruptly, traduced his character, maligned him before the people, and tried to destroy his standing and respectability on that account? No, they had not descended to that depth yet, and he hoped it would be a long time before they would undertake to defend an indefensible motion to censure an action which, whether, in itself, it was proper or improper, was improperly brought here, and resort to that kind of argument for the purpose of upholding the motion that degraded Parliament. That kind of attack on Mr. Letellier and his friends had been found necessary by every hon. member who had spoken on the Ministerial side. The hon. Premier, when the hon. leader of the Opposition was speaking, rose, and, in a very excited and indignant manner, like Macbeth's at the appearance of Banquo's

ghost said: "Do not look at me, Sir—I did not purchase a Speaker." Indeed, he (Mr. Mills) asked whether it was really true. The hon. Premier's memory was not always so retentive as they could desire. It was to be regretted that it was not more retentive. It was, too, very important that every hon. gentleman on that side should remember the political events of former years. He (Mr. Mills) had no doubt the right hon. gentleman was so much taken up with the bustle and excitement of the hour that what transpired a short time ago faded from his mind like a cloud from the horizon, leaving no trace behind. But there were persons less occupied, who had given some attention to the events of the past, and who did not forget everything that had happened in the Parliamentary history of Canada. What was the evidence of Mr. Turcotte's having been purchased? Hon. gentlemen said that he was elected a Conservative and was now a Reformer. Did every man who changed sides do so from mercenary motives? He said this was a new rule of evidence. Here, today, was one of the present Speaker's predecessors in the Chair, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn). He remembered when that hon. gentleman was an active and zealous, though not, perhaps, always prudent or discreet supporter of the Liberal party. He claimed to be a Liberal and was elected as such, but the leader of the present Government fixed his fascinating eyes upon him and he became strangely influenced. He was mentally transformed. He saw things afterwards in a different light. He began to distrust the wisdom of those with whom he had acted, and the policy he was elected to support, and left their ranks and became an office-holder on the other side. But did any hon. gentleman on the Liberal side say he was purchased, and changed his views on account of mercenary considerations? Was this new rule of evidence to be applied to him? The Postmaster-General himself had at one time left the ranks of his friends, and for a time exhibited himself in all the panoply of war on the other side. He returned to his friends, and took office for the first time. Was he, too, influenced by corrupt considerations? The Liberal party did not so charge him. The opposite position

was the one hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side had taken, and, if their inference was correct,—that it followed from a change of views, that the member who changed had tacted through mercenary motives,—what was the conclusion in the case of the member for Northumberland, or the Postmaster-General? He would say nothing as to the present Minister of Finance. He was a fitting illustration for another part of that subject. Upon the main question, he occupied a peculiar and somewhat embarrassing position, but he would call the attention of hon. gentlemen, who remembered events before Confederation, to the state of things then existing. The Sandfield Macdonald Government, in 1864, had a majority of one, besides the Speaker, who had been elected to support the Reform party. By that party he had been placed in the Chair. That Government retired from office, and Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier were called on to form a new Cabinet, which they did; and Speaker Wallbridge, who had been so ardent a Liberal before, became as ardent a supporter of the opposite side, without going back to his constituents. He (Mr. Mills) would like to know, when the hon. Premier, a few evenings ago, said: "I never bought a Speaker," if he had Mr. Wallbridge in his view, and whether he had, through corrupt influence, been taken from the Reform party? He (Mr. Mills) did not say he was, but it inevitably followed, from the logic of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Wallbridge was elected as a Reformer.

MR. BOWELL: He was not—I know from personal experience.

MR. MILLS said he was most assuredly elected as a supporter of Sandfield Macdonald's Government, and, as such, was made Speaker. He had given these illustrations from the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite, to impress them with the value of their proof in the case before the House. This was the new rule by which Mr. Turcotte and the members of the Quebec Government were vilified, slandered and traduced here. Were they officers of this Federal Government? Were they under the control of this Legislature? If not, why had their conduct been discussed here, and serious charges made

MR. MILLS.

against them? There was no better evidence of the indefensible character of this motion than this—that its advocacy required the vilification of men occupying a distinguished position, who had no opportunity of defending themselves in this House. Why was it that the conduct of Mr. Letellier, when called in question, involved such a scandalous procedure as that adopted in support of this motion? It was utterly impossible for the supporters of this motion to escape from the position in which they had placed themselves. It was obvious from this discussion that the fate of the attack upon the Lieutenant-Governor depended upon their ability to assail his Ministers and the Local Legislature with apparently some reason. When hon. gentlemen opposite were told in reply that the Joly Government had 33 supporters in a House of 65, they replied it was not so—they were only 31. Why was this question discussed here at all? Did the fate of the Lieutenant-Governor depend on the numbers 31 or 33? Was that the reason hon. gentlemen opposite contended so fiercely for the smaller number? The official life of the Lieutenant-Governor hung in the Executive balance here, and hon. gentlemen were earnestly striving to show that it had been lost by a majority of two. Was that the contention? Did they admit that, if he dismissed his Ministers, called in a new Government, and appealed to the country, his conduct would be proper or improper as his Ministers succeeded or failed? He (Mr. Mills) would like to know their views on that subject? Would they say Mr. Letellier took his political life in his hand, and that, if he succeeded, his offence was condoned, but that, if he failed, he was still open to condemnation and dismissal?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No.

MR. MILLS said he did not hear hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches say no, or gentlemen from the Province of Quebec who had brought up that question say no. If they meant no, why did they undertake to show that the Reform party had not been sustained in Quebec? and why argue that the Joly Government had to buy two members to obtain the present number, 33; and why did they labour so much

to show that those two members ought not to be counted with the Liberals? Why was the result of the elections made a matter for discussion by this House, unless they felt that, if the Lieutenant-Governor's Administration was supported, there was no ground on which to attack Mr. Letellier himself? The whole line of argument that had been followed in the House, so far, rested this motion upon the result of the elections. If they were prepared to take the ground that, successful or unsuccessful, the Lieutenant-Governor had no right to dismiss his Ministers, then the other grounds should have been left out. The members of the Local Legislature and of the Provincial Government ought not to have been charged here with corruption. But, when hon. gentlemen took the other ground, they showed, as clearly as possible, that they admitted Mr. Letellier had the right to do what he did if he were sustained in that act by a majority of the electors of Quebec. He would ask, what was the use of discussing here the number of Mr. Joly's supporters, whether they were many, or whether they were few, if the conduct of the Governor was not involved in the result? The great change in the condition of public opinion was sufficient to justify the Lieutenant-Governor in doing what he did, if it were proper for him to do it at all. He would like to know whether hon. gentlemen were prepared to lay down the doctrine absolutely that under no circumstances had the Lieutenant-Governor the right to dismiss his advisers, so long as they were sustained by a majority of the Legislature? If that were their view, they had but little support among English statesmen and writers upon the Constitution as it was. Hon. gentlemen confounded the practice under the Constitution with the powers authorised by the Constitution. He desired to call the attention of the House to the views expressed by the leading organs of public opinion, and by gentlemen occupying high positions in the Government of the country. In the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1878, there was an article reviewing the use of the prerogative and the doctrines put forward in the *London Quarterly*, and calling in question the constitutional principles there laid down. The *Edinburgh Review* said :

"He (the King) cannot, indeed, impose a policy upon his Minister or his Parliament; he can dismiss his Minister, and he can appeal to the country against the judgment of Parliament."

Did hon. gentlemen deny that doctrine, or deny that it correctly interpreted the Constitution as it was? Were they prepared to dismiss any Government who acted on the principles there laid down? The article continued :

"George III was strictly within his rights when [in 1804 and again in 1807] he dismissed the coalition, and dissolved the Parliament which supported the coalition. William IV was equally within his rights, when he dismissed Lord Melbourne, and appealed to the country. In these several cases a great question of policy was raised and determined by competent authority. In the [first two cases] the action of the King was confirmed by the nation; in the other it was reversed. Everything was done constitutionally and in order."

Upon the dismissal of the Granville Administration in 1807, Lord Howick said that he was enabled to inform the House that, although he had not received His Majesty's command to deliver up the seals of office, His Majesty had thought proper to send for persons not employed as his servants, and was engaged with them in forming arrangements for a new Administration. The men who were called in made a successful appeal to the country, and it was not in the power of Lord Howick and his friends to argue successfully that they ought to be in when the public verdict was that they should be out. George IV was not so successful, and the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel were not sustained by the country, and were obliged to retire. The old Government of Lord Melbourne was again called to office. There was no doubt that there were two theories of the Constitution in this matter, one which denied altogether the power of the Crown to dismiss Ministers, and looked upon the prerogative of dismissal as wholly obsolete, whilst the other admitted the doctrine. This writer in the *Edinburgh Review* contended that the power was one which still belonged to the Crown. He thought this prerogative still existed. It was no doubt greatly weakened. Its exercise involved great responsibility, justified now only to avert some public calamity. Looking to England, they found there was very

little difference, practically, in the ultimate result whichever view they took. If the Queen dismissed her Ministers and a new Administration was formed, unless they were sustained by a majority, the old Ministry would be recalled by the Queen. But, if the new Ministry were sustained, they would continue to carry on the Government, but they did so only by the approval of the nation. In the other view, precisely the same thing was done, and, in the end, the Ministers held office only by popular sanction. He did not, however, pretend to say he subscribed to the older doctrine as it was once understood. If the power of dismissal was now exercised as it once was in England, he had no doubt but that it would soon lead to revolutionary changes in the Constitution. He preferred to hold that, in the ordinary condition of parties and of the country, this power could not be used. He thought it a very grave act, involving great responsibility, for a Governor or chief magistrate to dismiss his Ministers, in our day; but, if he obtained an Administration that was supported by a majority of Parliament, that act was in practice condoned, and there was no power—looking at the separate community alone—that could legally or constitutionally call his act in question. This was still the recognised doctrine in England, in proof of which statement he would read an extract from Mr. Gladstone in an article entitled “Our Queen beyond the Sea.” There could be no doubt whatever that Mr. Gladstone was an excellent parliamentarian, and that there was no man living, in England or elsewhere, more thoroughly conversant with all the features of the Constitution. He was an able man, a scholarly man, and a profound thinker, and he had given special attention to this subject. Whatever he said upon this, or on any subject, was well worthy of attention, and especially was it worthy of attention upon a subject which had, as they all knew, occupied so large a part of his life. He said:

“There is, indeed, one great and critical act, the responsibility for which falls momentarily or provisionally on the Sovereign; it is the dismissal of an existing Ministry, and the appointment of a new one. This act is usually performed with the aid drawn from authentic manifestations of public opinion,

MR. MILLS.

mostly such as are obtained through the votes or conduct of the House of Commons. Since the reign of George the Third, there has been but one change of Ministry, in which the Monarch acted without the support of these indications. It was when William IV, in 1834, dismissed the Government of Lord Melbourne, when he was known to be supported after a luke-warm fashion by a large majority of the existing House of Commons. But the Royal responsibility was, according to the doctrine of our Constitution, completely taken over *ex post facto* by Sir Robert Peel, as the person who consented, on the call of the King, to take Lord Melbourne's office. Thus, though the action was rash and hard to justify, the doctrine of personal immunity was in no way endangered. And here we may notice that, in theory, an absolute personal immunity implies a correlative limitation of power greater than is always found in practice. It can hardly be said that the King's initiative left to Sir Robert Peel a freedom perfectly unimpaird. And most certainly it was a very real exercise of personal power. The power did not suffice for its end, which was to overset the Liberal predominance; but it very nearly sufficed. Unconditionally entitled to dismiss the Ministers, the Sovereign can, of course, choose his own opportunity. He may defy the Parliament if he can count upon the people. William IV, in the year 1834, had neither Parliament nor people with him. His act was within the limits of the Constitution, for it was covered by the responsibility of the acceding Ministry, but it reduced the Liberal majority from a number, certainly beyond three hundred, to about thirty; and it constituted an exceptional but very real and large action on the politics of the country, by the direct will of the King. I speak of the immediate effects. Its eventual result may have been different; for it converted a large disjointed mass into a smaller but organised and sufficient force, which held the fortress of power for the six years, 1835-41. If the Royal intervention anticipated and averted decay from natural causes, then, with all its immediate success, it defeated its own real aim.

“But this power of dismissing a Ministry at will, large as it may be under given circumstances, is neither the safest nor the only power which, in the ordinary course of things, falls constitutionally to the personal share of the wearer of the Crown. He is entitled, on all subjects coming before the Ministry, to knowledge and opportunities of discussion, unlimited save by the iron necessities of business. Though decisions must ultimately conform to the sense of those who are to be responsible for them, yet their business is to inform and persuade the Sovereign not to overrule them. Were it possible for him, within the limits of human time and strength, to enter actively into all public transactions, he would be justly entitled to do so. What is actually submitted is supposed to be the most fruitful and important part—the cream of affairs. In the discussion of them the Monarch has more

than one advantage over his advisers. He is permanent—they are fugitive; he speaks from the vantage-ground of a station unapproachably higher; he takes a calm and leisurely survey, while they are worried with the preparatory stages, and the force is often impaired by the pressure of countless detail. He may be, therefore, a weighty factor in all deliberations of state. Every discovery of a blot that the studies of the Sovereign in the domain of business enable him to make strengthens his hands, and enhances his authority. It is plain, then, that there is abundant scope for mental activity to be at work under the gorgeous robes of Royalty." These were Mr. Gladstone's views. No one would pretend to say that Mr. Gladstone was not a Liberal, or that the opinions that he had expressed were not entitled to the very highest consideration. He would ask the attention of the House to the views of Earl Grey, who was for many years Colonial Secretary under the Administration of Lord John Russell. In his work on Parliamentary Government, pages 4 and 5, after pointing out that the theory that the Executive power belongs wholly to the Crown, while the power of legislation is vested jointly in the Sovereign and the two Houses of Parliament, has ceased to be correct unless it is understood as applying only to the legal and technical distribution of power; after pointing out that the power belonging to the Crown is always exercised through responsible Ministers, and that in them the Executive and Legislative power are virtually united in the same bonds, he said:

"The exercise of this high authority is also placed under the check of a strict responsibility and control, and its possession made to depend on the confidence placed by the representatives of the people in the Ministers to whom it is committed. There is a further safeguard against abuse, in its being requisite that the Ministers of the Crown should obtain its direct sanction for all their most important measures."

Now the complaint was that the Government of Mr. Letellier had not consulted him, that they had treated him as if he were of no account. He (Mr. Mills) did not pretend to say how far these representations were well founded. He had no reason to doubt the accuracy of what Governor Letellier said. He did not think it the business of this House to establish itself a Court of Enquiry to ascertain whether Governor Letellier or his late advisers were the most to be relied

upon in this matter. He thought the very fact that such an enquiry would be necessary to vote upon the merits of the question showed how very improper it was that it should be brought here in this form. If they looked at the papers in this case, they would find that Governor Letellier did depart from what might be called the modern view of Executive authority; that he did draw from the scabbard a sword that had rusted there for twenty years in this country and for forty-four years in England. Hon. gentlemen would not deny that this prerogative existed. The sword had not been drawn in England during the reign of Her Majesty. It might be because Her Majesty had seen no reason to use this prerogative. There were other prerogatives that had not been used in England for 170 years. The prerogative of vetoing a Bill had not been used since 1707, in the reign of Queen Anne, and yet that prerogative had been used in the Colonies in very recent times. It had been used in regard to measures carried through the Canadian Parliament. Would they undertake to say that, because a prerogative had not been used for 44 years in Great Britain and for 20 years in Canada, it was no longer in existence; that, if Governor Letellier vetoed a Bill, he used a prerogative that no longer existed because it had lain dormant so long? No; hon. gentlemen would not say this of the prerogative to disallow the measures of the Government, for they said this was what he should have done. If the prerogative of dismissal was to be considered obsolete because it had not been used for 44 years, much more must the prerogative of disallowance be considered obsolete because it had not been used for 172 years. He wished to call attention to the position in which the Minister of Finance stood upon this question. The hon. gentleman was at one time a member of an Administration under Sir Manners-Sutton. That Administration were compelled to resign, because the Governor dissolved Parliament without their sanction. He appealed to the country; the retiring Administration were beaten. Not long afterwards, a second Parliament was elected, and the men whom he had compelled to retire again had a majority; but he was not aware that, when

they were again called to power, a petition was presented to the Imperial Parliament protesting against that action, and demanding the recal of the Governor. He was not aware that anyone in the House of Commons at Westminster moved a resolution such as they had before them. He was not aware that there was practically any difficulty found in the working of responsible government merely because Mr. Manners-Sutton adopted this extreme measure. The principles of responsible government were too strong, and no enduring mischief resulted ultimately from his course. At a later period, under the *régime* of Governor Gordon, Mr. Tilley and his friends went to the country on the question of Confederation, and were beaten by a majority of thirty-two to nine members out of a House of forty-one. A new Administration was formed, of which the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) was at the head. The Legislative Council, which did not depend on the popular vote, supported the policy of Confederation after the new Administration was formed. They at once carried an Address recommending its adoption. The subject was still under discussion in the House of Assembly, and it was the business of the Ministry to present the Address of both Houses to the Governor. This they refused to do until the final action of the Legislative Assembly was ascertained. The Legislative Council waited on the Governor, and he accepted their Address. He expressed himself strongly in favour of Confederation, complimented the Legislative Council, and took a line of action wholly at variance with the policy of his advisers, which forced them out of office. Whom did he call to form a new Administration? The Hon. Mr. Wilmot, now Speaker of the Senate, Mr. Peter Mitchell, and Mr. Tilley, the latter of whom was not then in the Legislature, having been defeated at the previous elections. They assumed the responsibility of the Governor's act, just as Mr. Joly did that of Mr. Letellier. How could the Minister of Finance, who then assumed the responsibility of the act of Governor Gordon, be prepared to say that the act of Mr. Letellier was unconstitutional and highly improper? He went to the coun-

Mr. MILLS.

try upon a question upon which the country had already pronounced; upon which it was obvious, from what transpired, that they were afraid of defeat; for a raid, it seemed, had been got up upon the border, to alarm the people, and to give them a chance of success.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Governor Gordon dismissed his Ministers?

MR. MILLS said he would like to know what difference there was between dismissing a Ministry, and, contrary to the advice of his Ministers, accepting an Address of the Legislative Council pronouncing against their policy, and approving of the policy set forth in it?

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I think there is a vast difference between them.

MR. MILLS: Would any hon. gentleman, as a constitutional lawyer, or as a public man acquainted with constitutional principles, stake his reputation on the correctness of the theory—that to call in other men, or to listen to them, to commend their advice, and to act upon it, did not imply dismissal, or was, in any respect, different from dismissing a Ministry. To say to a Ministry “You must go,” and say to them: “I will not sanction the Act which you recommend to me for my consideration, because I prefer to act upon the advice of others,” meant the same thing. It was a well known constitutional principle at this day, that a Ministry could not retain office unless their advice was followed. This question of the power of dismissal was one upon which, as he had said before, two views existed: the extreme modern view and the ancient view, which in the books was put forward as the constitutional rule. Mr. Freeman, in his able work on the growth of the English Constitution, discussed this, and pointed out that there were always in English constitutional government a number of unsettled questions, because the Constitution was never very long in practice the same; new practices were introduced by new necessities which arose, and by the silent, though perceptible changes in society—a wider diffusion of knowledge, a higher standard of gen-

eral intelligence, the growth of new forces, the increased, and ever-increasing power of public opinion. The hon. member for Cardwell declared it was absolutely necessary that the House should interfere and condemn the conduct of Mr. Letellier, which he argued was dangerous to constitutional government. He (Mr. Mills) maintained that, in any case in which a Governor dismissed his Ministers, he assumed for the moment a grave responsibility; but, with regard to such action, this question of prerogative was a dangerous one to define. If he were a member of the Quebec Legislature, he would express his opinion in justification or in condemnation of the act of Mr. Letellier; but, not occupying that position, he would not express an opinion upon the propriety of that act. He would say that he hoped the principle of responsible government would prove itself stronger than the arbitrary will of any Governor, and that it could not be subverted by the dismissal of an Administration. He hoped, when a Governor entered upon ground so little frequented in our day, and new Ministers were found to assume the responsibility, that the public over whom that Ministry were called to rule, would use their power to deal with those whom the law and the theory of the Constitution placed within their reach, because it must, while the system endured, remain true that no Ministry could stand, no advisers could be retained, no advice could be followed, contrary to the popular judgment constitutionally expressed. The principle of responsible government, if preserved thus, re-asserted its supremacy. There were other influences which were more dangerous to the principles of responsible government than the arbitrary or partisan conduct of any Governor, and one was the improper interference of a higher authority, deriving its strength and power from popular support and sanction. However imprudent might have been the act of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec in dismissing his Ministers, it would be still more imprudent, unwise and dangerous to the principles of responsible government for a more powerful Legislature, such as this, to undertake to control the action of the Governor's advisers. It was the right of the Legislature of Quebec,

and not that of the House of Commons, to complain. They had not done so. That this conduct would not reach the Lieutenant-Governor alone, but must strike those who assumed the responsibility of his course, and the Legislature which sustained them, was perfectly obvious. Hon. gentlemen opposite instinctively felt this, and charged the Legislature with vernal conduct, and its members with being purchasable. In fact, they declared that the Speaker held his position by the purchase of the Administration. The hon. member for Cardwell said the act of Mr. Letellier was unwise. It might be so. They had committed many acts of un wisdom here. Many hon. members believed that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches had committed unwise acts, acts that might be regarded as unconstitutional acts; but they did not believe in passing a vote of censure, at Quebec or at Westminster, on them for those acts. This House would deem it an impertinence if the Local Legislature of Quebec were to sit in judgment on their conduct, and say that this Government was not entitled to the support of the country, that they had foully won. Because this House was a more powerful or a more important body, could not remove the impropriety. It was a question, not of dignity or strength, but of jurisdiction, of responsibility. He was somewhat amused at the manner in which the hon. member for Cardwell undertook to establish the proposition that this House had a right to deal with this question. He referred to Section 59 of the British North America Act. Section 58 provided that the Governor-General should appoint the Lieutenant-Governor, and Section 59 that the Governor-General might remove the Lieutenant-Governor for cause shown, but it did not provide that he might be removed in any other way. It provided, also, that the Lieutenant-Governors might choose whom they saw fit, as their advisers, recognising, in this particular, the ancient law that the Crown appointed its advisers, leaving the modern practice to maintain itself according to modern methods. Was the act of Mr. Letellier one which justified his removal? If so, why did not the Administration act? He could only be removed through

the Crown, upon the advice of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Why, then, did not the hon. member for Cardwell adopt a constitutional method, and express his regret that the Governor had not advised the Governor-General to take this course? Why did not the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution censure the Administration for not having removed Mr. Letellier? The hon. member for Cardwell went on to state that the Lieutenant-Governor had no such powers as were possessed by Her Majesty or Her Majesty's representatives here in Canada. Our Constitution provided for the appointment of the Lieutenant-Governor in each Province, and authorised him to choose his advisers; of course he must act in the same manner as Her Majesty appointed her advisers, or else he possessed an unlimited and unrestrained power. If the hon. member was right, the Lieutenant-Governors had greater power over their advisers than Her Majesty possessed. The Act said he should appoint whom he thought fit. If this power was not limited by being made similar in principle to the power of the Crown, it was absolute. If Mr. Letellier had dismissed his Ministers after the Session was over and after the supplies had been voted, and had called in new administrators known to be supported by a minority in Parliament, and not known to be supported by the country, and if he had allowed them to keep office without an appeal to the country, the hon. gentleman might have had a right to complain. But the moment the new Administration was formed, they appealed to the country and were retained in power by the support of the country to this day. They asked this House not to look at the votes recorded in the Journals of the House of Assembly at Quebec, but to accept the statements on *ipse dixit* of hon. gentlemen supporting this motion, in order to learn the strength of the Local Government. That was what was done by the other side. He, for one, declined to go behind the Journals of the House. He had no hesitation in saying that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier assumed great responsibility when he dismissed his old Ministry and formed a new one; but, when the elections had taken place, and when the new Ministry

had been sustained, he was not prepared to censure them for the responsibility they had assumed. Whether the act was wise or unwise, just or unjust, was for another body to decide. It was not in this forum that that question should be tried. According to the view of the hon. member for Cardwell, Mr. Joly was guilty of a grave offence in undertaking to form a Government. That might be so. But that was referred to the electors in May last. Had he not been supported by a majority? Was not the conduct of the Governor, or rather those who took the responsibility of his act, regarded as inseparably connected with the result of the elections? Those gentlemen proposed to interfere, or to invite the House to interfere, in the interests of responsible government; in the interests of the independence of the Local Legislatures. What could any Governor, however arbitrarily he acted, do to interfere with the independence of the Local Legislatures? He was no special source of strength or influence. Unless he could get a majority of the Legislature to support him, the supplies would not be voted, and he would be compelled to change his friends and take back those whom he had wronged. There could be no doubt of that. The hon. gentleman opposite would not pretend that the Queen would be forced to abdicate, if, after dismissing her Ministry, the new Ministry failed to get the support of Parliament; much less would her position be endangered if her new advisers were supported by a majority of Parliament. He said, again, that it was most undesirable to use. But this House, under the circumstances, could not well call the act in question. They could not now strike the Governor without striking his advisers, for what he did was supported by a majority of the Legislature. What would be the effect if this motion were carried? He did not say that they should have Lieutenant-Governors at all. Whether they ought to be dispensed with or not could not now be conveniently discussed. He did not know but it would be a wise course to adopt, to put an end to the office altogether, and to allow the Local Legislatures to elect their own Premier. This, he held, was certain: that if the hon. gentleman's extreme view was correct, there

was a very great deal to be said in favour of that policy. There could be little room for doubt on that point. If cases arose from which the Governor discovered that his advisers were men of infamous character, or that they had been guilty of infamous conduct, it would be hard to deny that the Governor would be justified in dismissing his Ministers—then a Lieutenant-Governor might be useful. If, on the other hand, he was in all cases bound to retain his Ministers so long as they had a majority in the Parliament for the time being to support them, he (Mr. Mills) would like to know of what use there was in a Lieutenant-Governor? The Legislature could choose its own Prime Minister directly, as well as mark out, as it now did, for him the same course for the Lieutenant-Governor, which he was practically bound to follow. He has, upon any theory, to do according to the hon. gentleman's view of his functions. The Lieutenant-Governor would have nothing whatever to do. He would simply be keeping a boarding-house, if he (Mr. Mills) might use the expression, at which gentlemen might be entertained. He had no doubt the tendency of the age was in this direction. Beyond the hospitable duty of entertaining the public men of his capital, he would have no particular functions to discharge. That might be the right view. He had no doubt the current flowed in that direction; but it had not quite come to that. It was perfectly clear, from the views put forward by Mr. Gladstone, to which he had referred, that was not the view generally entertained upon this particular question. He would like to call the attention of the House to the position in which they would place every Lieutenant-Governor in the country. At present, the Lieutenant-Governor was a precautionary force against lawless ambition,—a regulating force; where there was prudence, that could never cause any friction. Go at once to the end, and make the modern tendency a reality, and how would he be left? They would leave him without any authority, without any power to secure respect; a man who might be advised by his Ministers, or might be disregarded by them, without any power to call their acts in

question, or to exercise any authority over them. He would be simply reduced to the position of a cypher, and nothing more. He did not see that he had the merest shadow of authority; but the authority, which was supposed to be vested in him, and which the law recognised as vested in him, and which the operation of the Constitution was gradually taking away, was an authority which, though vague and shadowy, served some purpose. By this motion, they denied his authority altogether, they declared that it had no existence. Governors were public men, chosen from the party making the appointment. Did they propose that he should, when a change took place, be a helpless object of contempt and insult, when his opponents in politics were, at the same time, his advisers and his masters here? He had no doubt whatever that, under their constitutional system, Lieutenant-Governors would occasionally make mistakes. But he hoped they would occur so seldom that the power of the Constitution in each Province possessed sufficient safeguards in itself to set those matters right, and there would be less danger from allowing them to be adjusted by public opinion within the Province, than by undertaking to make this Parliament a regulating body for the Provinces; to make it a censorious body to exercise supervision over the acts of Lieutenant-Governors, and to undertake to determine what was right and what was not right in the administration of the public affairs of the Provinces. He had no doubt that the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) and repeated by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), that, if this measure were carried, it would largely tend to destroy the independence of the Local Legislature, was correct. He believed their proper course here was to leave these matters alone, to keep their hands off, to manage their own affairs, and, if an extreme case arose, in which abuse had been committed by the Governor, the Legislature had the power to appeal to this Government for redress, and they could sit then in judgment on the conduct of the Government here on the matter. It was not their business to take matters in their own hand, and to undertake to say to the Lieutenant-Gover-

nor of the Province of Quebec, or any other Province, what he was to do in the discharge of his proper duties.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said that, having voted last year in favour of a similar resolution to that now before the House, and which was then introduced by the right hon. the leader of the Government, he felt that he would not, as a representative from the Province of Ontario, be justified in giving a silent vote upon it on the present occasion, more especially as the subject was of immense importance, not only to the Province of Quebec, but to the whole Dominion of Canada, and every Province in it, and above all to the Province of Ontario, in which the principles of responsible government had originated, and in which they had been fostered, and were still so dearly cherished; so much so that he was surprised that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), should have endorsed the improper exercise of power in drawing the sword from its scabbard for the purpose of destroying the very groundwork of responsible government. The importance of the subject arose from the fact that our constitutional system rested on precedents as much as upon written law, so that, if the act of Mr. Letellier was allowed to pass unrebuked and uncensured by this House, it would result in this: that, hereafter, even the Lieutenant-Governor might point to this as an authority and precedent, and say, "I have a right to dismiss my Ministers, although they have the confidence of an overwhelming majority of both Houses, of my own motion, irrespective of the opinions of the representatives of the people." Such a result would have the effect of introducing, instead of responsible government by representatives of the people, government by one man. In fact, they would have sanctioned an arbitrary despotism in Canada, and seated on the throne Luc the First. His idea of responsible government was government by the representatives of the people, and not by one-man power. He was surprised to hear his hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) declare that the Province of Quebec was alone interested in this question. He (Mr. Cameron) thought that the question was one which affected the principles upon which our

MR. MILLS.

whole Confederation rested. No person could deny that the voice of the people was the only one that could legitimately rule, and the Lieutenant-Governor could not be exalted to a position of supreme control of the affairs of the Province, which the framers of the Constitution never contemplated. To show the opinion of the Reform party upon this question, he would refer to a quotation that he found this morning in the leading organ of the gentlemen opposite, and which appeared at a time when the evidence in the matter was fresh. It was as follows:—

"But a thing done may be constitutional and yet wrong in itself. Lieutenant-Governor Letellier may have had a clear right to dismiss his Ministers, and yet his doing so might have been utterly unjustifiable. No doubt; and it seems to us this is the vital issue of the controversy. The dismissal of a Ministry commanding a large majority in both Chambers by a Lieutenant-Governor is an act of surpassing gravity. Public interests of the highest and most urgent moment could alone justify such an act. No such appeal to the people against the conduct of their representatives should be ventured upon unless the Chief Magistrate feels convinced not only that he is right, but so manifestly right that the case has but to be stated to meet the popular approval and unmistakable support. Has Governor Letellier such a justification for what he has done?"

He would ask if the views expressed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, during the discussion on this subject last Session, were not, to a large extent, opposed to the opinion advanced by them during this debate. He would read from *Hunsard* to show what the late Premier, now the leader of the Opposition, had said on this question last year.

MR. MACKENZIE: Read the whole of my speech.

MR. CAMERON said the hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

"I do not deny at all the premises that the hon. gentleman laid down as to the right of this House to criticise the action of the Lieutenant-Governors appointed by this Government. * * * I stated precisely, in so many words, that I recognised the full right of this full Parliament to discuss it."

His (Mr. Cameron's) hon. friend had stated, in precisely so many words: "I recognise fully the right of this Parliament to do this."

Mr. MACKENZIE: I say that now.

Mr. CAMERON said his hon. friend said he did so. When his hon. friend was speaking, he (Mr. Cameron) took down his words, in which he (Mr. Mackenzie) had said this House had no right to pronounce on the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor, then or now.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is quite consistent.

Mr. CAMERON said he was going to ask his hon. friend if he could reconcile his statements. He thought the quotation he had read showed the position that gentleman took last Session.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The position is exactly the same, both times.

Mr. CAMERON said he did not know how it was; but, whenever he got up to make any remarks about his hon. friend opposite, he seemed to chafe under it, more particularly when he quoted from *Hansard*. He did not know whether he trod upon his corns when he compared his (Mr. Mackenzie's) position now with the position taken by him last Session. Last Session they had been told that, because the elections were coming on in the Province of Quebec, it was an inopportune time to discuss this question; and now when the elections were over, they were told they had not the right to discuss it, because the Quebec elections were over. The time had, however, arrived when hon. members did discuss it, and, unless, in the words of the leading organ of the Liberal party, the most urgent circumstances could be shown to justify the Lieutenant-Governor's conduct, it was their duty to pass a verdict upon it. His hon. friend who had just sat down (Mr. Mills) had contended that they would be condemning the Government of Quebec if they passed this resolution. He would have expected better logic from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills.) That could not be good parliamentary reasoning. They could condemn Mr. Letellier without condemning his executive officers. The questions on which the Quebec elections had turned were three:—The Constitutional Question, the Railway Bill, and the Stamp

Tax Bill, and in many parts of the Province the two latter questions had a far more material influence on the elections than the question as to the right of Mr. Letellier to dismiss his Ministry. The plea based on the verdict of the people at the polls on May 1st was also false reasoning, and rested on false premises. The influences which affected that election were widely different from, and much more extensive than, the simple question as to whether Mr. Letellier was justified in his action or not. He was not here to justify the Administration of Mr. DeBoucherville, or to condemn the Government of Mr. Joly, but, when the Administration of Mr. Joly went to the country, they were supported because it was thought that the affairs of the country would be more ably administered by them, and not because they supported the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor. He did not pretend to say that, because the Lieutenant-Governor was deserving of censure, therefore Mr. Joly's Government was deserving of censure also. They were not the servants of this House; they had independent rights, functions and powers; but the Lieutenant-Governor was the servant of this Parliament. Then, again, it was said the Joly Government was sustained by a majority, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had asked why had they argued that question in this House unless they felt that the result of the Quebec elections settled it. The reason was this: It had been said that the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor had been purged by the result of those elections, and the Conservatives replied it had not. But, even were that test a true one the result of the Quebec elections showed Mr. Letellier was condemned. The hon. member for Bothwell said he did not choose to take the accusations, *the ipse dixit* of any member, as evidence; that he went to the Journals of the Local Legislature to see whether the Lieutenant-Governor, his Ministers and the Speaker were liable to condemnation. Let him look again at those journals and see whether the Lieutenant-Governor had been sustained by a verdict in favour of Mr. Joly's Cabinet or not. At the 95th page of the pamphlet containing the papers laid on the table of the

House, he would see that the verdict of the representatives of the people was—whether they sustained or condemned the Lieutenant-Governor :

“That this House, while expressing its firm determination to insist on the strictest economy in every branch of the public service, and on the closest supervision over the expenses of administration, regrets that the present advisers of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor should have persisted in remaining in power without having been supported by the majority of the Legislative Assembly upon their taking office, and without yet being supported by such majority.”

What was the result of that motion expressing directly want of confidence in that Administration, proposed in reply to the Address from the Throne? That the Joly Government was defeated by a majority of one. How, then, could it be said that the result of the elections purged the Lieutenant-Governor or justified that Cabinet, when, on the broad, square issue of confidence or no confidence, the motion of non-confidence was carried. Did not that show that the Lieutenant-Governor and the Joly Government were not sustained on that occasion. The hon. member for Lambton argued that the Joly Government carried the Supply Bill and was, therefore, sustained. He (Mr. Cameron) thought that the less said about the way they carried the Supply Bill, and carried on the affairs of the Government, the better. His hon. friend from Bothwell had said that Mr. Speaker Turcotte should not have been attacked in the manner heard—that it was ungenerous and improper to charge him with having been bought. But had any hon. member on the opposite side of the House ventured, or would any one venture to assert the charges against Mr. Turcotte were not true? It was all very well for the hon. member to say he wanted no man's *ipse dixit*, and appeal to the Journals of Parliament, but those charges had been made in the public press ever since the Legislature met in Quebec and, if he mistook not, on the floor of the Legislative Assembly, and had been talked of till the present. Had they ever been denied? Had the substantial foundation of the charges been removed? Had Mr. Turcotte shown the courage to stand up and say he had not been bought? The facts were so overwhelming that it

MR. CAMERON.

would be in vain for him to attempt to do so. If so, how had Mr. Joly obtained the supplies and managed to carry on the Government? By the forbearance of the people's representatives, the state of the pecuniary affairs of the Province being such as made it absolutely requisite, unless its representatives were prepared seriously to embarrass the public affairs, that the supplies should be granted. No doubt the Joly Government could have been thrown out by its opponents, but they had too high a regard for the substantial interests of their Province to adopt such a course. But how had Mr. Joly managed to maintain himself in power? By the casting vote of this purchased Speaker. Could the Ministry, whose sole support and prop was the casting vote of such a Speaker, exclaim: “Oh, we are immaculate and purged of all offence, no matter what may be said against us—the great mass of the electors have justified us.” Was it not a fact that, in addition to what the hon. member for Cardwell stated in reference to Mr. Turcotte, that an absolute majority of his electors signed a written request that he should not support the Joly Government, to oppose which he had been elected, and that he put the paper in his pocket, and went straightway and voted for that Government? Surely hon. gentlemen opposite need not say, then, much about the Joly Government being sustained by a majority of the House. But they had heard of the purchase of a Speaker by the Reform party before now. They knew of a gentleman in Ontario being seduced from his party, and, as his reward, taken from the Speaker's Chair and into the Government, by the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The Reform party were familiar with the practice of buying Speakers. His hon. friends from Lambton and Shefford (Messrs. Mackenzie and Huntington) had objected to the tone of this debate, and, while they, themselves, were rather remarkable for the use of strong and vituperative language, they charged hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side with a similar offence. He confessed he had not heard anything of the kind, further than a broad and plain statement of the facts, with regard to Mr. Turcotte's conduct, stated without vituper-

ative epithets, and which had not been contradicted. Though his friend from Lambton had said he had never heard stronger language, he (Mr. Cameron) had heard ten times stronger from his own lips; but they had never seen a question in Parliament calling for the use of stronger language than the one they were now discussing. But he must forget the kind of language used by the Reform party in and out of Parliament in 1858 and in 1873, and also by their recognised organs, with reference to far higher and more dignified individuals than Speaker Turcotte or Mr. Letellier. For instance, in 1858, the leading organ of the Reform party used not very mild language in charges against the Governor-General, which would be very appropriate against the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. It said:—

“With a Governor-General of this sort, of what use is Parliament? Of what avail are Ministers? Both are nullities if the occupant of the Government House has the right or the power to command the enactment of this Act or that. If he can order the enactment, he can with equal propriety order the repeal of laws; and what then becomes of law or freedom? If interference like this is to be submitted to, we may as well allow Sir Edmund Head to be Dictator *de jure*, as he already claims to be *de facto*. Members of Parliament may be dispensed with as an incumbrance; Cabinet Ministers may be abolished as unnecessary; and the Governor-General shall issue orders, bearing his precious sign-manual, which the people of Canada shall obey most humbly.

“So that his Excellency, not satisfied with dictating laws and playing the trickster to his Ministers—not content with claiming the control of the Statute-book, must needs go further than any British King has dared to go since the days of the Stuarts.”

The extract from the same organ, in 1873, read as follows:—

“We regret to say that the Governor-General has placed himself in a false position, and the sooner he prepares for his departure from the Dominion (which he will find too hot for him after his most unparalleled attack on the privileges of the House of Commons) the better.

“By accepting the advice of his Ministers, in opposition to the best established rights of the House of Commons, His Excellency has made himself accessory to all the crimes with which his Ministers stand charged.

“Words fail to express the heinousness of the outrage committed by Earl Dufferin. God help this poor country when the name of freedom can be so prostituted and outraged. Who could blame the poor outraged people if they

should, *en masse*, proceed to the capital and make the guilty criminals flee for their lives? Her Majesty should be petitioned to recall Lord Dufferin, whose name will henceforth be held in utter execration by every honest man in Canada.

“This is the last straw which breaks the camel's back, and now it is opportune to enquire whether our loyalty has at last yielded under the strain put upon it. * * * * * The Governor-General has forced many to think whether Canadian independence is not desirable.”

He thought his hon. friends on the Opposition side had better not lecture hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side for violent language, when they found such language applied to far higher personages than Messrs. Letellier and Turcotte, but which, by their conduct, one would be justified in applying to them. Then his hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Huntington) made use of a choice vocabulary of mild language in lecturing gentlemen upon this side of the House for the manner in which they had discussed this subject. The hon. gentleman made use of a few expressions which might be regarded as the sparkling gems of the brilliant eloquence with which he furnished them. Amongst the expressions were to be found the words “bludgeons,” “stiletos,” “daggers,” “cowardice,” “base calumnies,” “hurling defiance and denunciation,” “misrepresentation,”—these were a few of the choice words he employed while lecturing them as to the language they should use, and the use of such violent language would lead to them to believe that he had been recently associating with copper-coloured savages. His hon. friend the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had said that the people had spoken upon this subject, and this House should not interfere, and that the Provincial institutions were sufficient to work out the constitutional remedies. He (Mr. Cameron) had already maintained that the people, after being appealed to, had condemned Mr. Letellier. But, even if it were otherwise, it was still the duty of the House of Commons to express an opinion as to whether he did right or wrong. Then they were told that they should not bring the subject up again, because it was discussed last Session. He, however, had shown that it was not discussed on its merits, but that it was postponed on a dilatory plea put in by members of the Govern-

ment at that time. That plea, however, no longer held good, and they contended that they had a perfect right to pronounce upon the question now. Another argument which he had heard advanced elsewhere, but not during this debate, was that they were not competent, as a House of Commons, to express an opinion on this subject until the Government had dismissed the Lieutenant-Governor if he did wrong. In view of the phraseology of the 59th section of the British North America Act, there could be no foundation for such an argument as that. They might suppose a case in which the Lieutenant-Governor was manifestly wrong, and in which the Governor-General in Council refused to dismiss the Lieutenant-Governor, or to censure him; what would be the remedy? Had the House then no power to express an opinion on it? He maintained that the common-sense consideration was that they were entitled to express an opinion on this important subject. His hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Macdougall), as well as his hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), had both contended that it was the duty of the Federal Government to recall or censure the Lieutenant-Governor, and that, unless they did exercise that power, this House ought not to interfere. It seemed to him (Mr. Cameron) that the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was of a nature that rendered it a duty of the House of Commons to express an opinion. It had been said that this motion, if adopted, would be a vote of censure on his hon. friends on the Treasury benches, because it would amount to an assent that they had not done their duty in dismissing the Lieutenant-Governor. He was of a different opinion; as his hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was in office at the time this offence was committed, he was responsible for the advice which should have been given at that time to the Governor-General, and, if Mr. Letellier's conduct was deserving of condemnation, it was his duty to inflict the punishment. The motion, therefore, if a vote of censure, was a censure upon the late Government, and not upon the present occupants of the Treasury benches. He could well understand that the gentlemen now occupying that position might reasonably and properly

MR. CAMERON.

say that they found that last Session vote of censure was proposed upon Lieutenant-Governor Letellier; that they found that censure was not carried by the House of Commons—although he believed that the vote was carried by the Senate; that they found the Government of the day, which remained in power for some eight or nine months after this took place, had not thought fit to pronounce any opinion upon the subject, or take any action upon it, and that they (the present Government) had thought it more consistent with their duty and proper functions, to abstain from action until after the House of Commons had pronounced upon the matter. What the consequences of this resolution might be they had not now to consider. That rested with higher authority than theirs. It was for them to give their verdict, but the sentence and punishment lay in other hands. He did not purpose at this late hour to discuss the question at length, at present he would not say more than that, inasmuch as last Session he felt it his duty, as a humble member of the House, having considered the matter carefully, to vote in favour of the motion of the then right hon. member for Kingston, and having read the correspondence and documents which had since been laid before Parliament, he could come to no other conclusion than that, in accordance with the best interests of his constituents, the people of Ontario, as well as the people of the whole Dominion, he must vote for the motion. He had no fear, as was suggested by the hon. member for Quebec East, that the autonomy or liberty of any one Province would be interfered with. He thought the vote was likely to sustain the liberty of the people, and their right to speak through their lawfully elected representatives, instead of maintaining and upholding the arbitrary exercise of one-man power.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said he had paid particular attention to the speeches which had been delivered on this subject, and particularly to the speeches of the hon. members for Cardwell and North Victoria, who were looked upon among the people outside of Parliament as the shining and brilliant lights of the Conservative party. He

had expected to hear from them a distinct elucidation of the constitutional doctrine of the power of a Lieutenant-Governor to dismiss his Ministers. He had listened in vain for any clear, concise and reasonable exposition of that doctrine. He was a little surprised and somewhat amused to hear the hon. member who had just taken his seat state that the adoption of this resolution would be a vote of censure upon the late occupants of the Treasury benches. The hon. gentleman knew that, if this resolution passed, the censure could only apply to the existing Government. The Administration had been six months in power, and had not yet had the manliness or courage to deal with the question. They came to it now by resolution, and there was only one result that could logically follow the adoption of this resolution,—namely, the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor. If they dismissed him, he was much mistaken in the temper of the times and the sound common sense—and that he had always an abiding faith in—of the people of the country, if they did not hear of it at the next general election in the Dominion, if not in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman had also denounced the strong and vigorous language used by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington). He (Mr. Cameron), if his memory served him well, recollected hearing from the other side such words as “bribery,” “corruption,” “betrayal,” “outrageous conduct,” “villainous conduct,” etc. These epithets had been used in denouncing gentlemen behind their backs, while the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had made his charge face to face with hon. gentlemen. These gentlemen had, in a genuine spirit of Tory impertinence, charged men, not present to defend themselves, with bribery and corruption. This exhibited an amount of bravery and courage that did credit to hon. gentlemen. He proceeded to state that the late Government held that they had the right of discussing the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor. What they contended was that they had no right to pass a judgment upon that hon. gentleman which would inevitably result in his removal. An hon. member had taken the ground that no one had yet attempted to justify the conduct of

the Lieutenant-Governor. The reason they had not justified him was not because they did not think there was any fair or reasonable grounds for justification. The ground they had taken was that they were not here for the purpose of passing judgment, and, therefore, it was unnecessary to enter into the merits of the case, and that by the action of the people at the polls, and by the action of Parliament last year, the action of the Lieutenant-Governor was justified, and, therefore, it was unwise and indiscreet to pronounce any verdict upon his conduct. In reference to the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor, he believed the powers and prerogatives vested in him were precisely the same within his own sphere, as those of the Queen of England within her sphere, and of the Governor-General within his sphere. The doctrine of the exercise of prerogative, enunciated by hon. gentlemen opposite, was clearly opposed to the ablest of English constitutional writers. His hon. friend from Bothwell had quoted several authorities to show that the Sovereign had the right to dismiss her Ministers if they were not conducting the affairs of the country in harmony with her will, or in the interests of the people. He would refer to an authority which had not been quoted, to show that, under these circumstances, the Sovereign had this power, even though the Ministry had the confidence of the majority in Parliament. Hearn, on the Government of England, says :

“All measures are introduced into Parliament by the servants of the Crown, acting with the knowledge and concurrence of the King. If a Ministry adhere to a measure towards which the King cannot overcome his dislike, that Ministry cannot remain in office. If, notwithstanding all the efforts of the Ministry, a Bill to which the King was known to object, was likely to be carried by Parliament, the course of the measure would be interrupted by a dissolution, and the decision of the new Parliament would be accepted as final. In effect, this course is sometimes taken, but under different forms. It is disguised under the character of a change of Ministry. It is a sufficient inducement to the King to change his Ministers, if his existing servants be unable or unwilling to conduct, to his satisfaction, his relations with Parliament.”

The law upon the subject was perfectly clear. It was laid down by Todd, by

Lewis in his work entitled, "The Administration of Great Britain," by Freeman, in the last edition of his work, by the hon. gentleman who now led the Government, in his speech last Session, which was the ablest, most logical, the clearest and the most concise delivered on the occasion. It entered fully into the constitutional question, and so far as he (Mr. Cameron) made out its purport, it appeared to deal with it, though not in the spirit in which, according to his judgment, it ought to be dealt with, in a very able manner. He (Mr. Cameron) quoted from Charles Knight the following passage:—

"The Sovereign has a constitutional right to dismiss his Ministers, but it must be on grounds morally capable of justification in Parliament, and not on the simple exercise of his personal will."

He also quoted from Bagehot, one of the authorities quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite, but they only quoted isolated passages. If they had taken the trouble to read his work from beginning to end, they would not find this doctrine laid down there in absolute terms. Hon. gentlemen opposite had challenged a justification of Mr. Letellier's action, on the merits of the case. This House was not called upon to do this. The fact was sufficient that the people of Quebec had pronounced upon it at the polls, and his action was sustained by the Local Parliament. The justification of Mr. Letellier, however, could be easily established. The hon. gentlemen who supported this resolution were those who had, all their lives, been opposed to the principles of responsible government, though they now pretended to be such sticklers for the liberty of the subject. One of them had invoked the shades of Baldwin and Lafontaine, asking what these great men would say if they rose from the dead and found the Liberal party now pleading in behalf of this prerogative of the Crown. It was just as essential to the liberty of the subject that we should maintain one estate of the realm, as that we should maintain the other. According to the theories of hon. gentlemen opposite, we had only the House of Lords and the House of Commons, and the representatives of the Sovereign, whether in the Dominion

or the Provinces, were mere figure-heads. It was our duty to maintain the three estates of the realm, but hon. gentlemen, in order to have a slap at Mr. Letellier, and at the Liberal party in Quebec, were prepared to sacrifice the Constitution, and leave us in a worse position than even before Confederation. The line of argument taken by these hon. gentlemen reminded him of the statement made by Sir Boyle Roche in the old Irish Parliament, when a constitutional question was under discussion. He said: "I am prepared to surrender the half, nay, the whole of the Constitution, in order to preserve the remainder." So the hon. gentlemen were prepared to sacrifice the constitutional rights of the Province of Quebec, if they could only get a slap at Mr. Letellier. They were told that the tyranny of Mr. Letellier should be put down, but they knew that in the Mother Country, and in the history of the Mother Country, there were times when the tyranny of Parliament and of the representatives of the people became as dangerous and obnoxious as the tyranny of the Sovereign. The Irish Parliament, in its last years, did not represent the sentiments of the people; and, through influences brought to bear on them, they did what they should not have done. Would it have been an arbitrary act if they had been dealt with as the De Boucherville Ministry had been dealt with. No wrong, in that case, could have been done to them. The subject ought to be protected from the tyranny of Parliament, as well as from the tyranny of the Lieutenant-Governor, if tyranny had been committed by him. They were told there was not a single fact to justify Mr. Letellier's action. He had listened to and read the arguments of the hon. members for Cardwell and Simcoe (Messrs. White and McCarthy), and found that none of them were new, but that they had all been taken from the speech of the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) last Session. Under the facts and circumstances, it was the bounden duty of Mr. Letellier to dismiss his Government. Hon. gentlemen would find, in the papers submitted to Parliament, at page 12, one of the first circumstances which Mr. Letellier set forth as a ground for the dismissal of his Govern-

ment. He stated that, during the Session of 1876, a Bill was read three times in one branch of the Legislature and only twice in the other. That matter, isolated, would not justify the dismissal of his Ministers, but it showed their carelessness and utter incompetency. What would be thought of the hon. the leader of the Government if he allowed a Bill to pass this Parliament, and asked the Governor-General to sanction it, when it had only received two readings. He would not retain long his character as an able statesman. The second charge was that a Bill was passed through both Houses with an important blank in it. It was practically a nullity, and yet the advisers of the Crown allowed it to pass. It might be said this was a clerical error, but it showed how utterly incompetent the advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor were. The third ground taken by Mr. Letellier was that his Ministers substituted the Executive for the judicial power, by using the Lieutenant-Governor's name to appoint a municipal councillor in the village of Montmagny, instead of leaving it in the hands of the people—thus interfering with their liberty. The fourth ground was the passing of Acts without his sanction—the Tax Bill, and the Bill relating to the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway. If there ever was a Bill which would justify the people in rising in open rebellion against the Government which introduced it, it was this. If there were any circumstances which would justify the Lieutenant-Governor in dismissing his Ministry, it appeared to him that this one circumstance was enough to justify him in that course. The fifth charge was that two proclamations had been issued without the signature of the Lieutenant-Governor having been obtained thereto. That charge would be found on page 15 of the Blue-book, and on page 32 there was the reply sent in by the late Administration. What was the charge; what was the answer; and what was the reply thereto? The charge was that those gentlemen issued two proclamations without the signature of the Lieutenant-Governor, and the question was whether they were authorised to do so. The Lieutenant-Governor said they had not received his sanction. The answer given to that by his late advisers was that is

not true. Four days after the proclamations were issued without his sanction, the Lieutenant-Governor put his name to them. The members of the DeBoucher-ville Government had defended their conduct in this matter by saying that they considered they had a general authority to do so from the usual practice which had previously prevailed. Their defence was worthy of practitioners in an Upper Canada Division Court. The Lieutenant-Governor justified his course in dismissing his sworn advisers, by saying that the Legislature was admitted to be controlled by rings. He was not going to enter upon that branch of the defence. The seven grounds upon which Mr. Letellier justified his conduct were established, and showed a persistent ignoring of the Lieutenant-Governor; they showed an amount of tyranny that could hardly have been expected, in the nineteenth century, from gentlemen who were the sworn advisers of the Crown; they showed an utter disregard for the functions, powers and prerogatives, of the Lieutenant-Governor. He was not surprised, therefore, that Mr. Letellier found it his duty to dismiss these men. They knew that, in the early history of Upper Canada, there were cases in which the Lieutenant-Governor exercised his judgment by opposing, as unwise and unconstitutional, a similar course to that opposed by Mr. Letellier, and refused his sanction to Bills regarded as oppressive and unconstitutional, upon which the Ministry resigned. The Tories had sustained that view, and now, when the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec had used almost identical words in refusing to sanction the legislative acts of his advisers, upon the ground that the legislation was unwise, the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House talked about the liberty of the subject being invaded, and the rights of the people not being protected. He believed thoroughly that the justification of the Lieutenant-Governor had been made out clear, distinct, and beyond doubt. There was another ground that already had been spoken of. Parliament was dissolved by the Lieutenant-Governor, at the instance and by the advice of his sworn advisers. They advised him to dissolve Parliament. He appealed to the

people of the Province and they sustained him. They were told, by the seconder of this resolution, that Parliament did not sustain him, that he only retained his position by the purchased vote of the Speaker, and by that of another member who had also sold himself to Mr. Joly, and that that was the only reason why he was not out of power, and the Lieutenant-Governor at the mercy of the people of the Province of Quebec. He would remind the hon. gentlemen opposite that the gentleman at the head of the Government had only sustained himself in power for twenty years by the spoils taken from his political opponents.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : My hon. friend would call that petty larceny.

MR. CAMERON : Yes, I charge the gentleman with larceny in the first degree. He would advise the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a Bill into Parliament that would make the right hon. gentleman guilty of the crime of larceny for just such offences. He would also like him to introduce a Bill that would make it a criminal offence for hon. gentlemen to obtain their seats by false pretences, as the hon. gentlemen had done. The hon. gentleman talked about the Speaker and another gentleman being influenced by the Government. Why, the hon. gentleman had bribed two Postmasters-General, one Receiver-General, one Minister of Agriculture, and others too numerous to mention. The Postmaster-General, whom he always listened to with attention and respect, asked the House what the people of Ontario would do under similar circumstances. He would tell that hon. gentleman what the people of that Province would do. They would mind their own business, and would not appeal to this Parliament to rectify a local grievance. The people of Quebec had pronounced on the subject, the late Parliament had pronounced on the subject, and both tribunals had acquitted the Lieutenant-Governor, and there the matter should rest. Hon. gentlemen would recollect that one of the charges against the DeBoucherville Government was that they were controlled by railway rings. What did the Premier of the

Province answer to that charge? His answer was that the people at the polls had pronounced upon that question, and that, therefore, that charge had passed beyond the region of discussion. His answer would be found at page 22 of the papers submitted to Parliament. If that argument was sound in the one case, it was equally so in the other. The people of Quebec had acquitted the Lieutenant-Governor. Parliament had voted down this resolution, and now they were asked to deal with it a third time. There is no clearer principle of British law than that a man shall not be tried twice for the same offence. The rule that applies to the criminal, charged with the pettiest crime, in England, the Governor of a British Province should clearly have the benefit of. He had the highest respect for the French-Canadian people. They are noted for their chivalrous and gallant conduct. Let them not, therefore, persist in trying a man the third time for the same offence. Above all, let them not correct him without evidence, and behind his back. The course the majority might take was of no consequence to the Lieutenant-Governor, as the Government had not the courage to dismiss him, even though fortified by a vote of this House. If the Government did act on this vote, and did dismiss the Lieutenant-Governor, hon. gentlemen might depend on it that the people at the polls would condemn the conduct of the Government, at the first opportunity, as unwise, and subversive of the constitutional rights of the Provinces.

MR. McLENNAN said, when the gentleman who had just sat down began to speak, he hoped that they were going to reach a higher platform, a loftier tone. But he must say that he had not been struck with the cogency of his argument, or with the eloquence of his language. If he (Mr. McLennan) understood this question at all, they had not to do with the Administration of the Province of Quebec, but only with the Lieutenant-Governor. The question was not whether his Administration acted wisely in some of their acts, but whether the Lieutenant-Governor acted wisely or unwisely in dismissing a Ministry that represented

MR. CAMERON.

a majority of the people of the country. And it was because this question might some day affect the great Province of Ontario, that he ventured to say a few words in relation to it. He had had the pleasure last evening of listening to a very eloquent address by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), and he certainly admired the manner in which he used the English language, in extolling the beauties of free government. Unfortunately he (Mr. McLennan) could not admire the substance of his speech so much as its form. He (Mr. Laurier) admitted that this House had some control over the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, but that it would be far better that any acts of that officer, of a despotic or tyrannical nature that were covered by ministerial responsibility should be left to take their course and not be interfered with by this Government. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), while mastering the English language, had extended his observations, he would also have observed that, where the spirit of the people using that language was predominant, tyranny and despotism were impossible. He would have known that any Governor under the control in any measure of this House could never, by any chance, be permitted to exercise tyranny and despotism. The hon. member for Lambton stated, in the course of his very ingenious defence of the situation, that Federal Government was a fraud, if this House could exercise a supervising surveillance over Provincial Government. But there were other things far more dangerous to Governments, which consisted in sapping and undermining them. He ventured to say that this question affected very closely the system of government which was now upon trial, and it behoved us to be very watchful against everything that could retard its development. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) had asked how gentlemen would like to see Mr. Mowat referring the decision of political questions to a star chamber. He (Mr. McLennan) did not think the gentlemen from Ontario would allow Mr. Mowat to decide political questions for them in a star chamber; and it was because there was a possibility that such a question might come up at some day that the matter was of so much interest

for the Province of Ontario. He had the honour to represent here a county which had given a Lieutenant-Governor to Ontario. Last year the hon. member for Lambton, accompanied by the Premier of Ontario, made a visit into his (Mr. McLennan's) county. Whether there was any connection between the fact of this visit and the fact of his candidature for that county, he (Mr. McLennan) could not tell, but the circumstance was one which brought up the whole question of the influence of Lieutenant-Governors. They were told, among other things, that the lesser Premier of Ontario accompanied the greater Premier of the Dominion into his (Mr. McLennan's) county as a private gentleman. It was in the recollection of this House that that gentleman descended from the Bench, that he doffed the ermine to go into the arena of Provincial politics. There might be no descent from that position to that of a private gentleman, but he strongly suspected that Mr. Mowat must have accompanied the Premier of the Dominion in somewhat the same character that Ministers of a peculiar sort accompanied Kings in a previous age, that was, to remind them of their mortality and of their infirmities. They were asked by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), of what use were Lieutenant-Governors. He (Mr. McLennan) believed that, in the opinion of this country, Lieutenant-Governors were not useful as party politicians. There was a higher rôle for them, and one that was very clearly laid down in the Constitution, illustrious examples of which had been afforded, from time to time, by the noble men who had occupied the position of Governors-General of this country. They should exist as the impartial arbiters of all Governments and of all parties, but they should not plunge into the arena of politics to find excuses for any course. This question of the functions of a Lieutenant-Governor was one that should now be settled for all future times. A higher rôle was appointed for them than that of serving, as his hon. friend the member for Cardwell (Mr. White) stated correctly last night, as counters to political parties. Such a course was entirely unworthy of their office. He had in his mind, at the moment, the case of a Lieutenant-Governor appointed

by the late Ministry to the far-off Province of British Columbia, and, when the question came up, some time last year, as to his position towards political parties, he declared that political parties were nothing to him; that his office was to hold an even balance between them, and neither to justify one nor decry the other. This was the only safe ground for Lieutenant-Governors to take under the Constitution of our country. Some very vigorous language had been used in this House respecting the possibilities that might follow the adoption of this motion. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) had challenged Ministers to show their pluck by dismissing the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. He (Mr. McLennan) was not afraid to vote for this resolution on account of any consequences, or from any fear that the Government would do too much or too little. He was quite content to leave the matter in their hands. If he could trust them on their great Canadian policy, which he conceived to be of paramount importance to this country, which he had done implicitly, he believed he could entrust them with his vote on a motion as to the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. He believed it was quite competent, and very proper, for this House to record its opinion upon a point of so much interest for the present and all time as the conduct of Lieutenant-Governors under all circumstances.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he would like to make a few remarks before the close of the debate, and to first notice the observations of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) in which he held the House could not discuss this question, speaking thus in opposition to the hon. member for Lambton, who, last year, stated the House had a right to discuss the actions of Lieutenant-Governors appointed by themselves. But the member for South Huron stated they had no right to pass an opinion or vote of censure with regard to it. How could they discuss it, unless there was a resolution in the Speaker's hands affecting the matter, which must either be condemnatory or laudatory. The hon. member for Lambton admitted, last year, that they had a

MR. CAMERON.

right, if they thought fit, to take up and pass such a resolution as the present, whether they approved or disapproved of the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor. Could it be held that they had not as much right to discuss his conduct as that of a postmaster in the country, or any other Federal officer? This right must be admitted. The only question for discussion was whether they should pass this motion of censure or not. They all remembered that, last year, when the discussion in this House took place, by none was any defence of Mr. Letellier made; they heard only a dilatory plea put in, a request to wait till the people of Quebec had passed their judgment upon the action of Mr. Joly. The member for South Huron, feeling the taunt cast at the leader of the Opposition, thought it necessary to rush in and attempt a defence. His hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had done the same, going back 40 years to draw forth some of the old forgotten prerogatives of the Crown, and even as far as the time of Charles I. The member for South Huron tried to defend the conduct of Mr. Letellier, showing too well the truth of the old adage, that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." When he discussed clause by clause Mr. Letellier's case for the dismissal of his Ministers, he admitted that each charge in itself was nothing. He passed over accusations as only showing little faults as clerical errors, not of the Ministers themselves, but of some of their officers. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) would like to call the attention of the hon. members from Quebec to the strange position taken by the hon. member for Shefford. He had appealed to them to preserve the autonomy of their Province, their peculiar institutions, laws and language, from the interference of the majority of this Parliament. How well did that appeal come from a gentleman, with the hon. member for Chateauguay beside him, who, no doubt, remembered well his speech at Argenteuil, in which he attempted to stir up strife, and set race against race and creed against creed. It ill-became him to talk about preserving the rights and autonomy of Quebec, after that famous deliverance. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) was sure that if the hon. member for Chateauguay would express his honest sentiments, he

would say that the hon. member for Shesford was the last one who should attempt to set himself up as the defender of the rights of that Province. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) told them that he would not defend the conduct of Mr. Letellier, which was indefensible, but that he did not think they had a right to pass upon an offence he had been three times tried for by the people of Quebec, in the elections of May last, by the Local Legislature in June, and by the Parliament of Canada last Session; yet he said that this Parliament had not the right to try him. That brought up the whole question. When Parliament tried it last year they acted legally, which was an admission that they had a right to try him then, and surely, if so, they had a right to try him now. Was the hon. gentleman right in contending that Mr. Letellier had been tried by the Province of Quebec? There lay the whole issue of this question. They had, he thought, two questions in this matter which must be kept entirely distinct; they had the action of the Ministers and of the Lieutenant-Governor himself. The local Ministers were responsible for the advice they gave. The responsibility of the Ministers was tried by the local elections, and by the Local Legislature, but not so (Mr. Letellier's liability. What would be the result if the character of his conduct was to be judged by the outcome of the elections? They would have the unedifying spectacle of a Lieutenant-Governor, the representative of the Sovereign, passed upon by the people at the polls. If one side succeeded, he was right; if the other, he was wrong. The representative of the Sovereign would have to leave his elevated position, take part in the elections, and throw the whole weight of his office into the scale for one side or the other; his trial and sentence of guilty or acquittal being involved in this struggle. Nothing could be more destructive of the dignity and influence of the Crown than such interference, and it would never be thought of in England. The Lieutenant-Governor was responsible to this House and Government, and it was by the result of the elections in Quebec, for representatives in this House, that he was to be tried. It was objected, it would not do for members from other

parts of Canada to censure the Governors of particular Provinces. They were told that, some day, in this way, some of the smaller Provinces would be over-ridden. But they were not now acting in opposition to the wishes of the people of Quebec. It was on the 17th September last that Mr. Letellier was actually tried by the people, the question being distinctly put to the vote in every constituency, as to whether he was right or wrong; the result had been unmistakably shown by the return of 48 members to condemn him, and only 17 to support him. They knew also, for it was no secret, that the opinion of a high authority, no longer connected with this country, was that the constitutional question would be lost sight of at the polls in May last, there being so many questions exciting the people, who were smarting under the idea of a probable increase of taxation, and animosity to the Government of Mr. DeBoucherville for proposing new taxes, to prevent the Province running into debt, as the present Government was reported to be allowing it. The people (for the sake of argument, let it be said that they supported Mr. Joly) did not approve of Mr. Letellier's dismissal of his former Ministry. Now, if the Lieutenant-Governor was an officer of this House, he was responsible to it as much as any Governor was to the House of Commons in England for his administration of a Colony. In the records of the British House of Commons, they might find frequent reports of the discussions of the conduct of such officers. The conduct of Governor Eyre was discussed and adverted to in Parliament very strongly. Sir Charles Darling and Mr. Pope Hennessey had their conduct discussed in the House of Commons of England. Why, then, should not this House discuss the conduct of their Lieutenant-Governor?

MR. HUNTINGTON: It is not exactly the same thing.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said it was precisely the same thing. Lieutenant-Governors occupied the same position, as representatives of the Government, as the Colonial representatives did in respect to the Crown. Lieutenant-Governors were responsible to this

House, and it was only in this House that their conduct could be discussed. Otherwise, there was no tribunal to which they were responsible. It was true the Governor-General in Council had power to remove; but they had the right to pass their opinion, if the Government did not see fit to act. The power of the Governor in Council to remove the Lieutenant-Governors did not debar them from discussing independently the action of Lieutenant-Governors. He desired to call attention to one thing that had been omitted in this discussion, and that was that the Lieutenant-Governor had placed himself in such a position by his conduct as to destroy his usefulness. He had rendered it impossible for him to govern properly and efficiently the people over whom he had been placed. He had placed himself in direct antagonism to a large section of the people of that Province. He had placed himself in personal antagonism with the very people whom, in the event of a change of Ministry, it would be necessary to call to his Council. He would refer to an extract which would show clearly what position a Governor occupied with regard to a Colonial Government. He would quote for a moment from a despatch written by the Right Hon. Edward Cardwell to Governor Sir Chas. Darling, in 1866, in which he declared the duty of a Governor. He said:

“It is one of the first duties of the Queen's Representative to keep himself, as far as possible, aloof from, and above, all personal conflicts. He should always so conduct himself as not to be precluded from acting freely with those whom the course of Parliamentary proceedings might present to him as his confidential advisers. While, on the one hand, it is his duty to afford to his actual advisers all fair and just support, consistently with the observance of the law; he ought, on the other hand, to be perfectly free to give the same support to any other Ministers whom it may be necessary for him at any future time to call to his Councils. The colony is entitled to know that the Governor gives this support to his Ministers for the time being, and that he is able and willing, if the occasion shall arise, to give the same support to others. I regret to say that in the present instance you have rendered this impossible. It must be evident to yourself that you occupy a position of personal antagonism towards almost all those whose antecedents point them out as most likely to be available to you in the event of any change of Ministry. This has resulted, as I think,

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

entirely from your own acts, your adoption of a course of conduct which cannot be justified in law, and your strong denunciation, in which I am wholly unable to concur, of those who have objected to that course. It is impossible, I much regret to say, that, after this, you can, with advantage, continue to conduct the Government of the colony.

“Looking to your long services, and sincerely desirous to make every allowance for the difficulties of your position, I have been most reluctant to arrive at the decision which, nevertheless, I have been obliged to adopt. I am compelled to advise Her Majesty that you should be relieved of your duties, and the Government of the colony be placed in other hands.”

That was the despatch from the Right Hon. Edward Cardwell to Governor Darling in 1866.

MR. HUNTINGTON: That is not a case in point.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said why was it not? Had they not in the papers that had been laid upon the table of this House, conclusive evidence that Governor Letellier had placed himself in personal antagonism to the leaders of a great party in the Province of Quebec—the leaders of that party which, in the event of a change of Ministry, he would have found it necessary to call to his Council? They knew that, throughout the length and breadth of that Province, there was a feeling which knew no bounds, which had destroyed Mr. Letellier's usefulness, and which, in the words of the despatch, would have compelled a Colonial Minister to advise Her Majesty to recall him, had he been an officer representing the Imperial Government. If that was the case, the same duty was incumbent upon the Government here, and upon this House, to pass its opinion on that conduct. And he thought that, if a member of the House believed that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's conduct was unjustifiable or indefensible, then the plain course for him to pursue was to vote for this resolution. It seemed, to his mind, quite clear that they had a right to discuss it. They discussed these questions in the Imperial House of Commons, and, if they could discuss his conduct, they could discuss that resolution, and that resolution must approve or condemn—

MR. MACKENZIE: No, no.

MR. KIRKPATRICK, said that every person who condemned that course ought to vote for this resolution, and so express his opinion upon it.

MR. CASGRAIN said that he would not have spoken at that late hour and after the exhaustive discussion that had taken place, if it were not to protest against the assertion of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and especially to protest solemnly against the partisan spirit that had run through this debate, and against the means made use of to prevent all amendments to the main motion. It deprived the members of their right to register in the Journals of the House the expression of their opinions, and forced upon them a vote that did not make known all their views upon the question. At the same time that the leader of the Opposition had risen, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), rose, too, with a little motion drawn up beforehand, and, by one of these happy and unforeseen accidents, he had succeeded in catching the Speaker's eye just at the right moment. And what had been his aim? To choke off discussion, prevent any amendment, and to oblige the House to vote upon a motion that did not give expression to the real feeling of all the members upon the point at issue. This was not the true constitutional manner of proceeding, although parliamentary subtleties had invented it; it was not a frank or loyal manner, it was not an honest way of discussing the question from a judicial stand-point, as it was now submitted to the House. He did not think that the country would be satisfied, neither would they be the real judge, the judge in last resort, the people; for, after all, it was the people, especially the people of the Province of Quebec, that were to judge this question in an impartial manner and without any partisan spirit. They had an amendment to offer that might have met the views of a good number of members, but they could not now propose it. During the course of the debate he did not believe that there had been any change of convictions on either side. He thought that the members of the Right had come here with their minds made up to ask for Mr. Letellier's head at any

price, exactly as it had been seen in an illustrated paper that represented the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) as serving up the head of the Lieutenant-Governor, and offering it to Messrs. Chapleau, Angers and Church. With such a disposition of mind, was it right to have recourse to a subterfuge in order to obtain an expression of opinion from the House? He recognised there the meanness that characterised the Conservative party and that delayed the supplies until now. For his part, he disapproved of the manner in which the discussion was carried on. He would not enter into the merits of the question, it had been settled long ago by Mr. Joly and his Ministers, who had made themselves responsible for this act of the Lieutenant-Governor, and, if there was, in the country, a man capable, by his honour, ability, and his talents, of defending the Lieutenant-Governor, it was Mr. Joly. He did not wish it to be believed that the vote to be given would represent the opinion of the country, or of the Province of Quebec. There had already been a vote given last year. The whole British Empire took an interest, in theory, in the question now raised by the Conservative party. It was on the other side of the Atlantic that it would be finally settled who was right and who was wrong, from a constitutional point of view. They were creating a precedent, and hereafter there would be a precedent that would establish that, when there was a question affecting the public good, the advantages or the fortune of the country, the prerogatives of the Crown might, and should be, made use of to protect these interests. There were upon this subject two extreme opinions—one that reduced the Crown to nothing, and made of it a mere ornament of a true republic, whilst, on the other hand, the Commons of England would be like the Roman Senate in the days of its power; the other opinion would bring back the ancient prerogatives of the Crown still written in the Constitution. For his part, he saw a protecting shield in the Crown. Under grave and difficult circumstances, when the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor was at stake, when he had well-grounded doubts as to the integrity of representatives, when his Ministers had lost his

confidence through incapacity or otherwise, it was then that the Lieutenant-Governor was to make use of the Royal prerogative. He maintained that the true constitutional question should be stated in this manner, that this power conferred on the Lieutenant-Governor should remain in a latent state, but that, in grave and solemn cases, he should make use of it as a remedy for the good of the country. In England, it was public opinion that finally settled constitutional questions. Precedents were there appreciated on their merits; it was so, and it should be so in this country. The conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor was before the people, the people had judged it, and it was the people who would finally pronounce upon it as a precedent for the future. Mr. Joly and his Ministers were there, they had assumed the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor's act, and they would be either condemned or sustained upon this question. The Postmaster-General (Mr. Langevin), who always had upon his lips a word about religion, had profited by this occasion to remind the House that the Catholic religion was the religion of the majority in the Province of Quebec. He might have dispensed with this remark, and not have drawn attention to a fact that every one was aware of. For he did not hesitate to say that, under a deceitful veil, he had endeavoured, on account of Mr. Joly's religion, to excite religious and national prejudices against him and against the Liberal Government of Quebec.

MR. MOUSSEAU enquired where the member for L'Islet had seen that.

MR. CASGRAIN said that enough of it had been seen in the elections, and that he hoped there would be no more of it in the future. It was true that the Postmaster-General might be converted by his association with the Grand Master of Customs (Mr. Bowell) they were both cut out of the same piece of cloth, a chip off the same block. Being on board the same vessel, they would arrive together either at Rome or at Babylon. At all events, he regretted to be obliged to protest against the Postmaster-General's words, but he did so strongly and fearlessly. He was now ready to vote against the motion as drawn up. He

would have preferred an amendment, but, as the other side had seen fit to prevent all amendments, he would have to take things as they were, and protest as he had already protested.

MR. CIMON said that the speech just delivered by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) took him back in spirit to the birth of Rome. This was not surprising, for the hon. member was fond of ransacking by-gone centuries, his origin dated back so far. In the heroic days, the Romans had the habit, on the eve of great events, to consult their oracles. Thus, at eventide, when the sun was sinking in the west, and the shadows of night began to creep over the earth, they turned their eyes heavenwards, in order to see whether they could not there descry vultures or condors, so that they might predict, by the flight of these birds, what was to happen. It was fortunate for the hon. members of the House that they had this evening an oracle that they could consult. The hon. member for L'Islet had predicted what would be the result of the motion now before the House. He had stated that the vote of this House would be without effect, that the question now under discussion would be referred to the Imperial authorities, and that the latter would maintain His Honour Luc Letellier as Lieutenant-Governor. He regretted not being able to repose any confidence in the prophecy of the hon. member, for he could not help believing that the Lieutenant-Governor was an officer of the Federal Government, under the control of this House, and charged with the working of the Constitution in the Province of Quebec, in accordance with true principles, with honesty and honour, and that, when he was recreant to his duty, he was responsible to the authority from which he held his office. He wished to know in what century we were living, and if the representatives of a country that was to become one of the great countries of the world could not watch over their own interests; if they could not say that Mr. Letellier was unworthy to govern the Province of Quebec; if they could not declare that this officer, whom they had appointed and for whose grave conduct they were responsible, had been recreant to his duty, or if they wished he should

MR. CASGRAIN.

leave Spencer Wood and go back to his fireside gods. He hoped that they were not tied down to the will of the Imperial Parliament, when it was merely a question of the removal of an officer appointed by the Executive of Canada, and he trusted that the hon. member for L'Islet was not justified in saying that whatever the House might decide to-night would have no consequence. There was one thing that was not to be forgotten, in spite of what the members of the Opposition might say to the contrary, and that was that there was a feeling of great uneasiness in the Province of Quebec. This Province was, to-day, in a very critical position, all public affairs were suspended, and the electors had no confidence in the present Lieutenant-Governor. That man had violated the Constitution, and, what was still worse, he was teaching the people to despise authority. He was a demoralising example for the young generation, with respect to sovereign authority in this country. That was why they wanted to sanction, as a principle, that in this country no one could take the name of Her Majesty in vain. What was now seen at Spencer Wood, the dwelling-place of the Governors of the Province, who had heretofore governed according to the principles of the British Constitution, and who had taught the people to love the British Empire, and to cherish England's Sovereign? They saw there a place of meeting, where the men of the Liberal party organised elections; it was a mere Liberal club. It was from Spencer Wood that came the Liberal organisation, during a late Federal election. Could such a state of things be continued much longer in the Province of Quebec? Several hon. members on the other side of the House had said that they intended to appeal to prejudice among the Catholic and French Canadian population of the Province of Quebec. They had told the House that a dangerous precedent was going to be made, because the interference of the Federal Parliament in Provincial matters was asked for. But he would like to know whether it was a bad precedent to ask for justice; and whether doing justice constituted a threat or a danger? There was no need to fear. The population of the Province of Quebec knew what to think upon this matter,—they

would always be happy to learn that the Federal Government had done them justice, even though in doing so there had been interference in Provincial affairs. When enemies of the Province of Quebec—and the worst enemies of this Province were the Liberals of this country—when they unjustly endeavoured to interfere in the local matters of this Province, through the agency of the Federal authority, who had sent a Lieutenant-Governor to Quebec with the special mission of ousting the DeBoucherville Cabinet, it was then that the Liberals, the enemies of popular rights, had made a bad precedent. And it was against this bad precedent that the Conservatives protested now. They wanted to wipe out this dangerous precedent by another that should be in accordance with justice and the Constitution. They now asked for the interference of the Federal authority, but in a constitutional manner and for the protection of the rights of the people. There was no need to fear this precedent, that they wanted to establish as an antidote against the one created previously by the Liberals. What they wanted the House to declare to-night was that the Federal authority should never interfere, even constitutionally, with Provincial affairs, not even through a Lieutenant-Governor. There was no danger for the Province in such a precedent, for it would sanction a principle of justice and constitutional law,—a principle that might be invoked in the future, and it would be a good lesson for all Lieutenant-Governors who might wish to forget their duties.

Mr. CASEY said the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) discussed the question of whether this House had a right to consider such a motion as this, and whether it had a right to discuss it under the present circumstances. His (Mr. Casey's) own opinion was that their right to discuss it at any time, and under any circumstances was extremely doubtful, although he was aware that in this he differed from many gentlemen on his own side of the House. They were all aware that the initiative, in regard to the dismissal of a Lieutenant-Governor, was given by the Constitution to the

Cabinet of the day, and that action in the premises should be taken by the Cabinet of the day. Consequently, any discussion in this House, unless with the object of directing the Cabinet to dismiss a Lieutenant-Governor, or of censuring the Cabinet for not dismissing him, was, to say the least of it, of very doubtful constitutionality. He thought that a resolution of censure should not come up in the manner this had. The motion of censure was one most injurious to public interests, and of a kind which the framers of the Constitution intended to prevent. As they had heard from one of the leading gentlemen who framed that Constitution (Mr. Macdougall), it was the intention of the framers of the British North America Act to prevent political discussion of the acts of Lieutenant-Governors, except in the manner indicated by the Act, the initiative being taken by the responsible leaders of the House. Against that, it was argued that Lieutenant-Governors stood in exactly the same relation to this House as Colonial Governors did to the English House of Commons. The parallel was not exact. The English House of Commons was a sovereign body, not bound by any written Constitution; and it had nothing in its own Constitution to prevent either the Cabinet or the Legislative body from taking the initiative in an action of this kind. But under our written Constitution our powers did not exceed those actually given to us, and the Cabinet alone could take the initiative in an action of this kind. But, even granting that the House had a right to discuss this motion, it had no right to discuss it now. The question had been finally settled last year. Mr. Letellier had now undergone, not only three trials, as already pointed out, but four. The present Government, as well as the late one, had considered his case and declined to act, although strongly pressed to do so by their Quebec supporters. The last Parliament considered it and declined to act; the people of Quebec had weighed his act, and had given their verdict in approval of it, by supporting the Cabinet which had assumed the responsibility of it. The motion now before the House was a direct vote of censure on the Government, moved by one of its own supporters.

MR. CASEY.

Why did the Government allow this? To get information? No, for they had that in full already. To have a judicial decision? No, for it was their own duty to make such a decision, and they had evidently decided, since they refused to take action. It could only be to find out how far the bulk of their supporters from the other Provinces were willing to agree to the action demanded by their friends from Quebec, that they might shelter themselves behind the apparent sanction which their party, as a whole, might give, if they afterwards granted those demands. As to this question having had any influence in the elections, they all knew that it was most assuredly not the main issue, or an important point even, in Ontario or the Maritime Provinces. What carried the elections was the National Policy promised by the Conservatives; and now the Government intended to use the majority so gained to pander to the vengeance and personal ends of their Quebec supporters. This would form a precedent of a most unwholesome and dangerous nature. The hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Cimon) had charged members of the Opposition with trying to raise prejudices against the French-Catholic population of Quebec. No accusation was more unfounded. The Opposition had argued against the course of Quebec Conservatives, which was a very different thing. The latter would necessarily raise prejudices against themselves by their course. He warned the Conservatives of Ontario of the consequences of voting for this motion. If these gentlemen, returned to some extent by those who usually voted Reform, to support a Protection policy, prostituted their power for the purpose of assisting this petty persecution, they would have to look to a severe reckoning at the next general elections. It had been held by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) that, if they had a right to try the case last year, they had so now. This was fallacious. If they had that right then, their decision at that time was final, since their functions in this matter were judicial and not legislative. If they had it not then, they could not try it now. Gentlemen opposite might take either horn of the dilemma, and find that whichever they took would prove their

inability to censure Mr. Letellier. He protested, too, against the attempt to choke off amendments by moving the previous question. The same thing was effected last Session by moving in amendment to Committee of Supply. Freedom of amendment was the only way of securing the real opinion of the House. Gentlemen opposite were now, as last year, afraid of that opinion, but without the same excuse, as they now had an overwhelming majority.

MR. BRECKEN said he thought that nearly everything that could be said on this subject had already been urged. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who had just sat down, had talked about gentlemen on this side of the House being drilled. He (Mr. Brecken) had not seen anything of the drill-sergeant since he came into the House; but he thought that, if supporting a cause without advancing an argument in its favour was an evidence of being drilled, the hon. gentleman, who had just taken his seat, must have been very recently in the company of the drill-sergeant. He had listened, with a great deal of pleasure, to the speech which was delivered by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier); he had more than pleased him, he had charmed, but not convinced him; and, while he (Mr. Brecken) was listening to him, he had almost forgotten that the hon. gentleman was opposed to him. He (Mr. Laurier) had thrown out a warning to this House to deal carefully with this case. He (Mr. Brecken) could hardly understand from the speeches delivered by hon. members on the other side of the House whether in their opinion they had or had not the right to discuss this question. It appeared that, under the 59th clause of the British North America Act, a Lieutenant-Governor might be removed by the Governor-General in Council for cause assigned. He could hardly imagine that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) was in earnest when he stated that the cause to be assigned could only be applied to a personal offence and not to a political one, and that this House was not free to act with regard to the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. He (Mr. Brecken) had lived in a country which, in former days, had tyrannical Governors, and the repre-

sentatives of the people had had a little experience in opening and carrying on negotiations with the Colonial Office. They had occasion, more than once, to send delegates to England at considerable expense and great trouble, to have their grievances redressed; and, much as they deferred to and respected the Mother Country and British statesmanship, they had always looked forward to the time when they would have such a tribunal as that now afforded them in the body of men in the House of Commons, representing the whole of British North America, to which to refer such cases. The Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was appointed by the Cabinet of the Dominion, which was only a Committee of this House. If this House had not the power of discussing such cases as that now before them, and where the facts of the case justified them in coming to a resolution censuring the Lieutenant-Governor, they were not entitled, were not qualified, were not educated up to the point, to fit them to enjoy responsible government, an admission he felt sure hon. members on the Opposition side were not prepared to make. The members of the Government were the servants of the people, who, through the electorate of the Dominion of Canada, appointed them to office. The Government of Quebec were also responsible directly to the people, but the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was the servant of this Parliament, and hon. members on the other side of the House, who called themselves Liberals, could say that this House had no right to decide whether or not the conduct of Mr. Letellier, their servant, was constitutional or not. His hon. friend from Quebec East, when he stated the term "Cause" applied to personal charges, and not to political, did not sufficiently consider the charges made against the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. He (Mr. Brecken) did not agree in that opinion, and that was the only kind of argument put forward by hon. members on the other side of the House. One point, and to his (Mr. Brecken's) mind, one which had not been raised by previous speakers, was that Mr. Letellier had placed himself in a position of personal antagonism to the views of a large and influential portion of the people of

Quebec, led by a party of very distinguished statesmen in that Province. An election might be held there in six months hence, and, judging from present appearances, it was not at all improbable, and the men whom the Lieutenant-Governor of that Province had, as he (Mr. Brecken) contended, unconstitutionally dismissed, might be returned as the constitutional advisers of His Honour, and he would be bound to accept them. Governor Letellier had, by the course he had pursued, greatly impaired, if not altogether destroyed, his usefulness as the head of the Executive of the Province of Quebec. If there was any advice which the Colonial Office had always impressed on Governors, it was that they should neither know friends nor enemies among the public men with whom they had to deal. What would be the position of Mr. Letellier when he found himself in such open hostility to men who were not at all unlikely to be again called upon to advise him? He would quote an extract from the speech of Mr. Cardwell, as reported in English Hansard, Vol. 182, page 621, in the case of Sir Charles Darling, Governor of Victoria, in reply to an hon. member of the British House of Commons, asking that certain papers be brought down, relative to a dispute between the two Houses of the Legislature in the Colony of Victoria, concerning the Appropriation Bill, 1865. Mr. Cardwell said:—

“It appeared to him that the proposal he (Sir Charles Darling) conveyed to him, that the members of the former Executive Council should be deprived of the distinction they enjoyed, because they presented a petition to their Sovereign praying for redress of grievances, which he (Mr. Cardwell) thought they were justly entitled to do, was couched in terms which rendered it impossible that the Governor who employed that language and adopted that course should be a safe guide to the colony, or an impartial arbitrator of differences in the circumstances in which the colony was placed.”

He desired, for one moment, to apply that principle to the case of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier. Could Mr. Letellier, in the future political contests in Quebec, act as an impartial arbitrator between the contending parties? No. He might safely assert that every charge that had been made by Governor Letellier had been satisfactorily answered by Mr.

MR. BRECKEN.

DeBoucherville, ex-Premier of Quebec. He had no feeling in the matter, and it appeared to him that those *ex post facto* reasons which had been advanced had vanished into thin air. He had an advantage over many hon. members of approaching this matter as an entire stranger and without prejudice, and it struck him that Governor Letellier was a partisan, and as soon as he became a partisan he ran counter to the advice that had always emanated from the Colonial Office, that a Provincial Governor must have no friend and no opponent, and he must so act as to be in a position to associate on the most friendly and cordial terms with the statesmen of the Province over which he was placed, and by whom the people surrounded him. Had the Lieutenant-Governor acted up to this? He did not exactly understand the hon. member who had preceded him, and who had stated that under the 59th clause the right of dismissal was given to the Executive, while it was not given to the House, and, therefore, it was irregular for them to discuss it. He held that Lieutenant-Governors were servants of the House, and that the Cabinet occupied the same position to the House as the House did to the people. As far as he himself was concerned, he could see no difference between discussing the question now and discussing it after the Government had taken action upon it. Some hon. member had said, “Are you going to strip Governors of all their functions and duties; are they to be mere figure-heads?” That question had been answered by the hon. member for Frontenac, who pointed out what were the legitimate duties and functions of Lieutenant-Governors, but he (Mr. Brecken) would say, better, far better, that Lieutenant-Governors should be figure heads, than that they should be allowed to undermine the principles of self-government, principles that they all prized, and that they would struggle to maintain, as did the people of Quebec to secure. The hon. member for South Huron, though he attempted to lecture the Ministerial side of the House, had offered no arguments for his views. He made a number of straggling remarks, but no single point. In voting for the motion, he believed he would be aiding the people of Quebec to obtain a tribunal

whose voice was the voice of power, and which should be enabled to put the offending Lieutenant-Governor in his proper place. He should not have identified himself with one party or the other, but have held the scales of justice impartially, and kept the mirror so bright and free from the dust of partisanship, as to reflect truly the voices of the majority of the people, and have them clearly and distinctly made manifest.

MR. ANGLIN said they had sat three afternoons and evenings discussing this important question, and yet, for such of them as did not enjoy the confidence of the Government, it was exceedingly difficult to know what they were called on to do. The resolution was so vague and indefinite in its terms that they were compelled, in order to ascertain the meaning of this whole movement, to rely upon the observations made for some days past. A formal complaint had been lodged against Mr. Letellier—not by the people of Quebec, or any considerable portion of them, but by three gentlemen whom he had turned out of office, and who naturally wanted to get back. A long statement of what they alleged to be facts they concluded by declaring as follows:—

“Wherefore, the violation of the principles of responsible government committed by the Lieutenant-Governor, and his actions as above represented, are of a nature to imperil the peace and prosperity of the Dominion of Canada, and to bring into disrespect the dignity of the Crown, and should be dealt with under the authority granted the hon. the Privy Council of Canada, by the 59th Section of the British North America Act, 1867.

“And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) “J. A. CHAPLEAU,
“L. RUGGLES CHURCH,
“A. R. ANGERS.”

This was followed, in the papers submitted to the House, by Mr. Letellier's answer, to which the original petitioners replied in December last. Three months had since passed. The House had not been told, authoritatively, whether the Government had ever acted in this matter or not. It was to be presumed they made no decision upon it up to the day the papers were brought down. It would have been quite competent for them to have come to some decision since. He did not think they were treating this House

with proper respect when, during three days' debate, they sat in profound silence, and never deigned to inform the House what their views or intentions were, or what action they would take should that resolution be passed. It was due to the House that some statement of their views and policy should be made before the vote. The Postmaster-General alone broke the profound silence, but, though he had talked much of the British flag, and of other irrelevant matters, he uttered not a word that would indicate the policy of the Government on this important question. Not only had Ministers maintained silence, but they had stifled debate, placing shackles upon it by means of an amendment moved by one of their followers, which was known as the previous question. They had in this proceeding departed from the usage of the British House of Commons where the previous question was employed, not to hamper members or impede the action of the House, but to avoid voting on a question in which it was not prepared to vote on. The hon. gentlemen opposite, who caused this amendment to be proposed, must understand its nature, and, therefore, some might suppose that they intended by it to get rid of this question altogether. Rumour had said, for many days, that they were very anxious to get rid of it. The hon. mover of the amendment, who had told them it was not calculated to prevent discussion, should know it would prevent any member moving an amendment expressing the sense of the House as to the subject under consideration, and at the division he would find himself voting against his own motion. The object sought by those who caused this amendment to be moved was to prevent other amendments from either side of the House. Curiously, the main motion was precisely the same as that moved by the hon. Premier last year. Why did the mover resort to the very extraordinary course of submitting such a motion? He (Mr. Anglin), at first, suspected that it was to coerce the leader of the Government into supporting it, and he hoped to have voted with the Government against this motion. With regard to the personalities introduced into this debate, the hon. member for Cardwell

(Mr. White) was the first to introduce them in an attack upon the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) which was not called for. The hon. member for Shefford then warned him that he was treading on rather dangerous ground in attacking so able a man, and questioned his right to speak for Quebec, where he had never been able to find a constituency. That could scarcely be called a personal attack, and could not be held to justify the extraordinary series of attacks since made on the member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington). The member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) and other hon. members on that side resorted to those attacks, it would seem, with the object of diverting attention from the real question into side channels, and, by personal and sectional appeals, influencing the vote. Those gentlemen also charged that the religion of the majority of the people of Quebec had been insulted by the members on the Liberal side. He (Mr. Anglin) had not heard a word offensive to the religious feelings of any hon. member on either side uttered by the member for Shefford; but he did hear attempts on the Ministerial side to revive old animosities and provoke sectarian hostilities. The member for Lincoln, in his attack on the member for Halton, was the first to make an attempt of this kind, recalling something he was reported to have said twenty-five years ago, when he had, no doubt, less experience than he had to-day, and was not, perhaps, so liberal and fair. There was much to provoke some observations of that character, as they had the extraordinary spectacle presented by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), from the Province of Quebec, moving this resolution, and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), said to be an Orangeman, who represented an Orange constituency, seconding it. If any attempt had been made to stir up sectional feelings, it had been made by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The Opposition had been charged, over and over again, by the other side of the House, especially by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), with not having dared to defend the conduct of Mr. Letellier. He (Mr. White), invited the House to enquire into the whole Quebec elections, in order that it

might be able to judge how Mr. Letellier's dismissal of his Ministry should be regarded, and find out how each individual constituency was manipulated, and ascertain by what means the Joly Government had succeeded in obtaining a majority; to enquire into the position of every hon. gentleman elected at that time, and to discover whether he was elected as a Conservative or a Liberal, and he sought to persuade the House that the most foul practices had been resorted to on the part of Mr. Joly and his friends. To enter upon enquiries of that kind would not only be foreign to this subject, and essentially improper, but would involve this House in endless labour. They had only to take the results of the whole election, to judge of the decision of the Province of Quebec as expressed at the polls in that election. It had been asserted, by gentlemen on the other side of the House, that hon. members on the Opposition benches refused to say a word in defence of Mr. Letellier. They considered that, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, they had no right to interfere, in any way, between the Lieutenant-Governor, acting through the Joly Government, and the people of Quebec. The action of the Lieutenant-Governor had been characterised as tyranny, but an appeal to the judgment of the people at the polls could not be properly called an act of tyranny. The member for Queen's, P. E. I., (Mr. Brecken) said that the documents submitted to the House proved the charges made against the Lieutenant-Governor, but he (Mr. Anglin) thought that the charges were not so proved. Mr. Letellier denied that he had signed the proclamations that had been issued by the gentleman making these charges, and, although that alone was, perhaps, not a sufficient ground for his action in dismissing his Ministry, yet it was unquestionably a serious offence. Although Mr. Letellier had been charged with falsehood, there was absolutely nothing in the documents which had been produced to sustain that statement. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., (Mr. Brecken) asked what would happen if another election took place in the Province of Quebec, and the people decided that the late advisers of the

MR. ANGLIN.

Lieutenant-Governor should be again the advisers of Mr. Letellier, and said it would be for him a most unpleasant circumstance. If those gentlemen were restored to office, they would scarcely treat the Lieutenant-Governor with greater disrespect than they had repeatedly shown him while they were members of his Cabinet. If they got along at all together, it was because of the kindness and forbearance of the Lieutenant-Governor. It was a matter of notoriety that the Lieutenant-Governor invited one of those gentlemen to dine with him, and he refused on political and partisan grounds, and that, when the city of Quebec gave a dinner to Lord Dufferin, they refused to attend the banquet, because, forsooth, "The Dominion Government" was to be among the toasts, and they published their reasons, so that the world should know what thorough-going partisans they were. The hon. the Postmaster-General said that the Lieutenant-Governor, from time to time, took memoranda of everything that passed between him and his Government. It was clear that he felt that he was on dangerous ground, and that it was necessary to take the greatest precautions to protect himself from misrepresentation of what he said and did at those interviews. The Postmaster-General complained that the Lieutenant-Governor sought thus to accumulate evidence against his advisers, when he should have taken objection at once to anything of which he did not approve. But it was easy to understand that the Lieutenant Governor was unwilling to come to a rupture with his Ministry when he could possibly avoid it, and, if they looked at the letter Her Majesty wrote at the time of the dismissal of Lord Palmerston, they would find that Her Majesty acted in a very similar manner. She complained, in that letter, of the various acts of which she had so often and so long had reason to complain. Now, the insults offered to the Lieutenant-Governor appeared to have been very numerous, and offered day after day, as if his Ministers took a pleasure in proving to the Lieutenant-Governor that they had no respect for him. An attempt had been made by the hon. member for Cardwell to prove, what a great many others had asserted,

that, with regard to the railroad measure, the Lieutenant - Governor authorised the introduction of that measure, because, forsooth, when the Ministers applied for authority to introduce financial measures, he sent such authorisation. It would be absurd to hold that, by the telegram so sent, he had authorised the introduction of this very extraordinary measure, which would have enabled them to set aside the Judiciary of the Province altogether, and deprive the people of the protection of the Judiciary secured to them from the days of Magna Charta, and enable the Executive of the Province to take these municipalities by the throat, as one of the Ministers said, and force them to pay money which they believed they were not bound in equity or in law to pay. The Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, in the exercise of his discretion, when he found that this measure was likely to become law, came to the conclusion that it was his duty, for the protection of the people of Quebec and their rights, to exercise the prerogative with which he believed himself to be invested, and to dismiss these Ministers, form another Ministry, and appeal to the people of Quebec, in order that they might say for themselves whether they were willing that such laws should be passed. This was called tyranny. It was a strange kind of tyranny. The whole thing had been fairly and properly submitted to the people. It was quite true the people did not directly pass judgment upon the Lieutenant-Governor; but they did directly pass judgment upon the Joly Government, who had constitutionally assumed the whole responsibility for the acts of the Lieutenant-Governor, and had asked the people to judge whether they should be sustained or not. They put their case freely and fairly before the people. They thought the Governor did perfectly right in not permitting these laws to be passed in not permitting the DeBoucherville Government to seize the municipalities by the throat. They came thus before the people of Quebec and asked them, the only constitutional judges, the ultimate court of appeal in the case, to determine whether in this they were right or wrong, in having thus assumed the responsibility of the act of the Lieutenant-Governor.

They all knew that the Province of Quebec had been, for many years past, owing to a number of unfortunate circumstances, almost thoroughly Conservative. In the first Parliament of Canada, the Liberal party could muster only fifteen members from the Province of Quebec. Five years afterwards, they managed to increase the number to eighteen. In 1874, under the influences of the Scandal, to which it was not necessary now to refer more particularly, the number increased to thirty-two; but the number fell off again. Those influences having grown weak in that, as in other Provinces, and other causes coming into operation, the number of Liberal members declined to seventeen. In the Local Parliament, a similar state of things existed. In 1867, the whole of the Opposition numbered only twelve; five years later, it numbered only seventeen. In 1875, it only numbered twenty. But, in 1878, when Mr. Joly accepted the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor's act, thirty-three, or, as the Postmaster-General asserted, thirty-one of the sixty-five members were elected to support him; and if the result was further analysed, it would be found that, in a great many constituencies, the majorities of the Conservative party were very small indeed; so that very much more than half the voters of the whole Province of Quebec pronounced in favour of the Joly Government, and acquitted them of that responsibility which they had assumed on entering office. The people of Quebec were the ultimate court of appeal in all matters affecting their own Province only. Hon. gentlemen opposite said: Oh, no; Mr. Letellier's conduct was lost sight of altogether in that election last May, but, on the 17th of September, the people returned to their senses, and then they elected some forty-eight members to this House to pass judgment on Mr. Letellier. Did hon. members opposite really expect people to believe that this act of Mr. Letellier was the motive-power, the great influence that swayed the people of Quebec on the 17th of September last? Were they not all aware that in that Province the policy of Protection had taken deepest root, and that to this alone was the Conservative victory there attri-

butable? and hon. gentlemen had no right, because they were in majority, to speak for the Province of Quebec in this matter. Quebec had settled that in her own way, and had not sent her representatives here to re-open it, but to assist in framing a protective policy. He was not one of those who contended that this Parliament had no right, under any circumstances, to meddle in the affairs of the Provinces. He, some years ago, had claimed the protection of Parliament for the Catholic minority in his Province, and he would, to-morrow, join with the Protestant minority in Quebec in calling for the interference of this House, should such interference be necessary to protect their rights. He was not one of those who contended that they should not, under any circumstances, take into consideration the conduct of Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces. It should, however, always be borne in mind, that, as the prerogative of dismissing a Ministry and dissolving a Parliament should only be exercised in an extreme case, so their interference with the Provincial Legislatures or Lieutenant-Governors should take place only in extreme emergencies. Had such emergency arisen in this case? It was only a year since these elections were held. The Joly Government had since held the general elections, met the Legislature, obtained supplies, and passed the laws they thought necessary. They had continued to manage the affairs of the Province to the great satisfaction of the great majority of the people. What had occurred within the year to justify this extraordinary action now proposed? The charge against Mr. Letellier had been submitted to the Governor-General in Council; and, in matters of this kind, the Executive was always one; and, whether it was Tory or Liberal, the action of the Executive in matters of this kind should be final. This matter was also submitted to Parliament, and Parliament decided that it ought not to interfere when the people of Quebec had the means of settling this question for themselves. Hon. members opposite contended that, because the House said "No" to the resolution proposed last Session, it was not to be held as having passed upon this question at all. He did not believe that the right hon. the Premier would venture to propound so extraordinary a doctrine.

He had not intimated to the House what his views on this question were, or that it was with his approval this resolution was introduced. It was much to be regretted that he had not taken the House into his confidence, and let them know what his policy was. The Government could not avoid the responsibility of this motion. While it was true that this House had a right to discuss the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor, yet there were modes of proceeding which ought to be observed. This was a very improper mode of proceeding. The British North America Act distinctly imposed on the Executive the duty of dealing with Lieutenant-Governors who committed any offences. It was for them, in the first instance, to judge of the nature and gravity of such offences, and to dismiss the offenders if they thought proper, and then come down to this House and state the reasons why they had dismissed them. When that report was presented to the House, it would be open to any member to take action on it. The resolution ought distinctly to affirm something more than it did, so that the House might know exactly what its effect would be. He had endeavoured to ascertain what were the intentions of the Government, from the speech of the hon. the Postmaster-General. The hon. gentleman spoke repeatedly of the necessity of passing a vote of censure on the Lieutenant-Governor, but did not go beyond that. Would that censure involve dismissal? Of course, the hon. gentleman would not answer. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) defended the conduct of the Government, and said that they were pursuing a strictly constitutional course in maintaining profound silence, in leaving the matter entirely to the House, and then he intimated that, if this resolution passed, it would be for the Government to inflict punishment. The only punishment that could be inflicted was the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor. Would it not have been fair and manly on the part of the Government to have declared their intentions? The resolution should declare—to be complete—that the Lieutenant-Governor was guilty of conduct which, in the opinion of this House, required that he should be immediately dismissed. Had it not occurred to hon.

gentlemen that there was a parallel between the conduct of those 48 hon. members from the Province of Quebec who, they were told, were sent here to insist upon the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor, and the conduct of another set of men in France. Marshal MacMahon believed that his Government did not represent the feeling of the country, and having had occasion to disapprove of their conduct, because they had deliberately deceived him, as he alleged, he dismissed them and called in another Government. Then, proceeding in a perfectly constitutional manner, as did Mr. Letellier, Marshal MacMahon, having received the assent of the Senate, as the Constitution required, dissolved the House of Representatives, and went to the country. The DeBroglie Ministry resorted to all the means usually employed at elections in France to obtain a majority. Their opponents asserted that this action of Marshal MacMahon was a revolutionary movement, that he desired to put men in power who were inimical to the Republic. That Ministry was defeated, and resigned, and the Republicans came into power. They knew how the Left grew so strong both in the Upper and Lower Houses that they were able to force upon Marshal MacMahon a Ministry very obnoxious to him, and there came a time when he would not assent to the measures they proposed, and he resigned. The extreme Republican party, not content with driving him out of office, were now endeavouring to have the DeBroglie Ministry impeached, and the chances seemed to be that they would succeed. Did the members for Quebec, and especially the younger members, ever stop to think that there was a wonderful similitude between the conduct of the Left in France and their own conduct in attempting to obtain the removal of Mr. Letellier? He was sure that they looked with strong disapproval upon the conduct of the Left in France. Perhaps they were strong Monarchists, and would like to see the success of any attempt to secure the downfall of the Republic, but they found them here to-day pursuing with as bitter a hatred, a man whose only fault was that of differing with their party as to the proper course to be pursued in the Government of their Pro-

vince, and who thought fit to change his Ministry, and appeal to the people as MacMahon appealed to the people of France. It was said, moreover, that Gambetta, the leader of the French Left, was very much opposed to this attempt at impeachment, and was doing all he could to discourage it. Was there no similarity between his conduct, in that matter, and that of the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government? It had been said that the right hon. gentleman was opposed to this attack on Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, and that he would have very much preferred that it had not been made. But he yielded, as Gambetta had yielded. Perhaps this comparison might be very offensive to hon. gentlemen opposite—although he certainly did not intend it to be such—and it was, doubtless, painful to their feelings to be compared to the followers of Gambetta. Those hon. gentlemen were sometimes called Ultramontanes. As that word had come to be synonymous with Catholic, he hoped they were—and they, doubtless, considered it a very gross insult to be compared with the followers of Gambetta, and to have their course compared with that of the extreme men in the Chamber of Deputies—the Communists, the Socialists, the enemies of religion. He made this comparison simply to place, in as strong a light as possible, the true character and tendency of their conduct. They were now flushed with victory, and were full of the idea that it was their duty to their Province, or, at all events, their duty to their party, to get rid of this Mr. Letellier, at any cost. They would run all risks in order to punish him, in order to teach him a lesson, and all future Lieutenant-Governors a lesson—a salutary lesson, it might be; but he still thought the course they were taking was fraught with great danger to themselves. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), in a very able and powerful speech, had warned the members from the Province of Quebec of the danger they would incur, of the peril in which they were placing their cherished institutions, by the course they were now taking. The hon. member for Cardwell sneered at that warning, and said that the exordium of his speech was an advice, and the peroration a warning. Both ad-

vice and warning were wholesome and salutary; and, if he (Mr. Anglin) might be allowed, in his turn, to advise the members from the Province of Quebec, he would join heartily in both the exordium and the peroration. He believed the course they were taking was fraught with the greatest possible danger to the autonomy of their Province, and to the autonomy of all the smaller Provinces. If this resolution passed, the Lieutenant-Governors, instead of being independent heads of the Provincial Governments, acting on their own judgment and discretion, would be henceforth mere satraps and subordinates of the party who happened to be in power in the Dominion. The Conservative party were in power to-day, the Liberal party would be in power to-morrow. He believed that the liberties of the people of Quebec, under the Constitution, their autonomy and their peculiar institutions, would be perfectly safe in the hands of the Liberal party. But anybody who knew the country well must know that there was an increasing danger that a party would arise in it, neither Liberal nor Conservative, which would pay very little regard indeed to the desires of the Province of Quebec. Let him say to his friends of that Province that he knew there was in the Maritime Provinces a widespread and growing feeling in favour of Legislative Union. He judged, from what his hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Macdougall) had said, that there was reason to apprehend that a similar feeling was growing in Ontario. All the English Provinces were growing very rapidly in population, and the strength of the people in the Province of Quebec was becoming proportionately less. Could they not see for themselves how great a danger they ran when they did anything whatever to affect in the slightest degree the independence of their local Government, either in the person of their Lieutenant-Governor or of his Council, or of their Legislature? While he was of a different race from the people of Quebec, he was not, as others had said of themselves, of a different religion, and he sympathised entirely with them in their struggles for the maintenance of their peculiar institutions. The whole Catholic population of

this country looked to the Province of Quebec as the great centre around which they might gather, and to which they might look for aid in the maintenance of their rights and liberties, if, at any time, these were in danger. He admired their institutions almost as much as they did themselves, and, for that reason, he spoke to them thus plainly on this subject. If this motion were carried, it would strike a deadly blow at the independence of the Province of Quebec, and he implored them to give this matter further, calmer, and more deliberate consideration. He was afraid that they disregarded their dearest interests in order to gratify a very natural feeling of partisanship. Let them not invoke such an attack as this which, if successful, would make of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province a mere slave and tool of the Federal Government. He knew he was one of those who invoked the interference of this House in another matter. He did so under a strong conviction of duty, because he believed the minority in his own Province was oppressed. That application, however, was essentially different from the present, because in that case the Federal Government had imposed upon it by the British North America Act the duty of guaranteeing those very rights and privileges which he asked it to guard. But, in the present case, there was simply a question as to the mode of determining what the liabilities of some municipalities were, upon which the Lieutenant-Governor differed with his advisers. He was satisfied that, in the ordinary political struggles of party against party in a Province, if the interference of the Dominion Parliament was to be invoked by one party or the other, and Parliament was to respond to that appeal and a Lieutenant-Governor was to be disgraced because he differed with the predominant party, such action would strike a fatal blow at the independence of the Province.

MR. COSTIGAN said he did not intend to enter on the constitutional question. The speeches of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), in English, and of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), in French, had sufficiently established their case. He

(Mr. Costigan) wished to turn from the serious aspect of the question to an aspect of it that was of an amusing nature. He congratulated the House that the seal of silence had at last been removed from the lips of the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat (Mr. Anglin), and that he had been able to deliver himself of the very singular speech they had just heard. It was well that, in an assembly like this, there should be a gentleman of his ability to guard this House against the dangers that sometimes arose in mixed communities. They saw how well he could guard them, though some might think that there was a little feeling in the manner in which he had mentioned the name of the hon. member for Simcoe, when he believed that he had found in that gentleman an Orangeman, the burst of indignation that came from his lips when he made that mistake—for he (Mr. Costigan) was not aware that the hon. gentleman from Simcoe belonged to that society; but, if he did, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin) lead this House to believe that it was something to excite his horror? If members of the House would look into the newspaper of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin), they would find that he expressed opinions but little more prudent than those in his speeches. In his paper he made it a crime for him (Mr. Costigan), because he supported Mr. John White. Would anyone believe that the gentleman who made this a crime for him (Mr. Costigan) was first returned to Parliament by the aid of the votes of the Orangemen of his county? Would the House believe that he (Mr. Costigan) had been held up to ridicule in his native Province by the *Freeman*, for the support he had given Mr. White in East Hastings, when the hon. gentleman from Gloucester himself could not have been elected in the county of St. John without the aid of the vote that he got from the Orangemen? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin) who owed his position to the aid of Orangemen, whom he now held up to ridicule, when he could no longer make use of them, might well leave him (Mr. Costigan) in the enjoyment of his liberty to vote for or against a man, were he Protestant, or Orangeman, or Catholic. It was true he had gone into a constitu-

ency to work in favour of the hon. gentleman (Mr. White), in whose liberality he had confidence. Did the hon. gentleman from Gloucester ever go that far? He thought he did. When it was necessary for him to seek the Orange vote in the county of St. John to secure his election, he went down to the Orange Lodge at Piserinco and stood upon the platform, under the Orange banner and King William, and asked them to give him their votes. Who was his friend and associate at that time? In order to make his ticket a strong one, Mr. Coran, known there as King Coran, leader of the Orangemen, was taken on to the ticket as representing the Orange body, while the hon. gentleman himself represented the Irish Catholic element in the county of St. John. The Irish Catholics warmly supported the hon. gentleman, and voted for his Orange friend, and the result of the coalition was that the ticket was elected, and harmony established between the Orangemen and Catholics of St. John. In the face of these facts, he (Mr. Anglin) should not complain of any member of this House, or of any man in the country, using his rights as a British subject to speak or vote for any man he pleased. Coming to the discussion of the question at issue, he would not advise a stranger to take his opinion of constitutional laws from the hon. gentlemen opposite, because they had a habit of always interpreting constitutional law to their own exclusive advantage. Take the New Brunswick School question as a test of their constitutional opinion. When the question was first moved here, those hon. gentlemen warned Quebec, and they warned all the Provinces, of the danger of asking the Federal Parliament to interfere in local Provincial affairs. What did they do in 1872? He had always voted the same way, but hon. gentlemen opposite had not. In that year, the prominent gentlemen on that side advised his Excellency to disallow the New Brunswick School Law—that was pretty well for gentlemen who argued now that this Parliament should not interfere in this Quebec question. The amendment was moved by Mr. Dorion, expressing regret that His Excellency had not been advised to disallow that law. He (Mr. Costigan) voted for that motion,

MR. COSTIGAN.

and was consistent to-day in supporting the present one (Mr. Mousseau's). In 1873 a motion, involving the same principle of disallowance, was proposed, and he did not know that there was a Liberal in this House who did not support it with his vote. He had decided to support this motion, to do what the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) in opposing it professed to desire—maintain the rights of Quebec and protect them against interference from this Parliament. The Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was wrong and deserved censure. In censuring him, would they be condemning a single act performed by him in his Provincial capacity? They were discussing his conduct as a Federal officer not responsible to the Legislature of Quebec, and a question having nothing to do with it. How did this motion touch the Government of Quebec, to excite sympathy for which, the late Postmaster-General made one of his characteristic appeals, or injure any political party? It only reached the Lieutenant-Governor. If the motion passed, would it hurt or affect the Joly Government?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Not a bit.

MR. COSTIGAN said he believed it would not. Amiable and personally popular as Mr. Joly had been, if he could not govern the Province of Quebec without the aid of a partisan Governor, then he should not govern at all. The cry that this motion would endanger the institutions of Quebec was the old one, which he had always opposed. It was used when the school question was before this House. The rights and privileges of the people of Quebec were protected by something stronger than the Constitution itself. That people were so well qualified to win and retain the esteem of the other peoples of this country that their rights would always be safe with the majority. They were told the representatives of Quebec had no right to discuss this question; but it was discussed and voted upon last year. They would notice this remarkable fact, in looking at the Journals of last year, that every gentleman who voted to sustain Mr. Letellier last year, with only a few exceptions, was now staying at home, and that those

who stood up for constitutional government and the rights of Quebec were sent to Parliament again. They were told, also, there was no use in the hon. gentlemen from Quebec claiming that they were elected to condemn the *coup d'état*. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side approved of the course taken by Mr. Letellier. Now, he would ask, as a matter of fair play and common sense, if forty-eight gentlemen, representing independent constituencies in the Province of Quebec came here to this Parliament, they had not as good a right to carry out the views of their constituents as the seventeen or eighteen elected on the other side, in support of the other side of the question. They might be excused if they paid a little attention to the views expressed by the majority of that Province. He found a great many public men changed their views. It was very singular how these changes occurred, and there must be something which caused this particular change of position. In the Province of New Brunswick, when he was a very young member, during the first few years he was in Parliament there, they tried the very question they were trying now. It was true the Governor of that country did not commit the crime, constitutionally speaking, that had been charged against the Governor of Quebec. Thirteen years ago he raised his voice and gave his vote with the hon. gentleman opposite him, the member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith), and the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), and the hon. gentleman who so ably represented the county of Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor). Thirteen years ago they voted together on this principle—

SIR A. J. SMITH: And lost.

MR. COSTIGAN said that did not change the principle. The principle was one worth fighting for. The hon. gentleman was Premier of that Government, and, if they had heard him appeal to the House and the country at that time, they would have expected a stronger appeal to-night. The hon. gentleman was removed from that honourable position. He would not refer to the cause of his removal. He would not do the hon. gentleman the injustice of saying that he was par-

ticularly affected by losing his position. No, he believed the hon. gentleman cared as little about the position as most public gentlemen at that time in their Province did. It affected his self-esteem, perhaps. However, from whatever cause, it affected him pretty seriously, and he made a strong appeal to the House on the ground that the Governor had no right to force the Ministry to resign while they had a majority at their back. In making this comparison, he did not make it in justification of Governor Gordon, nor with a view of finding fault with hon. gentlemen who stood with him (Mr. Costigan) on this question. In that case, His Excellency Governor Gordon at that time, governed New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith) was Premier of that Government, which he (Mr. Costigan) supported. The Governor received an Address from the Legislative Council, which fact showed that the Legislative Council was with the Governor, a very different case from the Government of Governor Letellier in Quebec. One branch presented him with an Address on the question of Confederation. He received that Address without consulting his advisers. They complained of this, and he gave as his reason, that an accident prevented him. Hon. gentlemen pleaded that Governor Letellier could only be guilty of having committed a mistake. In Governor Gordon's case, the hon. member for Westmoreland declared it was not right to talk about mistakes while the rights of the people were being trampled upon.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Governor Gordon was not dismissed.

MR. COSTIGAN said they would consider, first, how far he deserved dismissal. The hon. gentleman knew exactly how much the people had to do with the question at that time. In this case, they had the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick acting in concert with the Legislative Council. The Governor was acting apparently consistently, because the papers connected with Confederation were promised to the House. The hon. gentleman would remember that some of his own supporters found fault on that account. They claimed that the Governor should be dismissed because he acted against the

advice of his constitutional advisers while they had a majority of the House, although they had not a majority of the Legislative Council. Besides that, Governor Gordon could do what Governor Letellier could not do. Governor Gordon could say that he was looking beyond and above Provincial politics, that he was carrying out an Imperial policy, and that, as an Imperial officer, he was studying the interests of the nation. Was there anything like this that could be urged in defence of the Governor of Quebec? There was no cause in his case unless it was a political cause, to wrest the power from the majority and place it in the hands of a minority. When the consequences of that act were canvassed in Ottawa, they said: "Oh! it's all right, he was sent there to do a work, and he did it well." They were warned, in the next place, of the great danger of establishing a precedent. Gentlemen opposite said they should not establish a precedent. He, however, maintained that they must establish one. The only question they had to decide was which of two they would establish. Would they take the precedent hon. gentlemen wished to establish, that, knowing the policy of the party governing that Province was antagonistic or inconvenient to the Federal power, all they had to do was to send a partisan Governor to take charge of that Province and wrest the power from the people? This was the precedent hon. gentlemen opposite wished to establish, and it was one, as stated before, that might be found very convenient in other Provinces besides that of Quebec. There might be a change in the Province of Ontario in the election about to take place. Suppose a change took place in Ontario, and supposing that this precedent was established, could they, even in Ontario, have any confidence in the Governor of that Province? If the Conservatives of Ontario succeeded in returning to their Parliament a Conservative majority, was there any guarantee that, with this precedent before them, any Governor, sympathising with those gentlemen as the Governor of Quebec sympathised with the Rouge party there, was there any guarantee that a *coup d'état* might not be brought about? Besides these constitutional arguments, they had had

MR. COSTIGAN.

other kinds of arguments. He did not see the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) in his place, who had brought a very strange argument into this debate. He (Mr. Cameron) had tried to make a parallel case between the present constitutional question and the losing of the Parliament in Ireland. He (Mr. Costigan) supposed it was sympathy that that hon. gentleman felt toward the people who lost their Parliament at that time. He did not know that the hon. gentleman was an Irishman, or of Irish descent; he rather thought he was a Scotchman from Ireland. His impression was that the cause of Ireland losing her Parliament was that there was a Letellier somewhere. So long as they had the benefit of the able arguments of gentlemen who were well known to possess the knowledge and ability to discuss constitutional law, it was well they should have the benefit of their constitutional opinions. And, if the hon. gentlemen opposite had on their side the benefit of the constitutional, learned and intelligent member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), who had just addressed them, he (Mr. Costigan) would give them the opinions of the representative from St. John County, that he had spoken of some time ago, who edited the *Morning Freeman* at that time, and perhaps they would come to the conclusion that the gentleman who then edited the *St. John Freeman*, and represented St. John in the Assembly of New Brunswick, was the same hon. gentleman who now ably represented Gloucester, in this Parliament, and made so earnest a defence of Governor Letellier. To give them an idea of the way that this question was put in New Brunswick, he would read an article in that paper headed: "BY SPECIAL TELEGRAM TO THE MORNING FREEMAN. EXTRAORDINARY CONDUCT OF THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR. THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR BOUND TO RESIGN. THE LIBERTIES OF THE PEOPLE AT STAKE. RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT OVERTHROWN." He would now let them have some constitutional law,—he did it in all due respect to the hon. gentleman. He believed the opinions were sound, and all he regretted was that he (Mr. Anglin) did not seem to express the same views now. In an editorial in the *Freeman* of 10th April,

1866, alluding to Governor Gordon's act, the hon. gentleman said :

"This is most insolent, but it is not as bad as the conduct of the Governor—who it now appears must have been in collusion all through with the chief conspirators—although the people have rejected the scheme; although the Government chose to prevent the adoption of the scheme, had still a majority of seven in the Assembly; although at least 27 of the members still openly avowed themselves opposed to that scheme, the Governor—without consulting his constitutional advisers, acting under the guidance of the intriguers, and contrary, it is said, to the views of the Attorney-General, whom alone he summoned to see his reply, a few minutes before he read it to the Legislative Council, who were in waiting, even while Mr. Smith was remonstrating against so gross a violation of the principles of responsible government; so gross an insult and injury to the people of this Province—made this reply, which if the people of this Province have not lost every spark of manly, independent spirit—if they are not indeed, only fit to be the slaves of Canada, must excite the deepest feelings of indignation and resentment from the Restigouche to the Saint Croix."

Also in an editorial in the same paper, dated 12th April, 1866, he said :

"It was, at all events, an act of gross despotism,—of arbitrary tyrannical power,—to which no people who love, and who deserve freedom, can possibly submit. At one blow, responsible government was overthrown, the liberties of the people were destroyed, the independence of the Province was shattered,—unless, indeed, in the spirit and manliness of the people themselves, there is, as we believe and trust there is, sufficient vitality and earnestness to repel the blow, and make this terrible outrage rebound on the heads of its authors, crushing them, as they wish and strive to crush the liberties of the people."

The hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) also had his own opinions. The following, taken from the same paper of April 17th, 1866, expressed the opinion of that hon. member :—

"The question now was whether this Province was to be ruled arbitrarily by a nominee of Downing Street, or by the people themselves, for their own welfare. He would endeavour to speak of the Governor with the respect to which his position entitled him; but it was not high position, nor a cocked hat and feathers, nor gold lace, that make the man, and he must speak plainly in this case, for not only his own character, but the interests and independence of the Province were assailed."

SIR A. J. SMITH : Hear, hear.

MR. COSTIGAN : The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." When this question was up last year, the hon. member for Westmoreland declared that he still entertained the same strong opinions against Governor Gordon's act. He would now quote the St. John *Freeman* again, in order that the House might have the benefit of its able editor's opinion regarding the powers of Lieutenant-Governors, and the proper exercise of those powers. On May 8th, 1866, the hon. gentleman said :

"The Governor maintains, because he has the constitutional right to dismiss a Ministry and dissolve the Legislature, he was guilty of no violation of the Constitution, and did not ignore the principles of responsible government by his extraordinary conduct. A man may as well plead the right of carrying arms and of self-defence as a justification for shooting down anyone he supposed to be his enemy. The right, or, to convey a more correct impression, let us say the power, to dismiss a Ministry is vested in him by the Constitution; that the abuse of that power, gross, wanton and wholly unjustifiable as the abuse was in the present case, is surely one of the very worst offences against the Constitution of which the ruler could be guilty. That power or prerogative is not intrusted to him to be used for the gratification of his whims or his caprices, or in the service of a party, or even for the purpose of coercing the people at the will of the Colonial Secretary; but for the good of the people themselves. It is worse than an error to employ it rashly, even with the best intentions, or for the best of purposes; to use it in order to give power to a faction who seek to destroy the liberties of the people, and to do this without the shadow of justification, is, indeed, a flagrant crime against the Constitution of the country."

He believed in the principles advocated on that occasion by the hon. members now representing Westmoreland, Gloucester and Charlotte. A majority of the people's representatives, of whom he was one, insisted upon the recall of Governor Gordon, but he was sorry to find that, of the four members now present, who so loudly condemned Governor Gordon, he stood alone in condemning Governor Letellier for a far more palpable violation of the people's rights. There were few men in this country whose attention was directed to that question who could arrive at any other conclusion than that the *coup d'état* in Quebec had taken place because there was a Liberal Government in power at

Ottawa. They had been told, with apparent seriousness, that the action of the Government was so unjustifiable that there was a feeling of relief experienced in Quebec, and that a feeling of patriotic emotion went up from the people, when the Lieutenant-Governor committed this act. Where was this enthusiasm in the Province, that it did not enable the Government to fill the vacancy which had occurred? It was in the imagination of the hon. gentleman, and one of the most important positions in the Government was left unfilled. They had been taunted on their side of the House with all sorts of crimes, with being inconsistent, and, the best of the joke was, they had been threatened by hon. gentlemen, who could talk loudly last year, apparently with some show of reason, but who, having gone to the people, had received a severe drubbing at their hands, and these were the men who threatened the Government with the consequences of the passing of this motion. He was sure it was well they could all be satisfied in this way. The members on the Government side were satisfied with what they had got; the Opposition were satisfied with what they expected. There was, therefore, every prospect of this being a very pleasant Parliament. One of the accusations of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec against his Government was that a Bill had passed the Legislature providing for the destruction of thistles, or something of that kind, and imposing a penalty; that His Excellency had been obliged to give his assent to that Bill, although the amount of the penalty was not named; and the Governor, stated, in this case, that the Premier asked him, as a particular favour, not to be too particular with regard to this little error, but to allow it to pass, and that, to oblige the Premier and give evidence of his good will, he allowed it to pass. It was a small matter, but showed which way the wind blew, and the truth was as necessary in that little matter as in any other. The Premier himself, finding the blank had not been filled, introduced an amendment fixing the amount of the penalty, and in the Statutes of Quebec the Act complained of was upon the very same page as the Act amending it, and the two were sanctioned by His Honour at the

MR. COSTIGAN.

same moment and on the same day. Would it not be difficult to give a reason why the Premier should go to the Governor to ask him to let it pass in its imperfect form when there was no irregularity in the Statute? That was one of the crimes for which the Ministry was dismissed, and it was about as serious and substantial a charge as any that had been made from beginning to end. He (Mr. Costigan) need not descant upon the point made that the Quebec Government was condemned on account of their Railway Bill. It was made one of the grievous charges against them, that the Lieutenant-Governor refused to sanction that Act. But the moment his friends came in he sanctioned this Bill. They might all have our political leanings, and few men were without them, but there should be a limit to them. There was a sentiment of fair play and honesty, and principle and practice, amongst them, which must, under all circumstances, appeal to their better sense and judgment. Unless they came to the conclusion that they were to be mere slaves, they must feel that there was a limit to their political leanings, and when a case like this came before Parliament, it was their duty to say by their votes, that, as the representatives of the people of this country, as having a right to deal with questions in every Province of the Dominion, under the control of this Parliament, they had a right to deal with Quebec, and intended to deal fearlessly and in such a manner with the question that in no other Province should such a fatal mistake, calculated to disturb the peace and prosperity of the country, be again made, and that all Governors must know that they were to preside rather than to rule over Legislatures, and that this Parliament, whatever might be the political feelings or divisions between parties in this country, representing the true feeling and sentiment of the people, would not sustain or justify a one-man power in any one of the Provinces of this Dominion.

MR. ALLISON said that, at the commencement of the debate, it was not his intention to trouble the House, but, when he heard the reply of the hon. gentleman from Shefford (Mr. Huntington) to the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), if anything

had been wanting to satisfy him of the weakness of the cause of the Opposition, it was that reply. The hon. member for Shefford had taunted the member for Cardwell with previous defeats at the polls. The latter gentleman had the satisfaction, however, of seeing his party steadily gaining ground, and, finally, triumphantly sustained; while the former, with all the patronage of Government, neither scrupulously nor stintingly made use of, ignominiously defeated. He thought, without personal acquaintance, or invidious comparisons, that the hon. member for Cardwell had contributed as much, by his tongue and pen, by his intelligence and energy, as any man outside of Parliament to such results. Gentlemen opposite claimed that the result of the appeal to the people of Quebec justified Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's action. On that principle, Lord Dufferin would have been justified in dismissing his advisers three years ago, as there was no room to doubt that at that early day of their political existence they had lost the confidence of the country, as manifested by the result of the special elections from time to time. Gentlemen opposite also claimed that the results of the Dominion election in Quebec were not affected by the Letellier matter, but were carried upon the promise of a fallacious protective tariff. He had no hesitation in saying, that, as far as Nova Scotia was concerned, it was not the promises of the present Government, but the failure to fulfil their promises on the part of the gentlemen opposite, that led to their defeat. It was not the promises of the National Policy, so much as their utter disregard of Provincial interests. It was because they were conducting the Intercolonial Railway on "commercial principles," and pursuing a fiscal policy which was paralysing every industry; it was because the practice of the Government was diametrically opposed to the preaching of their press, and the speeches of their leaders; Dominion and Local Governments "hunting in couples," and rivalling each other in united corruption; it was homilies on political purity, and "big push" letters from the same hand; it was these causes, and such as these, that had defeated their party. He denied that the

Joly Government had been sustained by the people. To the shame of one or two of them, be it spoken, it was sustained by the representatives. The hon. members for Bothwell and Verchères had asked if, because Mr. Turcotte was denounced, every public man who had changed sides had "sold" himself. Not at all. The man who changed his political relations on principle should be commended rather than condemned; but, if their friends in Quebec would exercise a little patience, their Speaker would soon add another to the list of illustrations of the fact that the man who betrayed the party that elected him, either from motives of ambition, or for purposes of greed, merited the condemnation, and forfeited the respect, not only of the party which was weakened in numbers by his desertion, but also of the party which his treachery sustained. His Honour the Speaker of this House had been charged in good nature with having changed sides some years since. He (Mr. Allison) congratulated the country on the change. But, if his conversion had been like that of the Speaker at Quebec, if he had been elected to Parliament by the opposite party at the last election, if his somersault had occurred since that election, and if his purchased support were keeping the present Government in power by a casting vote, would not gentlemen opposite proclaim, and justly so, that the exalted eminence of the Speakership, instead of being a post of honour, as a position of shame? He asked his Honour's pardon for even supposing such a case by way of illustration. One gentleman supporting the Government had said that Governor Letellier had a work to do, and had done it. He doubted this. He believed that the work given him to do by his masters was to make arrangements to carry the late Dominion elections in Quebec, and in this he had failed. But, admitting for a moment that his action in dismissing his Ministers was right, the elections having resulted as they did with a real but very small majority, if the wish and voice of the people had been expressed in action, then he took the ground that, in continuing to retain his present advisers, he was doing the Liberal-Conservative party a favour.

"He served them better than he thought, and kinder than he knew." His observation might have been limited, but it had been this: that, whenever any party clung to power contrary to public sentiment, sustaining itself by questionable means, such as an alteration of the franchise, the readjustment of constituencies, or the purchase of opponents, its doom was sealed. It was on the downward grade, the sympathy of the people being invariably with the wronged, either politically or otherwise, and any temporary suspension would only accelerate its speed to the bottom. If they could, by any means, dam the current of the St. Lawrence to-day, the seething waters would only rush more impetuously tomorrow. He therefore asked his friends to continue to be moderate, as men could afford to be who stood on tenable and constitutional ground. He asked them to continue, as they had done, to give an instance, to the Dominion and to the world, of freemen conducting themselves with patience, confidently waiting for the constitutional reparation of their wrongs. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) had predicted that serious consequences might result to the Province of Quebec from the passage of the resolution before the House. He had drawn upon his imagination for the existence, at no distant day, in the Lower Province, of some mysterious political combination, which might overrule the Provincial affairs of that Province. Political crises might arise in the future, as they had in the past, and all the politics he (Mr. Allison) knew, consisted in each individual taking what he considered to be a consistent course in each, as it occurred, and taking the consequences. In the present crisis he considered it the duty of the House to speak in behalf of those whose voices had been silenced in the councils of their Province by the tyrannical action of a partisan. He was prepared to do so, hoping and believing that if ever the rights of Nova Scotians were similarly trampled upon, the representatives of other Provinces would hasten to their relief. If, as gentlemen opposite maintained, Lieutenant-Governor Letellier had the right to dismiss his Ministry, largely sustained in Parliament, he was thankful that this House had the right

MR. ALLISON.

to call his conduct in question, and he hoped sufficient appreciation of its baseness to stamp it with contempt. He would not further detain the House at that hour. He would only, in conclusion, express the opinion that, by some means, he knew not what, at no distant period—and express the hope that, from that period forward—the people of the sister Province should have, occupying the high position of Lieutenant-Governor of their Province and First Commoner of their Legislature

"Such men as will the people's rights maintain,

Unawed by influence, and unbribed by gain;
And patriot truth, her glorious precepts draw—
Pledged to untrammelled liberty and law."

MR. LONGLEY said it had been stated that the question before the House mainly concerned a single Province, and that, therefore, the smaller Provinces especially could feel but little interest in it, but he thought it must be conceded that, where vital principles were involved, all must feel alike interested. This was a constitutional issue. It should not be forgotten that the DeBoucherville Government, when it was struck down by Governor Letellier, commanded a majority of twenty in a House of sixty-five, equal to a majority of sixty-three in this Parliament. This was not equal to the majority which the present Federal Government commanded, but it was considerably larger than that which their predecessors could boast of during the last year or two of their tenure of office. In view of this fact, it seemed to him that it would not have been so monstrous an act for Lord Dufferin to have dismissed his late Ministers as it was for Governor Letellier to dismiss his late advisers, when they were relatively stronger in the confidence of the people of Quebec than were the MacKenzie Government in the confidence of the people of the Dominion. But he might go further, and call the attention of the House to the fact that the Joly Government was voted down, as soon as it was formed, on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, by the same majority which should have kept the DeBoucherville Government in power. Three times in one day was the Joly Government, the arbitrary creation of Governor Letellier,

thus voted down. But the new Government went to the people, and, when they came back, they were still in a minority, as was clearly apparent from the correspondence submitted to Parliament. The first question upon which the Assembly divided, after the election of Speaker, was embraced by the following amendment to a motion made by a supporter of the Government:—

“That this House, while expressing its firm determination to insist on the strictest economy in every branch of the public service, and on the closest supervision over the expenses of administration, regrets that the present advisers of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor should have persisted in remaining in power without having been supported by the majority of the Legislative Assembly, upon their taking office, and without yet being supported by such majority.”

No one could deny that this was a direct vote of want of confidence in the new Government, the vote standing 32 for and 31 against. The constitutional issue should then have been considered settled; but the Governor, who could strike down a popular Government sustained by a majority of twenty, could sustain in power a Government in a minority of one. He would not dwell upon the discreditable means since employed to sustain the Government thus defeated, as the facts were too well known already for the reputation of those more immediately concerned. The worst of it all was, however, that the credit of the country had greatly suffered, and a sore blow had been dealt to the very foundation of our political institutions. He should like to know upon what principle of constitutional rule the new Administration was screened from the effects of an adverse vote of the Assembly? Surely they would search their annals in vain for a precedent, since the introduction of responsible government. Indeed, it would seem scarcely necessary to urge any further arguments on this point, since it had already been admitted here by one of the apostles of Reform that no parallel to the action of Governor Letellier could be found in English history, without going back forty years. He might, perhaps, have said one hundred and forty years. Though the air was thick with rumours of corruption and mismanagement on the part of the DeBoucherville Government

at the time of its dismissal, no proof in support of these allegations had ever been furnished, nor could any be furnished, probably. The Joly Government were under the most urgent necessity to do so, and doubtless would not have failed in that regard, had they been able. The Lieutenant-Governor affected to believe that the DeBoucherville Government had lost the confidence of the country, but he (Mr. Longley) wondered upon what he founded his belief. Anyway, the accuracy of his judgment, or the sincerity of his belief, might have been tested without changing his advisers. That he did not take this course gave rise to the suspicion that he was swayed by other influences and other motives than those relating merely to the politics of Quebec. The only offence of the DeBoucherville Government, so far as he could discover, was that they sought, with honest purpose, and in the discharge of public duty, to make the municipalities meet certain pecuniary obligations voluntarily assumed, in the first place, but from which they naturally, and he was afraid he must say dishonourably, shrank, when the hour of payment came, and they saw a chance of throwing the burden back upon the Government. Taxation loomed up before the people, and they were in a mood to favour any party promising, even by implication, to give them relief therefrom—hence the loss, to some extent, of the DeBoucherville party, and the gain, to some extent, of the Joly party, the constitutional question being temporarily largely lost sight of. No men ever acted with more moderation than the members of the DeBoucherville Administration under the same provocation. All the charges of the Lieutenant-Governor against the dismissed Government amounted to nothing; he himself being Judge, as clearly appeared by his own admission “that there was no intention on the part of the Premier to disregard the prerogatives of the Crown, and that there had been on his part only an error committed in good faith,” etc. This was putting the matter in the most favourable light for the Lieutenant-Governor. Taking the whole correspondence, and grouping all the facts together, not the semblance of provocation seemed to have been given for the charge of disrespect to himself or disregard for the prerogatives

of the Crown. No proper defence had been set up on behalf of Governor Letellier on the part of his defenders here, simply because none could be set up. The ground taken had been this: That it was inexpedient and unnecessary for the Parliament to deal with the question, and that the Government should deal directly with it. Well, he supposed this was the best objection that could be taken to the resolution before the House, but, in the estimation of the Government and their supporters, and in the opinion of all disinterested people, the course adopted was quite constitutional, and, in the end, would probably be found quite effectual for the accomplishment of the end in view, namely, the vindication of the principle of constitutional government, as forming the basis of the people's rights and liberties. He should have great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

MR. ANGLIN said that, as this was the only opportunity he would have of replying to statements that had been made, he would beg leave to occupy the attention of the House a few moments. He had shortened his speech because of the lateness of the hour, and, in doing so, he became much embarrassed, and left out much that he, perhaps, should have said. He must protest against the allegation that he had attacked Orangemen, or any Orangeman, or anyone having a title to the name, in any way whatever, or that he said anything calculated to give offence to Orangemen. He had no intention of doing so, and he was satisfied that he had not done so. In the remarks that he did make he had not the slightest idea of offending the member for North Simcoe in the slightest degree. The attack of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), was entirely unwarranted by any fact or circumstance. He spoke of his (Mr. Anglin) having owed his election to Orangemen in the city of St. John. He never denied that he had canvassed the Orange vote. He would always be very glad to receive the Orange vote on fair and honest grounds, involving no sacrifice of his own feelings or principles. When the Constitution of his Province was in danger, he felt it his duty to appeal to the Orangemen of the Province as to all

others, and persuade them, if he could, to unite for its defence. It was well known that, on one occasion, he went into an Orange Lodge and spoke with the King William banner over his head and an assembly of Orangemen in front of him—every man in the meeting being an Orangeman. In addressing them, he admitted that he found himself in a position he thought it never would have been his fortune to occupy; he talked to them fairly and reasonably on the great subject that occupied the attention of the people. He said nothing there to compromise his position as a Catholic, or their position as Orangemen. He said nothing there he would be ashamed to repeat in any place in the world. He was not ashamed to say that they received him kindly and respectfully, and he succeeded in persuading a large number of them that they ought to vote as he was about to vote. He had intended to show that the act of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, which the majority now proposed to condemn, was strictly constitutional, whatever might be thought of its wisdom. He had intended to quote a number of Provincial cases, where such a course was taken by the Lieutenant-Governors of various Provinces, and in which that course was approved of by the Imperial Government, upon being appealed to. He had always maintained that Lieutenant-Governors had the prerogative right of dismissing their Ministers and dissolving Parliament. The case of Mr. Gordon was not the only case they had in their Province. There was the case of Lieutenant-Governor Manners-Sutton. When their Legislature passed a prohibitory liquor law, which was disapproved of by the people, and he found that the operation of this law threw the whole country into a state of confusion and disorder, he suggested to his Council that they must do something. He required that they should enforce law and maintain peace or assemble Parliament and ask for a repeal of the law. They declined to do one or the other, and Mr. Manners-Sutton very properly dismissed them. He did all he could to sustain him (Mr. Sutton), and he was glad to say that 39 of the 41 members of the House of Assembly were elected, pledged to vote for the repeal of the prohibitory liquor law, and thereby

pledged to approve of the course taken by Mr. Manners-Sutton. The hon. gentleman who formed the Government of that day never thought of appealing either to Her Majesty the Queen or the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of seeking redress for what they thought to be a wrong. An appeal was made to the people, and the question was discussed on its merits. There was no doubt as to the will of the people, and to the will of the people they submitted. In Mr. Gordon's case he denied that that gentleman was justified in exercising that power, under the circumstances. Those two cases were not parallel. In the latter case, the question of Confederation was fairly submitted to the people at the polls, and the people had pronounced on the subject. The House was now asked to declare that the conduct of Mr. Letellier was unwise, without knowing the effect that the passing of such a decision might have.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED.

GEORGE TURNER ORTON, Esquire, member for the Electoral District of the Centre Riding of the county of Wellington, having taken the oath, was introduced by Mr. Tupper and Mr. McCallum, and took his seat.

Question *put*, and motion to adjourn the debate *negatived*, on a division.

Question *put*, and motion for the previous question (Mr. Ouimet) *agreed to*, on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Allison | Lane |
| Arkill | Langevin |
| Baby | Lantier |
| Baker | Little |
| Bannerman | Longley [P.E.I.] |
| Benoit | Macdonald (King's) |
| Bergeron | Macdonald (Vict., B.C.) |
| Bergin | McDonald (Cape Breton) |
| Bill | McDonald (Pictou) |
| Bolduc | McDonald (Vict. N.S.) |
| Boultebe | Macmillan |
| Bourbeau | McCallum |
| Bowell | McCarthy |
| Brecken | McCuaig |
| Brooks | McInnes |
| Bunster | McKay |
| Bunting | McLennan |
| Burnham | McLeod |
| Cameron (N. Victoria) | McQuade |
| Caron | McRory |

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Cimon | Masson |
| Colby | Massue |
| Connell | Merner |
| Costigan | Méthot |
| Coughlin | Mongenais |
| Coursol | Montplaisir |
| Currier | Mousseau |
| Cuthbert | Muttart |
| Daly | O'Connor |
| Daoust | Ogden |
| Dawson | Orton |
| DeCosmos | Quimet |
| Desaulniers | Patterson (Essex) |
| Desjardins | Perrault |
| Dewdney | Pinsonnault |
| Domville | Pope (Compton) |
| Doull | Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.) |
| Drew | Poupore |
| Dubuc | Richey |
| Dugas | Robertson (Hamilton) |
| Elliott | Robinson |
| Farrow | Robitaille |
| Ferguson | Rochester |
| Fitzsimmons | Ross (Dundas) |
| Fortin | Rouleau |
| Fulton | Routhier |
| Gault | Ryan (Marquette) |
| Gigault | Ryan (Montreal Centre) |
| Gill | Rykert |
| Girouard (J. Cartier) | Schultz |
| Girouard (Kent, N.B.) | Shaw |
| Grandbois | Sproule |
| Hackett | Stephenson |
| Haggart | Strange |
| Hay | Tassé |
| Hesson | Tellier |
| Hilliard | Thompson (Cariboo) |
| Hooper | Tupper |
| Houde | Valin |
| Hurteau | Vallée |
| Ives | Wade |
| Jackson | Wallace (S. Norfolk) |
| Jones | Wallace (West York) |
| Keeler | White (Cardwell) |
| Kilvert | White (E. Hastings) |
| Kirkpatrick | White (N. Renfrew) |
| Kranz | Williams |
| Landry | Wright—136 |

NAYS :

Messieurs

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Anglin | Huntington |
| Bain | Killam |
| Béchar | King |
| Bourassa | LaRue |
| Brown | Laurier |
| Burk | MacDonnell |
| Burpee (St. John) | Mackenzie |
| Burpee (Sunbury) | McIsaac |
| Cameron (S. Huron) | Malouin |
| Casey | Mills |
| Casgrain | Oliver |
| Chandler | Olivier |
| Charlton | Paterson (S. Brant) |
| Christie | Rinfret |
| Cockburn (Muskoka) | Robertson (Shelburne) |
| Dumont | Rogers |
| Fiset | Ross (W. Middlesex) |
| Fleming | Rymal |
| Flynn | Scrifer |

| | |
|-----------|----------------------|
| Galbraith | Skinner |
| Geoffrion | Smith (Westmoreland) |
| Gillies | Thompson (Haldimand) |
| Gillmor | Trow |
| Gunn | Weldon |
| Guthrie | Yeo.—51. |
| Holton | |

MR. ANGLIN: I see the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) has voted in the affirmative. According to the British practice, the mover of the previous question should vote in the negative.

MR. SPEAKER: In the British Parliament that practice prevails, but in, the Parliament of Canada, both before and since Confederation, the previous question has been viewed differently. Sometimes, of course, when it is moved with the same object that it is moved in the British Parliament, the mover and seconder generally vote in the negative—that is, against their own motion. But, in this country, gentlemen vote according to their own views, and there are numerous instances in which this practice has prevailed. It was done in 1870 and also in 1865 when the resolutions of Confederation were moved. Then the mover and seconder voted for their motion. In 1870, the previous question was moved by Mr. Holton, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, upon the Report of the Committee of Ways and Means; and both gentlemen voted for their own motion—that is, in the affirmative. I find among the gentlemen who voted with the mover was Mr. Anglin.

MR. HOLTON: I do not rise to challenge your opinion, or to call it in question, but I desire to make one remark. I think we are bound by the British practice here, unless the case be provided for specifically by our own rules. If we have gone astray on a former occasion, it is no reason why we should go against the rules, if the rule be still in effect when attention is called thereto.

MR. MILLS: I do not understand that you have given any ruling as yet. What I wish to specially call your attention to is that, in the English House of Commons, this motion is put in the affirmative precisely as it is here, and that, in the United States Assemblies and in Congress, as you will see by looking at May, it is put in the negative, so that

MR. ANGLIN.

the mover and seconder may vote for the motion. But, in the English practice, it is precisely as it is here, and the motion is put in the affirmative, and the mover and seconder of the motion must vote in the negative, and are generally appointed as tellers for the nays. If you will look at May, you will see that I am right.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is quite true that the previous question, as a general rule, is moved and seconded by gentlemen who desire that the main question should not be put, and, therefore, they vote against their own resolution. But there is no law or decision in England any more than there is here, that such a practice is obligatory. I deny that most expressly. That was looked into most studiously in 1865, at the time that I moved the previous question in order to get a vote on the Quebec resolutions. Every member of the House who was in favour of Confederation, including the mover and seconder, voted that the main question be put, and the point was raised, and it was there solemnly decided that there was no rule in the world to prevent the mover of the previous question voting that the main question be put, and the seconder as well. My hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) was quite satisfied with that authority. He moved it himself on another occasion, and voted for his own motion.

MR. OUIMET: I would state that May only says that the mover and seconder of the motion for the previous question, when they want to vote upon the question, generally vote against it. The word "generally" does not make the rule, and May never says anywhere that it is a rule that the mover and seconder of the main question are pledged to vote against it. But, Mr. Speaker, if it would afford any satisfaction to these gentlemen, I would not be opposed to voting against the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: According to the practice of the British Parliament, as I stated a few moments ago, the mover and seconder of the previous question vote against their own motion. According to the practice of the Canadian Parliament,

they generally vote for their own motion. This has been done on different occasions, notably in 1865 and 1870, and I think we ought to follow the practice of the Canadian Parliament. According to my opinion, the mover and seconder are free to vote as they like.

Question *put* and motion (Mr. Mousseau) *agreed to*, on the same division.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolution reported from Committee of Supply (March 11), *read the second time and agreed to*.

House adjourned at
Five minutes before
Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 14th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and *read the first time* :—

Bill (No. 49) To repeal so much of the Act 33 Vict., chap. 46, as relates to the collection of dues and tolls upon logs, timber, cedar, pine, and railway ties passing down the Moira River through the port of Belleville.—(Mr. *McCuig*.)

Bill (No. 50) Respecting La Banque Jacques Cartier.—(Mr. *Girouard*, Jacques Cartier.)

Bill (No. 51) To amend the Penitentiaries Act, 1875.—(Mr. *McDonald*, Pictou.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. TILLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is only recently, Sir, that I have fully realised the great changes that have taken place throughout the Dominion of Canada since I last had the honour of a seat in Parliament, and, to-day, I fully realise the great change that has taken place, and the increased difficulties devolving upon me, as Finance Minister, compared with the position of affairs when I submitted my financial statement in 1873. Then, Sir, my work was a very easy one indeed. Hon. members on the opposite benches were pleased, on that occasion, to compliment me on that state-

ment, but I felt that I had earned no compliment; that if that speech was acceptable to the House at that time, it was because of the satisfactory statements I was able to make with reference to the condition of the Dominion and of the finances of the Dominion. Then, Sir, I was able to point to steady and increasing surpluses and revenue, and that in the face of a steady reduction of taxation. Then, Sir, I was able to point, with some degree of confidence, to the prospective expenditures of the Dominion, extending over ten years. To-day I cannot speak of it with the same confidence. Then the construction of the Pacific Railway was under regulations that confined and limited the liabilities of the Dominion to \$30,000,000. To-day I am not in a position to say what expenditure or responsibilities we may have to incur with reference to that great undertaking. There has been a change in the policy, but it will become the duty of the Government and of Parliament to consider, while we have not the limit to our liabilities that we had—our money liability being then \$30,000,000, with 50,000,000 acres of land—whether we cannot, by some means, construct that great work largely out of the 200,000,000 acres of land lying within the wheat area of that magnificent country. Then, Sir, I could point with pride, and with satisfaction, to the increased capital of our banks and the large dividend they paid. To-day I regret to say that we must point to depreciated values, and to small dividends. Then I could point to the general prosperity of the country. To-day we must all admit that it is greatly depressed. Then I could point with satisfaction to the various manufacturing industries that were in operation throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, remunerative to the men who had invested their capital in them, and giving employment to tens of thousands. To-day many of the furnaces are cold, and the machinery in many cases is idle, and those establishments that are in operation are only employed half time, and are scarcely paying the interest on the money invested. Then, Sir, we could point to the agricultural interest as most prosperous, with a satisfactory home market and satisfactory prices abroad. To-day they have a limited market, with

low prices, and anything but a satisfactory market abroad. Then, Sir, we could point to a very valuable and extensive West India trade; to-day it does not exist. Then, Sir, we could point to a profitable and direct tea trade, that has been demoralised and destroyed. Then everything appeared to be prosperous; to-day, though it looks gloomy, I hope there is a silver lining to the cloud, that we may yet see illuminating the whole of the Dominion, and changing our present position to one of happiness and prosperity. Mr. Chairman, there has been, and very naturally so, a good deal of interest and anxiety manifested on the part of the friends of the National Policy, as it is called, in regard to its early introduction. I can quite understand that, because believing as they do, and as a majority of this House do, that that policy is calculated to bring prosperity to the country, it was but natural that they should be anxious for its introduction, and that not a day should be lost. And it is satisfactory to know that, great and difficult as is the responsibility which rests upon me here, I trust that the proposition I am about to submit will be sustained, not only by a majority of this House, but by an overwhelming majority in the country. It was natural, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the friends of this policy should be anxious for its introduction, and it was pleasing and satisfactory to see that even the Opposition vied with the friends of the Government in their anxiety for its introduction. It is most encouraging to me, because, of course, all Oppositions are patriotic, and certainly a patriotic Opposition, anxious for the introduction of this measure could not have desired that a bad measure, and one not calculated to benefit the country should be forced hastily upon it. Therefore, I take it for granted that, in addition to the support from the gentlemen behind me, we will have the support of gentlemen opposite to our policy and the propositions we are about to submit. But, perhaps, it will not be out of place for me to offer a few remarks in justification of the apparent delay that has taken place. It will be remembered that the Government was only formed on the 19th October. Some delay took place in awaiting the arrival in Canada of an hon. member, who, I am

MR. TILLEY.

satisfied, is one whom, whatever the political opinions of gentlemen of this House may be, all would have been anxious to see consulted before the Government was formed—I mean the Minister of Militia. The Government, therefore, was not completed till the 19th October. The members of the Government had to return for re-election, and those elections, though they were hastened with all possible rapidity, because we felt there was a great deal of work to be done, were not over until the early part of November, when we returned to the city of Ottawa. And what did we find? As Minister of Finance, I cannot say I found the finances in the most satisfactory condition. I found, Sir, that we had maturing in London, between the early part of November and the 1st of January, an indebtedness of \$15,500,000 with nothing to meet it but the prospective payment of the Fishery Award. On this side of the Atlantic we had in the various banks of the Dominion something like \$5,000,000, and between that date and the 1st of January, with the subsidy of the Provinces and payments to contractors who were constructing public works, something like \$3,000,000 had to be paid; and then, considering the position the banks were in all over the Dominion, the uncertainty as to what might transpire, it was just possible that a reduction in the reserves might take place, and that meant a demand on the Dominion Treasury. Every dollar we found it necessary to take from the banks at the time was embarrassing, and was reluctantly withdrawn. But it was inevitable that the Finance Minister should proceed to London, with the least possible delay, that arrangements might be made to sustain the credit and the honour of the Dominion. Well, Sir, in order to avoid that, feeling the importance of every member of the Government being at his post in order to prepare measures for the meeting of Parliament, a cable message was sent to our agents on the other side to ask if the visit of the Finance Minister to London could not be avoided. The answer was "No; his presence here is absolutely necessary." Under these circumstances, I proceeded to London, and I placed a loan of £3,000,000 sterling upon the market there. While referring to that, it might

not be out of place to offer a few observations in reference to that loan, as it has been criticised. That loan, as the prospectus shows, was offered to the highest bidder, and tenders were asked up to 3 o'clock, on the 6th December. At that hour, owing to a variety of circumstances, and among them I may name the suspension, on that day, of the West of England Bank, and the anticipated suspension of that bank for several days previous, which led to the demand from the country banks on the banks in London, for gold to strengthen their position, placed several of the London institutions in such a position that they could not tender, although they had intended to do so at an earlier period—about £1,700,000 were tendered for, on that day, out of the £3,000,000, and it was then stated that the loan would be kept open till the following Monday, at 3 o'clock. On that day, it was announced that the balance of the loan had been taken, and I was in a position to make my arrangements to leave on the 12th, having made provision to meet our maturing indebtedness, and on the 13th of that month the first instalment on that loan was paid into the hands of our agents. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there should be any further criticism in this House, or elsewhere, with reference to my absence from this country; if it should be said by any hon. gentleman in this House that the time selected for placing that loan on the market was an unfavourable one; if it should be said that it was the most unfavourable time, looking at the condition of the London money market, in which any of the Dominion loans had been floated; if it is said that that loan should have been floated in May or June, when money was bringing but two per cent. instead of six per cent. and seven per cent. when it was negotiated; if such should be said, or any reflections be made with reference to my absence in England, I will ask my hon. friend—my predecessor—to make my defence. Then, Sir, after my return to Canada, it became necessary that we should consider the whole question of the tariff. It is not a question that can be settled in a day. It is not a question that can be settled intelligently in weeks, indeed it would have been well if we could have had more time to con-

sider it than we have had, considering the magnitude and importance of the work. I can appeal to other Finance Ministers, and especially to my predecessor, who, in 1874, made several changes in the tariff of that day, to speak of the difficulties there are in making even as few changes as were then made. But if we undertake, as the present Government have undertaken, to readjust and reorganize, and, I may say, make an entirely new tariff, having for its object not only the realisation of \$2,000,000 more revenue than will be collected this year, but, in addition, to providing for that deficiency, to adjust that policy, or that tariff with a view of making what has been, and is to-day, declared the policy of the majority of this House—I mean the protection of the industries of the country—the magnitude of the undertaking will be the better appreciated. Sir, we have invited gentlemen from all parts of the Dominion, and representing all interests in the Dominion, to assist us in the readjustment of the tariff, because we did not feel, though perhaps we possess an average intelligence in ordinary Government matters, we did not feel that we knew everything. We did not feel that we were prepared, without advice and assistance from men of experience with reference to these matters, to readjust and make a judicious tariff. We, therefore, invited those who were interested in the general interests of the country, or interested in any special interests. Gentlemen who took an opposite view, met us and discussed these questions, and I may say that, down to as late a period as yesterday, though the propositions are submitted to-day, we were favoured with the co-operation and opinion of gentlemen who represent their particular or general views with reference to the great questions we have under consideration. We have laboured zealously and arduously, and I trust it will be found successfully, and we are now about to submit our views for the consideration of this House. I think we may appeal with some degree of confidence to gentlemen in opposition, in approval of the early period at which this tariff is being introduced, when I call to the minds of those hon. gentlemen that their Government was formed on the 7th of

November, 1873; ours on the 19th of October; that my hon. predecessor did not submit his tariff and Budget speech until the 14th April, this being the 14th March. When we submit to this House the result of our deliberations, you will all understand the nature and extent of the consideration that must necessarily have been given to them. I trust that this House and the country will feel that we have presented our views at as early a period as possible, taking all these facts into consideration. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House in the first place to the Estimates. I will not occupy your attention with the expenditure for the years 1877-78. That is before you in the Public Accounts. But I desire to call the attention of the House, in the first place, to a few facts with reference to the expenditures for this year. It will be borne in mind, Sir, that in the Estimates submitted by our predecessors last year of the income and expenditure of the present year, the Estimated income exceeded slightly the estimated expenditure. The estimated expenditure in round numbers was \$23,600,000. It will be found the expenditure of this year will exceed \$24,000,000. The Supplementary Estimates that I will submit to the House in a few days will be for Dominion Lands, \$7,000; Post Office Department, \$20,000; Public Works, revenue, that is railroad, \$186,000 in excess of the estimates, notwithstanding the efforts that have been made, and are being made, and will continue to be made, by the hon. the Minister of Public Works to reduce that expenditure. For Customs, in addition to the estimates of last year, a subsequent estimate of \$17,740 will be required for the expenses of collecting revenue; Mounted Police, \$40,000; Indians under treaty arrangement, \$44,674; Ocean and River Service, \$19,770; Public Works and Buildings, \$116,386; Militia (special), \$20,261. This is in connection with the troubles that occurred in Montreal. The Paris Exhibition, \$25,000; Charges of Management, which were omitted in the Estimates of last year, \$75,000, and which was in connection with the redemption of the debt of \$7,500,000; Election expenses, in addition to the vote that was made, \$60,000; Peniten-

MR. TILLEY.

tiaries, \$12,500; Sundry Minor Expenses, \$10,000, making altogether, \$554,424; less Public Works revote, carried over to be expended next year, \$163,000; on other services, \$75,000, making a total of \$238,000, and leaving the supplementary estimated expenditure, over and above the estimates of last year, \$416,424. This, added to the estimates, makes the total estimated expenditure of \$24,085,424. Estimated revenue for the present year, taking the first six months as our guide, and it is a very fair guide, under ordinary circumstances, will be \$21,620,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, it will appear from the returns that will be laid on the table of the House, that in the last three or four weeks a very large sum has been collected on Customs and Excise. This arises from the anticipated changes in the tariff. But, taking, previously stated, the first six months as a criterion, the estimated revenue will be \$21,620,000, leaving a deficiency of \$2,400,000. This is not very encouraging for the present year. Last year, as you see by the Public Accounts, the deficiency was between \$1,100,000 and \$1,200,000. Notwithstanding all the efforts that have been made, the saving that will be made in the Agricultural Department, the saving that will be made by the Minister of Public Works in connection with the railways, and the savings that have been made by the removal and dismissal of supernumerary employes in the different Departments; notwithstanding all this, there will still be a deficiency of \$2,400,000. Now, I will call the attention of the House for a few moments to the Estimates of next year. As these are before the House, I can deal more intelligently with them and call attention to the increase and decrease under these estimates. In the interest on the public debt, you will find that there is a very considerable increase. The increased interest is payable in England, in consequence of the last loan. The estimated amount for the new loan placed in last year's Estimates was \$504,000. Charges of Management, paid in England \$60,000, less savings in service \$6,500; total increase in the Charges of Management, \$53,000. There is an amount under this head that is payable

in connection with the redemption of the debt of \$6,000,000, on the 1st January next, and this corresponded with the item omitted last year, in connection with the redemption of \$7,500,000 in January last.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am very sorry to disconcert the hon. gentleman, unless with his permission. If my memory serves me, it may interest the House to know exactly how these two heavy charges on the debt which he paid, and is about to pay, have accrued. I would just suggest that he should mention that to the House.

MR. TILLEY continuing, went into an elaborate statement of the estimated expenditure for 1879-80, shewing a net decrease of \$241,191. He also went into the obligations to be met, and proved that a deficiency of \$1,600,000 would have to be met, even should the \$850,000 estimated as properly belonging to next year's revenue, be placed to the credit of the current year. He continued: In my opening remarks, I referred to the difficulty with which we have to grapple. We must, if we meet the expenditure of next year, our interest, the charges upon our revenue, and the necessary expenditure which the country has a right to expect, ask from this House the authority to receive a revenue from the customs of \$2,000,000 more than received this year. We have also, in arranging for the levying of that duty, to consider how it can best be imposed to encourage the industries of the country. It would be well, before I enter upon the consideration of this point of the question to ask ourselves what are the circumstances that have led to the reduction of revenue and to the present depressed condition of the country? With reference to the reduction of the revenue, I have heard it remarked that it is strange that the production of the revenues of late years has been so great. Perhaps there is as much prosperity here as in many other parts of the world; then why was there such a falling off in our revenue compared with the revenues of the United States and Great Britain? When we examine the case, we ascertain the fact that nearly all the revenue collected in England and

a large portion of the revenue of the United States is from specific duties, and, therefore, the decrease in the value of imports does not, in those countries, materially affect the revenue, whereas in the Dominion the duties are principally *ad valorem*, and, therefore, largely affected by the decrease in the value of goods imported. It is established by comparative statements that the goods imported into the Dominion have decreased in value to the extent of $33\frac{1}{3}$ to 40 per cent., and the duties on those imports being levied largely on the *ad valorem* principle, there has been a falling off in the revenues of Dominion in a corresponding proportion. In the proposition I am about to make, it will be shown—and I state this fact in order that the House may perfectly understand the nature and extent of those propositions—that on many articles on which we propose an increase of duty, 25 per cent., levied on the value, will not bring more per yard than we received on a 15 per cent. tariff in 1873. We will, by way of illustration, take 100 yards of cloth, valued in 1873 at \$1 a yard; the duty collected on it would have been \$15. The same cloth is worth now but 60c. per yard, and it would require a tariff of 25 per cent. to produce the amount of revenue received from the same quantity in 1873. It is important to bear this fact in mind, because, while it may be thought on the other side of the Atlantic, and by our neighbours, that we are increasing largely our taxation, and imposing increased duties on the products of other countries, it is well to make it understood that, if our duties had been specified, we would have been receiving the same amount of revenue as in 1873. There are other difficulties: the volume of imports has not much diminished. Regarding the matter as I do, I think it is to be regretted that the volume of imports has not been materially reduced. I look upon the large imports, ever since the Dominion was organized, showing a large balance of trade against it, as one of the causes of the troubles with which we have to contend—one of the difficulties that it is our duty, if possible, to remedy. They have been decreasing to a certain extent, but are still very large, showing distinctly and clearly, in my judgment,

that they ought still to be further diminished. I know there are hon. gentlemen here, and elsewhere, who entertain the opinion that the balance between the imports and exports is not a correct mode of judging of the condition of a country. I know that opinion is entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite. But let us, just for a few moments, turn our attention to the condition which England occupies to-day, as compared with the United States. From 1867 to 1873, the balance of trade against England amounted, in the average, to £50,000,000 sterling. It is quite true that difference was met by interest, the returns from her vessels, and in various ways, to an extent largely counterbalancing it, or leaving a balance in favour of England. By the last return I have, which covers the year 1877, the balance of trade against her is shown to be £140,000,000 sterling, or \$700,000,000 per year. The balance of trade against the United States in 1872 was \$116,000,000; in 1873 it was reduced to \$66,000,000; but last calendar year showed that balance in favour of the United States had reached \$300,000,000 a year. I think, then, without entering into a discussion here of Free Trade and Protection, so far as it affects England and the United States, we may fairly conclude that the prosperity of the one country, at this moment, is caused in a great measure by the large surplus in its favour, and the depression in the other by the large deficiency. Under these circumstances, it appears to me we should turn our attention to the best means of reducing the volume of our imports from all parts of the world. Let me refer to some circumstances that led to the present depression in the revenue. During and after the war in the United States, it is well understood that the country lost a large portion of its export trade, and its manufacturing industries had been to a certain extent paralyzed, and it was only about 1872 or 1873 that they really commenced to restore their manufacturing industries, and endeavoured to find an extended market elsewhere for the manufactures of their country. Lying as we do alongside that great country, we were looked upon as a desirable market for their surplus products, and our American neighbours, always

MR. TILLEY.

competent to judge of their own interests and act wisely in regard to them, put forth every effort to obtain access to our market. It is well known by the term slaughter-market what they have been doing for the last four or five years in Canada; that in order to find an outlet for their surplus manufactures, they have been willing to send them into this country at any price that would be a little below that of the Canadian manufacturer. It is well known also that they have had their agents in every part of the Dominion seeking purchasers for their surplus, and that those agents have been enabled, under our existing laws, to enter those goods at a price much lower than they ought to have paid, which was their value in the place of purchase. It is well known, moreover, that the United States Government, in order to encourage special interests in the country, granted a bounty upon certain manufactures, and gave to them the exclusive market of the Dominion, and, under those circumstances, we have lost a very important trade, possessed previous to 1873, in addition to the loss of the West India trade, and by the repeal of the 10 per cent. duty on tea, we lost the direct tea trade, and all the advantages resulting from it, by its transfer from the Dominion to New York and Boston. Under all those circumstances, and with the high duty imposed by the United States on the agricultural products of the Dominion, by which we are, to a great extent, excluded from them, while the manufactures of that country are forced into our market, we could not expect prosperity or success in the Dominion, so long as that state of things continued. These are some of the difficulties which have led to our present state of affairs. Now, after having made these few remarks on that head, I desire to call the attention of the House to the remedy. I know this is a difficult question—that it is the opinion of some hon. members, that no matter what proposition you may make, or what legislation you introduce, it cannot improve or increase the prosperity of the country. The Government entertain a different opinion. I may say, at the outset, it would have been much more agreeable if we could have met the House without the necessity

of increased taxation. But in the imposition of the duties we are now about to ask the House to impose, it may be said we will receive from the imports from foreign countries a larger portion of the \$2,000,000 we require than we will receive from the Mother Country. I believe such will be the effect, but I think that in making such a statement to this House, belonging, as we do to, and forming a part of that great country—a country that receives our natural products without any taxation, everything we have to send to her—apart from our national feelings, I think this House will not object if, in the propositions before me, they touch more heavily the imports from foreign countries than from our Fatherland. I have this to say to our American friends: In 1865 they abrogated the Reciprocity Treaty, and from that day to the present a large portion of the imports from that country into the Dominion have been admitted free. We have hoped, but hoped in vain, that by the adoption of that policy we would lead our American friends to treat us in a more liberal spirit with regard to the same articles. Well, after having waited twelve years for the consideration of this subject, the Government requiring more revenue, have determined to ask this House to impose upon the products of the United States that have been free, such a duty as may seem consistent with our position. But the Government couple with the proposal, in order to shew that we approach this question with no unfriendly spirit, a resolution that will be laid on the table containing a proposition to this effect: That, as to articles named, which are the natural products of the country, including lumber, if the United States take off the duties in part or in whole, we are prepared to meet them with equal concessions. The Government believe in a reciprocity tariff, yet may discuss Free-trade or Protection, but the question of to-day is—Shall we have a reciprocity tariff, or a one-sided tariff? The Government propose to do more. We had not been long the advisers of His Excellency before we decided that it was of the utmost importance to extend our trade with the British and foreign West India Islands, and, if possible, with South America, and that we should secure, if

possible, the admission of our ships into France at the same rate of duty as is charged upon British-built ships. Turning their attention to this subject, they advised His Excellency to appoint Sir Alexander Galt, one of the ablest statesmen in the Dominion—a gentleman whose experience in connection with the finances of this country, and whose knowledge of its trade and commerce cannot be surpassed by any, as a delegate to confer with the Government of Spain, and with the authorities in the British West India Islands, and associated with him Colonel Bernard, as assistant companion. I think that this House will sustain the action of the Government in this matter. These gentlemen went to Madrid, with the approval of the British authorities, to make arrangements with the Spanish Government to open up a trade with the Spanish West Indies. The papers on this subject we would gladly lay before the House, but at this time it would not be expedient to do so. In visiting England, my colleagues authorised me to communicate with the Imperial Government and ascertain if some arrangements might not be made, through their Minister in Paris, for the admission of our ships at two francs per ton, the same as paid by the British Government. Finding my time was limited and that it was necessary to return immediately, I stated to the Secretary of State for the Colonies the nature of the duties imposed upon me by the Government. I asked His Lordship's permission to charge Sir Alexander Galt with this duty also. It was agreed to, and he has made some progress in these negotiations. I trust before long to be able to submit the whole correspondence with reference to this matter for the information of the House. But, Sir, desiring not only to extend our trade with these countries, we felt that it was necessary to protect ourselves in other directions. We found, Sir, as I stated before, that it was important to encourage the exportation of our manufactures to foreign countries, and we are prepared now to say that the policy of the Government is to give every manufacturer in the Dominion of Canada a drawback on the duties they may pay upon goods used in the manufactures of the Dominion exported. We found also, Sir, that under the bounty system of some foreign

countries, our sugar-refining trade, and other interests, were materially affected. Well, Sir, the Government have decided to ask this House to impose countervailing duties under such circumstances. I trust that this proposition will receive the support of both sides of the House, because some six months since, when the deputation of sugar refiners in London waited upon Mr. Gladstone and Sir Stafford Northcote, both of them being gentlemen representing Free-trade views, they declared, in the most emphatic terms, that when Government came in and interfered with the legitimate trade of the country they were prepared to impose countervailing duties. To make this matter plain, and place it beyond dispute, the Government propose to ask the House for authority to collect on all such articles an *ad valorem* duty on their value, irrespective of drawbacks. My colleagues say explain it. For instance, a cent and a quarter drawback per pound is granted on cut nails exported to the Dominion of Canada; the duty will be calculated on the value of the nails, irrespective of that drawback. Now a bounty is given on sugar in excess of that which is paid by the sugar refiners; the Government will exact an *ad valorem* duty on the value of that sugar, irrespective of the drawback. I may also state, Mr. Chairman, that another reason why I think our American neighbours should not object to the imposition of the duties we propose is this: It is a fact, though not generally known, that the average percentage of revenue that is imposed on all imports into the Dominion of Canada, at the present time, taking the returns for last year as our criterion is $13\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. The amount of duty collected on the imports from Great Britain is a fraction under $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; while the amount of duty collected on the imports from the United States is a fraction under 10 per cent. If our friends across the border will not give us the Reciprocity Treaty again, they cannot find anything to object to in the imposition of these duties, if it bears a little more heavily on the articles imported from that country than they desire. When I state that the imports entered for consumption from Great Britain amounted in 1878 to \$37,431,000, and in 1873 to \$63,000,976, or nearly double; the im-

ports in 1877-8 from the United States were \$48,631,739, and for 187-34 \$54,283,072, there has been a slight falling-off; while, from England, it has been about one-half, under the operation of the present tariff. But, Sir, the House is more interested in the nature of the proposals we are about to submit than in the statements I have just made. Before I come to that, Sir, it is the first opportunity that has been afforded me of saying a few words to my hon. friend my predecessor. I know this subject is not of such importance as to justify me, at this time, in occupying much of the time of the House, but I must take this opportunity of thanking my hon. friend the member for Cumberland, who, in my absence, so eloquently defended my policy of 1873, who so ably met the statements made by my hon. predecessor. I recollect that, on a similar occasion, perhaps the first in which he had addressed the House as Finance Minister, he regretted that there had not been on the floor of the House a gentleman who had been a Finance Minister belonging to the other side. I felt, Sir, after reading the speech of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), that if it had been in the power of my hon. friend from Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) to have translated my hon. friend to Fredericton, and brought me back, he would have willingly made the exchange. I think so. But what did my hon. friend (Mr. Cartwright) do when he visited my constituents last summer? He, no doubt, desired to enlighten them. But I may be pardoned in saying I judged that one of the objects was to secure the defeat of some of the candidates, myself amongst the number. I recollect that he referred to the fact that I—and he spoke of it as my crowning offence—as Finance Minister, in 1873, had brought down Supplementary Estimates \$800,000 or \$900,000 in excess of the estimated receipts. I recollect the manner in which he dwelt upon this; the strong way in which he endeavoured to impress on the mind of my constituency what a great offender I had been, and that this was my crowning offence. Sir, he might have told that immense gathering that I, at the time, stated that the Estimates were then, as they were on previous years, largely in excess of the

sum that was expended. He might have told them that it was probable the receipts would be ample to cover the expenditure, and that I stated that should not such be the case, the \$800,000, the anticipated surplus of the then current year, would be amply sufficient to meet the deficiency. He might have said that. He might, Sir, have gone on and told them, though Mr. Tilley has been such a blunderer, I, the Minister of Finance, have, for four years in succession, had a large deficiency. I have made no provision for it. He might have pointed to the fact that, when the late Government were in power, they had a surplus of \$10,000,000, which the deficiencies under the present Government during the last four years had reduced to \$3,000,000, their deficiency being seven millions during the last four years. Taking the whole six years about \$5,000,000. But, I will say this, because I do not want to decry the credit or the standing of the Dominion: that we are in a position to state that, taking the whole twelve years into account since the organization of this Dominion; taking our surplus of twelve years; taking the amount of \$500,000, which had been charged improperly to income, that ought to have been charged to railways, and adding the \$4,500,000 received from the fishery award, and deducting the deficiency, it will be shown there was a surplus over and above the expenditure amounting to \$10,000,000, or nearly so, which shows, despite what has occurred during the last three or four years, that this Dominion has life and vitality if its affairs are properly administered. I will go, if my hon. friend will permit me, in imagination with him to his constituency on the 17th September. I will meet him there, on his return from Kingston, where he was engaged in a work, to him, no doubt, a labour of love.

Some Hon. GENTLEMEN: Successful labour.

MR. TILLEY: Where he found that, for the first time in his public life, the constituency that had stood by him—no matter what side of politics he was on—had deserted him, and I can see him as he receives his telegrams later on, finding that one friend after another has fallen, and that the Government is in a terrible minority—I can imagine, Sir, that I can

see him pacing the floor, greatly agitated, and saying: "Well, this is terrible; this is hard." I can see him a little after with his countenance somewhat more placid and resigned. I can hear him exclaiming, as he has been thinking over the deficiencies for the last four years, and the condition of the finances. I can hear him say aloud: "Well, terrible, terrible has been the judgment. Looking at it in the light in which I judged my political opponents, however, the verdict is just." Now, Sir, we may have some other opportunities of considering the past, but the country is looking to the future; is looking for something more than badinage or recrimination between the two sides of the House, and asking: What are you going to give us as a remedy for all the evils existing? The anxiety of the Opposition for this remedy appears so great. The leading organ cries: "Let us have it now!" and it is echoed from hill-top to valley. They wanted it now; they could not wait a day for it; they were so anxious to get it, I hope it will be pleasing to them and to the whole country. I may say, at the outset that, in considering this question of the tariff and protection to our industries, the Government considered how they could best discharge their duty to the Dominion; how they could best accomplish the object the country desired to see accomplished. We might obtain two million dollars by the imposition of duties upon certain articles, and appear to give protection, but in reality give none whatever. We might obtain a revenue from the increased duties, but not place it in such a position as to give real encouragement and protection to the industries they desire to protect. And, therefore, Sir, in arriving at the conclusions at which we have arrived, and which are to be submitted to the House, we submit them with the full conviction that they will be effective in their character, and give ample protection to all who are seeking it, and who have a right to expect it. I fear that I may weary the patience of the House, but really the importance of the subject is such that, if I am tedious, you will pardon me, for I desire to be as clear as possible. The tariff is in a somewhat voluminous form, and I can only give extracts from it in order to

show the general changes we have made. Still, I have classed them under different heads in order the more intelligently to explain it to the House, and I expect that to-morrow morning hon. members will have the resolutions in printed form.

Mr. MACKENZIE : We shall keep very quiet.

Mr. TILLEY : I hope you will. I propose to deal first with cotton goods, and I may say here, before reading the schedule I have before me, that the principle the Government has adopted with respect to many of these articles, is this : That where there are certain grades or descriptions of manufactures, the policy of the Government is this : To select for a higher rate of duty those that are manufactured, or can be manufactured, in the country, and to leave those that are not made in the country, or likely to be made in the country,—such as printed cottons,—at a lower rate of duty. It is difficult, in some descriptions of goods, to draw the line and make distinction ; with reference to cotton goods we have but little difficulty in doing it. There are certain portions made here, and certain portions that are not made here, and a line can be clearly and distinctly drawn. The proposition of the Government with reference to these goods, is as follows :—Cotton wool, cotton waste, free ; and I may state, for the information of hon. members, they must not suppose that the free goods named here are all that are in the list ; but, in order to bring it intelligently under the particular class of which I am speaking, where a portion is free and a portion paying duty, I introduce the free goods with that list, but it is separate and distinct by itself. Bleached or unbleached cottons, sheetings, drills, ticks, cotton and Canton flannels, not stained or painted, one per cent. per square yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. Now upon the question of under-valuation I may say a few words. One of the great difficulties that was pointed out to the Government by every delegation was the under-valuation of goods, and I may state here that the Government will ask you for a vote of money to enable them to overcome this difficulty, and they will also ask you for power and authority, such as the United States has, and exercises to-day, to fix out, through their officers, the value of

Mr. TILLEY.

the goods in the country from whence they are imported. The great difficulty I have pointed out is stated on all hands ; it makes but little difference what the rate of duty you impose, unless you prevent the under valuation. Now, we propose appointing additional officers, whose special business it will be to ascertain, in the different countries, what the value of the goods are in that country or that city from whence they are imported, and to impose the duty on those values, and to collect them. But, notwithstanding that there will be a difficulty, and to obviate that difficulty, and to reach certain special classes of goods, it has been considered desirable, with these particular industries, to make a specific and *ad valorem* duty. Under these circumstances, we have decided that, in respect to this class of goods, 1c. per yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* should be imposed. On all cotton sheeting, drillings, bed-tickings, plaids, cotton and Canton flannels, tickings and drills, dyed or coloured, pantaloon stuff and goods of that description, 2c. per square yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. These are articles, the value of which is well known in the trade, and we impose specific and *ad valorem* duties.

Mr. MACKENZIE : Can the hon. gentleman give us the values of those two classes ?

Mr. TILLEY : I have the rates here when we go into that question. I have the rates here, and shall be able to inform the House when we come to them. On all cotton batting warps, carpetings, knitting cotton, and other cotton yarns, under No. 40, not bleached, dyed or coloured, 2c. per yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* ; on the same, if bleached, dyed or coloured, 3c. per pound, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* ; on cotton warp, on denims, 1c. per yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* ; on cotton smalls and bags, 2c. per pound, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* ; on cotton shirts and drawers, woven or made with cotton, 30 per cent. *ad valorem* ; cotton sewing threads, 12½ per cent. ; on spools, 20 per cent. ; on all clothing made with cotton, or of which cotton is a component part, 30 per cent. ; on all manufactures of cotton, not elsewhere specified, and which comes

mainly from England, and which we do not make in this country, 20 per cent. I may state here, at the outset, that it is the intention of the Government to increase the 17½ per cent. list, as a whole, to 20 per cent., being goods that will yield, notwithstanding the articles that are taken out of the list, an increase of, perhaps, \$750,000 out of the \$2,000,000 required. We now come to silks: Silks, raw, or, if reeled from the cocoon, not manufactured, silk cottons and silk yarns, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*; sewing silk and silk twist, 25 per cent.; on silk velvets and manufactures, of which silk is a component part, not elsewhere specified, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. Next in the list are leather manufactures: On sole leather, tanned or rough and undressed, and on morocco, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; on sole and belting leather, tanned, and on all upper leather, not otherwise specified, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*; on the same dressed and harness, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on patent and enamelled leather, 20 per cent.; on all other leather and skins, tanned, not otherwise herein provided for, and on leather belting boots and shoes, and on other manufactures not otherwise provided for, now 17½ per cent., will be 25 per cent.; gloves of leather, 25 per cent.; leather board, 3 cents per pound. Marble in stone, or marble in block, rough on two sides, when not specially shaped, containing 15 cubic feet, or upwards, 10 per cent.; slabs, sawn on not more than two sides, 15 per cent.; planks and slabs, sawn on more than two sides, 20 per cent.; on finished marble, mantels of marble, and imitation marble, not elsewhere specified, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; on stone, rough, freestone, sandstone and other stones, excepting marble, per ton of 13 cubic feet, \$1; or curb stone, in the rough, \$1.50 per ton; on water limestone, \$1 per ton; on dressed freestone, building stone and all manufactures of stone, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; slate for roofing or slate-slabs, square and not specially stated, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; school and writing slates, 25 per cent.; slate mantels, 30 per cent.; bricks for building, 20 per cent.; fire bricks or tiles for stoves and furnaces, 20 per cent.; hydraulic or water lime, ground, including barrels, 40 cents per barrel; Roman cement, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; drain

pipes, 20 per cent., *ad valorem*. Now I come to another item that is, in some respects, in the same position as cotton goods, that is, earthenware and stoneware, brown and coloured, and Rockingham ware. That is an article made extensively in the Dominion of Canada. It is a coarse ware, but is manufactured extensively in this country, and all we require can be produced in the Dominion. It is proposed to select those articles that we can produce, and to impose a duty of 25 per cent. on earthenware and stoneware, and on C.C.-ware, an *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent., while all other china and porcelain, and imports of that kind, come under the category of enumerated articles at 20 per cent. Gypsum, unground, free; gypsum, or plaster of Paris, ground, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. Now I come to coal and coke. We propose that anthracite coal should pay a duty of 50c. per ton; bituminous coal, 50c. per ton; and coke, 50c. per ton—meaning a short ton of 2,000 pounds. In dealing with this matter, the Government had to consider what, in their judgment, would give barely the market of the Dominion to the coal deposits of Nova Scotia, because they are principally there. We know that, upon this subject, there has been some conflict of opinion; but the judgment of the Government is that, while the average import of coal into the Dominion of Canada during the last few years has been from 800,000 to 900,000 tons, and while the anthracite coal will continue to be largely imported, the Nova Scotia coal will take the place of a part of it. In the estimates of the Government, out of the 800,000 or 900,000 tons now imported, probably there will still be 350,000 tons of anthracite, and perhaps 150,000 tons of bituminous still imported, giving to the Nova Scotia coal the balance of 400,000 tons, with, of course, an additional supply, if, as we expect, our policy is successful, in consequence of an increased demand for coal to supply the growing manufactures of the country. The next class of articles proposed to be dealt with is books, papers and manufactures of paper. We experienced some difficulty in dealing with this item, and we called to our assistance gentlemen who know the trade thoroughly, who are acquainted with the interests on both

sides, and understand the matter from their own business point of view, and after conferring with them, the Government decided upon the following propositions:—Books, printed periodicals, pamphlets, bound or in sheets, not being foreign reprints of British copyrighted works, nor blank account books, copy books, Bibles, prayer books, psalm books or hymn books, six cents per pound. The Government adopted this principle, which is in operation in every country, I believe, except the United States, that the higher class and better class of books which cost a higher price than the objectionable and inferior books, where intellect has made the book valuable, a duty should not be placed upon the intellect, but the duty should be collected simply upon the value of the labour and the paper. Upon British copyrighted books 6c. per pound and $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. *ad valorem*. On bibles, prayer-books, &c., 5 per cent., as at present. On books and pamphlets imported through the post-office, for every two ounces in weight and fraction thereof, 1c. A great many books are sent through the post-office from the United States and elsewhere into the Dominion of Canada, and the Customs authorities have experienced great difficulty in regard to them, but under this proposition it is not necessary to know the value, but simply the weight. Newspapers imported through the post-office free, blank books, through the post-office, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; printed bill heads, cheques, receipts, drafts, posters, labels, advertising matter, &c., 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; advertising pamphlets, \$1 per hundred; printed music, bound, or in sheet, 6c. per pound; playing cards, 30 per cent.; engravings, prints, &c., 20 per cent.; maps and charts, 20 per cent.; articles not specified, 20 per cent.; on pulps for paper makers, 10 per cent.; mill and straw board, 10 per cent.; envelopes, &c., 25 per cent.; paper hangings and wall paper, 25 per cent.; printing materials and presses, 15 per cent.; printing type, 20 per cent.; type metal, 10 per cent.; type, old, and fit only to be re-manufactured, free; engraved plates, 30 per cent.; electrotypes, &c., 10 per cent. I now submit the proposition with reference to carriages,

MR. TILLEY.

furniture and wooden ware:—Railway carriages, cars, waggons, sleighs, wheelbarrows and like vehicles, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; household or cabinet furniture of all kinds, not otherwise named, 35 per cent. Some hon. members may ask why the rate of duty on this description of manufacture is 5 per cent. higher than that in some others? Marble slabs and cabinet-maker's hardware pay a high duty, and the same may be said of other articles used by the manufacturers, such as varnish. On clocks the Government propose a like duty. On examination it was found that clocks are manufactured, and extensively too, in the Dominion, as the duty which enters into the manufacture of these clocks has been increased, the Government felt it right to ask the House to agree to this proposition. I was under the impression that clocks was an article on which it would not be wise to impose a duty, as with any protection we might give them, we could not compete successfully with our American neighbours. But I found in that busy city of Hamilton, which is represented by nearly every article in the schedule before me, there is a clock-making industry successfully established, and producing a very nice article, in a birds-eye maple frame, for seventy cents, and they have orders from England for 6,000 or 7,000 of these clocks. Picture frames, mouldings, &c., 25 per cent.; billiard tables with pockets, $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet by 9 feet,—and with reference to these articles and the smaller class of organs and pianos, I may say that the Government have decided, after careful consideration, to impose a specific duty and an *ad valorem* duty,—billiard tables with pockets, 5 feet by 10 feet, \$25; $5\frac{1}{2}$ feet by 11 feet, \$35; 6 feet by 12 feet, \$40; in addition to an *ad valorem* duty of 10 per cent. Musical instruments, organs with not over two sets of reeds, a specific duty of \$10; with more than two sets and not more than four, \$15; with more than four and not more than six sets, \$20; all having over six sets of reeds, \$30, and in addition thereto 10 per cent. *ad valorem* on the fair market value; square pianofortes, having not over seven octaves, \$25; upright pianofortes, \$30; concert or grand pianofortes, \$50, in addition to ten per cent. *ad valorem* on the fair market value. Agricultural imple-

ments, not otherwise specified, 25 per cent.; woodenware pails, tubs, churns, brooms, brushes, &c., not otherwise specified, 25 per cent.; corks, and manufacture of corkwood, 20 per cent.; corkwood and bark, unmanufactured, free. We now come to glass manufactures, and here the same principle is intended to apply as that which I pointed out in reference to cotton and earthenware. We have selected for a higher rate of duty the description of glassware that can be made in the Dominion. On pressed glass bottles, vials of every description, 30 per cent.; carboys and demijohns, 30 per cent.; telegraph and lightning-rod insulators, 30 per cent.; lamps, globes, etc., 30 per cent.; ornamental, stained, and tinted glass, and glass windows, 30 per cent.; common and colourless window glass, and glass painted, enamelled and engraved, 20 per cent.; and all other glass, not otherwise specified, the non-enumerated rate of 20 per cent. The next class of articles is metal. The first item is pig iron. In dealing with this question, the Government had to take into consideration the important iron interest of the Dominion. It is quite true that a very large deposit of iron is found in the Province of Nova Scotia. Adjacent to it are immense beds of coal, inexhaustible, and no doubt for the Province of Nova Scotia this interest is a very important one, but it is not confined to Nova Scotia. We find, on examining the geological reports and the reports of the officials who have been charged with the enquiring into the extent of our iron deposits show us that in every Province of the Dominion there are large deposits of iron. From the west we have had specimens of iron submitted to us of the most valuable character, made by the application of heat from petroleum, which appears to remove some of the difficulties that have been experienced in producing good iron before, inasmuch as it removes the phosphorus and sulphur which rendered to a great extent that iron valueless. If this be so, we may reasonably expect that in the western part of our Dominion, in Nova Scotia, in the valley of the Ottawa, in the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick, we may, by giving some encouragement to this manufacture, or its production, have these interests springing up all over the Dominion and

producing the most beneficial results. We find in every country, no matter what country it is—take England for instance, take France or any other country that has risen to any position of wealth and commercial greatness—and you will find the iron interest is one of the most important interests of that country. I would also instance the United States. It may safely be said that it is the basis of every other industry. It is true we have not developed it to a great extent yet. We have one establishment at present in operation in Nova Scotia, but it will only produce one fourth of our present consumption. There is no reason why we should not supply the whole of the trade in time. There is a great diversity of opinion as to how this protection is to be afforded. It is now proposed to place a duty of \$2 per ton on pig iron; old and scrap, in blooms, slabs, hoops or billets, 12½ per cent. *ad valorem*; in bars, rolled or hammered, including flats, rounds and squares, band and hoop, sheet, smoothed or polished, coated or galvanized, and common or black, boiler and other plate, Canada plates or squares, nail and spike rods, and all other iron not otherwise herein provided for, 17½ per cent. *ad valorem*; on rolled round wire rods in coil, under half-inch in diameter, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; on iron rails or railway bars for railways or tramways, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*; on railway fish plates, frogs, frog points, chairs and finger bars, 17½ per cent. *ad valorem*; on iron and steel wire, not over No. 18 wire gauge, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; on tin plates, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; on castings in the rough, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on stoves and other finished castings, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; on car wheels, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; on mill irons and mill cranks, and on wrought forgings for mills and locomotives, or parts thereof, weighing 25 pounds or more, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on locomotive engines, and on stationary or other steam engines and boilers, and on other machinery composed of iron, or of which iron is the component part of chief value, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; locomotive tyres of steel, or Bessemer in the rough, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; seamless boiler tubing, drawn, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; on bedsteads and other iron furniture, and orna-

mental iron work, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; on hollow ware tinned, glazed or enamelled, of cast or wrought iron, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; on hardware, viz.: builders', cabinet-makers', upholsterers', carriage-makers', saddlers' and undertakers', 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; bolts, nuts, washers and rivets, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; tacks, brads and sprigs, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; horse-shoes and horse-shoe nails, iron wire nails, called "Point de Paris," 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; iron and steel screws, commonly called "wood-screws," 35 per cent. *ad valorem*; scales, balances and weighing beams, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; chain cables, over $\frac{1}{2}$ inch in diameter, shackled or swivelled, or otherwise, 5 per cent. *ad valorem*; anchors, iron masts and wire rigging, when used for ships or other vessels, free; nails and spikes, cut, $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound und 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; nails and spikes, wrought and pressed, whether galvanised or not, $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent per pound, and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; composition nails and spikes and sheathing nails, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on sewing machines, whole, and on "heads," or parts of heads of sewing machines, \$2 each; and in addition thereto, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on machinery for cotton and worsted mills, not made in the country, free; steel, in ingots, bars, coils, sheets and steel wire, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; edged tools of all kinds, including axes, scythes and saws; carpenters' coopers' cabinet-makers', and all other mechanics' tools, shovels spades, hoes, hay, manure, and potato forks, rakes and rake teeth, and steel skates, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; on cutlery, and on other manufacturers of steel, and of iron and steel, not otherwise herein provided for, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on knife blades, in the rough, or blades unhandled, and for use by makers of plated ware, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; copper, old and scrap, and in ingots, pigs, plates, bars, rods, bolts, wire, and in sheets not planished or coated, and for sheathing, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; seamless tubing, drawn, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; rivets and burrs, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; on all manufactures of copper, not otherwise herein provided for, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; wire of brass or copper, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*;

wire cloth, of brass or copper, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; brass, old and scrap, and in bars, bolts and sheets, round or flat wire, seamless drawn tubing, and tubing plain and fancy, unfinished, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; on manufactures of brass, not otherwise herein provided for, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; church bells, free; yellow metal, in bolts, bars and for sheathing, free; phosphor-bronze, in blocks, bars, sheets and wire, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; lead, old and scrap, in pigs, blocks, bars and sheets, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; lead pipe, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; lead shot, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; all other manufactures of lead, not otherwise herein provided, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; tin, in blocks, pigs and bars, and in plates and sheets, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; on tinware and japanned ware, and on stamped ware, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; zinc, in pigs, blocks and sheets, and on seamless-drawn tubing, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; on manufactures of not elsewhere specified, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; silver and gilt electro-plated ware, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; German silver in sheets, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; jewelry, watches, and manufactures of gold and silver, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; Jewelry is considered, like silk, a luxury, and had it not been for the circumstances affecting this article, it would have been subject to increased taxation. It appears that, even at $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., we only imported last year about \$240,000 worth, and the inducement is so great to smuggle, that the Government propose to leave these articles in the unenumerated list of 20 per cent. We now come to wool and woolen goods. In this case, Mr. Chairman, we have so arranged our proposition for the consideration of this House, that the duty is to be imposed so as to encourage the manufacture of the coarser description of woolens and blankets in the Dominion. We have, at the present time, a large product of wool shut out practically of the American market, and sold there at a very low price on account of the high duty imposed. The Government felt if they could secure a ready and good home market for this important product, they were bound to do it, and they ask the House to sustain them in this proposition. Wool, unmanufactured, hair of the alpaca, goat and other like animals,

and wool waste, free; on manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animals, viz:—Shawls, blankets and flannels of every description; cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings, cloakings, felt cloth of every description, horse-collar cloth, yarn, knitting-yarn, fingering-yarn, worsted-yarn, under number 30; knitted goods, viz:—Shirts, drawers, and hosiery of every description, $7\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound, and, in addition thereto, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animals, made up or manufactured, wholly or in part, by the tailor, seamstress or manufacturer, except knit goods, 10c. per pound, and, in addition thereto, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; on all manufactures composed, wholly or in part, of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animals, not herein otherwise provided for, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on treble ingrain, three-ply and two-ply carpets, composed wholly of wool, 10c. per square yard, and, in addition thereto, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; on two-ply and three-ply ingrain carpets, of which the warp is composed wholly of cotton, 5c. per square yard, and in addition thereto, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; oil cloth for floors, stamped, painted or printed, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; jute, unmanufactured, and jute balls, jute, manufactures of 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; flax, fibre, scutched, 1c. per pound; flax, fibre, hackled, 2c. per pound; flax tow, scutched or green, $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound; breadstuffs and barley, 15c. per barrel; buckwheat, 10c. per barrel; Indian corn, $7\frac{1}{2}$ c. per bushel; oats, 10c. per bushel; rye, 10c. per bushel; wheat, 15c. per bushel; peas, 10c. per bushel; beans, 15c. per bushel; buckwheat, meal and flour, $\frac{1}{4}$ c. per pound; Indian meal, 40c. per barrel; oat meal, $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound; rye flour, 50c. per barrel; wheat flour, 50c. per barrel; rice, 1c. per pound; rice and sago flour, 2c. per pound; barley malt, 2c. per pound. Dairy produce—Butter, 4c. per pound; cheese, 3c. per pound; flax seed, 10c. per bushel. It is proposed to impose 40c. per barrel on apples; they now pay 10 per cent. On cranberries, prunes and quinces, 30c.

per bushel; peaches, 40c. per bushel; cherries and currants, 1c. per quart; gooseberries, filberts, raspberries and strawberries, 2c. per quart; grapes, 1c. per pound; hops, 6c. per pound, instead of 5c.; honey, 3c. per pound; meats—fresh or salted, on the actual weight as received in Canada, 1c. per pound. At present the duty is collected on 185 pounds to the barrel in the United States, which, when it reaches here, by the effect of the salting, weighs up to 200 pounds. The duty now, therefore, according to the old tariff weight, will be 1c. per pound; bacon and hams, 2c. per pound; meats not elsewhere specified, 2c. per pound. On lard, which is now charged at one cent, it is proposed to make the duty $1\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound; fried lard, 2c. instead of 1c.; trees, shrubs, 20 per cent; seeds for field and garden, 15 per cent. Seed in small paper parcels, there is a large quantity brought from the United States put up in small papers at vast labour, the paper for which we tax 20 per cent, and printing in same proportion, it is proposed to place them under a tariff of 25 per cent; potatoes, 10c. per bushel; tomatoes, 30c. per bushel. All other vegetables now 10 per cent., 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. Manures, of all kinds, free. We now come to the proposition in regard to spirits and wines. Spirits and strong waters not having been sweetened or mixed with any article, so that the degree of strength thereof cannot be ascertained by Sykes' hydrometer, and so on in proportion for any greater or less strength than proof, and for every greater or less quantity than a gallon, viz:—Alcohol, rum, whiskey, Geneva gin and unenumerated articles of that kind, \$1.32 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Imperial gallon, instead of \$1.20. Objection was taken to the proposition made by my hon. predecessor, to make the increase on brandy per gallon the same as on gin and whisky, it is now proposed that brandy shall be increased 25c., or \$1.45 per gallon; and that old Tom gin be charged \$1.32 $\frac{1}{2}$ per gallon. I may here state that the proposition which the Government will submit with reference to the excise, is an increase of 10c. per gallon on excise spirits, leaving tobacco where it is at present, except the Canada twist, made from Canadian leaf, which will be reduced from 10c. to 4c. per pound. It was suggested to

the Government that this might be met in another way, by imposing a small duty on the imported leaf, in addition to the excise duty; but in the United States they have reduced the excise duty on tobacco to 16c. If we propose to increase ours beyond 20c. it would encourage smuggling, and we would lose legitimate business and revenue. It was decided not to impose an additional duty upon the imported tobacco leaf, but to meet it in this way, reducing the tobacco manufacture from the leaf of our own growth to 4c. per pound. A resolution will be submitted to reduce the duty on malt from 2c. to 1c. per pound. It is estimated that the increased 10c. a gallon on spirits will give over and above what we lose on malt, \$100,000 additional excise duty. The Government considered that it would be wise to encourage, if stimulants are to be used at all, the use of malt liquors in preference to spirits. Spirits and strong waters sweetened or mixed, so that the degree of strength cannot be ascertained, namely, rum, shrub, cordials, &c., \$1.90 per gallon; spirits or strong waters, imported in Canada, mixed with any ingredients, and, although coming under the denomination of proprietary medicines, tinctures, essences, extracts, or any other denomination, are, nevertheless, deemed spirits and strong waters, and subject to duty as such, \$1.90 per gallon; cologne water and perfumed spirits, in bottles or flasks, not weighing over four ounces each, 40 per cent. Wines and fermented liquors. I may state, at this stage of the proceedings, the reasons that have influenced the Government to submit the proposed sale of duty on wines; one of the proposals, submitted to the Government of France, through Sir A. T. Galt, was that we would place a duty on French wines, at the same rate precisely as that charged in England, namely, 25c. per gallon, or 1s. sterling. These negotiations, though not closed, we may hope, at no distant day, will be successfully arranged. There has been a difficulty between Spain and England with reference to rates of duties imposed by each country on wines. The proposition I am now about to make will, if we arrange with Spain and France, meet the circumstances of the case by the withdrawal of the 30 per

MR. TILLEY.

cent. *ad valorem* duty imposed, leaving it 25c. per gallon, 26 degrees of proof, and increased in proportion to strength, the same as in England. On champagne, the Government asked the House to impose an additional duty. The duty, as it now stands, is lower than that exacted on many of the necessaries of life, and lower than that imposed on the cheaper kinds of wines; and, in order to equalise the rate of duty collected on wines, there is no reason why champagne or sparkling wines should be exempted from a fair contribution to the revenue of the Dominion. Champagne and all sparkling wines in bottles containing each not more than a quart, \$3 per dozen bottles; on bottles containing not more than one pint, \$1.50 per dozen; containing a half pint each or less, 75c. per dozen, and to it is added a duty of 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. Bottles containing over a quart each, will be charged in addition, \$3 per dozen. Liquors imported under the name of wine, containing more than 40 per cent. strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer shall be rated for duty, as non-enumerated spirits. Wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, including ginger, oranges, lemons, strawberries, raspberries, elder, and current wines, containing 26 per cent. or less of spirits of the strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer, imported in wood or in bottles, six quart and twelve pint bottles to be held to contain an Imperial gallon, 25c. per Imperial gallon, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. When containing over 26 per cent. and not over 31 per cent. 40c. per Imperial gallon; when containing over 31 and not over 36 per cent., 55c. per Imperial gallon; when containing over 36 and not over 40 per cent., 70c. per Imperial gallon, and in addition to the above specific duty, 30 per cent. per Imperial gallon. Malt liquors, when imported in bottles, six quarts and twelve pint bottles to constitute an Imperial gallon, will be charged 18c. per gallon. When imported in casks or otherwise than in bottles, 10c. per Imperial gallon. Oils, lard, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; linseed or flaxseed, 25 per cent.; neatfoot, 20 per cent.; tallow, per pound, one cent.

After Recess.

MR. TILLEY resumed his remarks, saying: At six o'clock I was proceeding

to explain the propositions which the Government propose to submit to the consideration of the House. I take up the subject where I left off. The next articles are gunpowder and other explosives, gun, rifle and sporting powder in kegs, half or quarter kegs and small packages, 5c. per pound; on cannon and musket powder, in kegs and barrels, 4c.; on canister powder in pound and half-pound packages and tins, 15c.; blasting and running powder, 3c.; on giant powder, dynamite and other explosives, with nitro-glycerine as a constituent, 5c. per pound, and, in addition 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; nitro-glycerine 10c. per lb., and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; salt, except imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or for the use of the sea and gulf fisheries which shall be free, in bulk, 8c. per 100 pounds; on barrels, bags and other packages, 12c. per 100 pounds; chemicals, medicines, paints and oils, acid, sulphuric, $\frac{1}{2}$ c. as at present; acetic, per Imperial gallon, 12 cents; muriatic and nitric, *ad valorem*, 20 per cent.; oxalic, free; saltpetre, 20 per cent., *ad valorem*; essential oils for manufacturing, 20 per cent.; essences of apple, pear, pineapple, raspberry, strawberry, vanilla, and other fruits, \$1.80 per gallon, and *ad valorem* of 20 per cent. This is to cover the spirit duty. Coal tar and coal pitch, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; varnish, bright and black, for shipbuilders' use, free; all other not elsewhere specified, 20 cents per Imperial gallon, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. Colours—bichromate of potash, blue, black, scarlet, and marone, in pulp, Paris green, Prussian blue, satin and fine-washed white, ultramarine and umber raw, free; added to this class, that were formerly dutiable, are Prussian blue, and one or two other colours; paints not elsewhere specified, 20 per cent., *ad valorem*; putty, 25 per cent.; ochres, dry or unground, washed or unwashed, not calcined, 10 per cent.; spirits of turpentine, not enumerated, 20 per cent., *ad valorem*. Coal oils and their products remain as they are; cod liver, medicated, 20 per cent., *ad valorem*; sperm oil, 20 per cent.; neatsfoot, olive or salad, sesame seed, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; sulphate of quinine, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; opium crude, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; prepared for smoking, and all preparations

of, \$5 per pound, the cost being about \$11. The representative of British Columbia will be interested in this duty. Perfumery, including preparations for the toilet, hair oils, powder, pomatum, and other perfumery preparations for the hair, mouth or skin, 30 per cent.; pomades, French or flower odours, preserved in fat oil for conserving the odours of flowers which do not bear the heat of distillation, imported in tins of not less than 10 pounds each, *ad valorem*, 15 per cent.; medicines, or any medicine preparations of which the recipe is kept a secret, or the ingredients a secret, recommended by a bill or label, for the relief or cure of any disorder, in liquid form 50 per cent.; and all others, 25 per cent., as at present. These medicines are at present often the cover for spirits, introduced under their name—(the duty was formerly 25 per cent.); artificial flowers, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*; feathers, ostrich and vulture, undressed, 15 per cent.; dressed, 25 per cent.; furs, hatters', not in the skin, free; skins of all kinds, not dressed, free; dressed, 15 per cent. *ad valorem*; furs, viz., caps, hats, muffs, tippets, capes, coats, as manufactured in cloaks, &c., 25 per cent.; candles, tallow, 2c. per pound; paraffine, wax, 4 per cent.; all others, *ad valorem*, 20 per cent.; India rubber and gutta percha, unmanufactured, free; boots, shoes and other manufactures of India rubber and gutta percha, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; soap, common, brown, not perfumed, per pound, 1 cent; yellow, castile, and white, perfumed or toilet, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; starch, including farina corn starch or flour, and all preparations of, 2 c. per pound, as at present; cordage for ships, 10 per cent.; for all other purposes, 20 per cent. I may here state, that, at the opening of my remarks, I referred to a proposition of the Government to treat all articles manufactured in the Dominion, and exported from it, in this way: there shall be a drawback on the materials used in manufactures, equal to the duty paid, on the evidence of their exportation. The proposition is to treat new vessels of every description as an export, duty paid on cordage to be the exception. For, if we allow a drawback on it, we shall close up the establishments maintained now by the supply for ships. It is proposed to increase the duty on cordage to 10 per cent., which duty ships

would have to pay; but iron in pig, bolts and blooms, on paying duty and being used in vessels, would have the duty paid back. So, practically, ships will be regarded like all other articles exported, all duties being returned to the builder.

AN HON. MEMBER: What size of ships?

MR. TILLEY: All sizes and descriptions. We propose 10 per cent. duty on all foreign vessels seeking registration in the Dominion. This extends to all parts of the Dominion. As regards the proposed duty on sugar and molasses, if I occupy the attention of the House for a few moments, I am sure you will pardon me, for it is one of the most difficult questions with which any Government can possibly have to deal. We know there has been great dissatisfaction in the United States as to the mode of levying the duty there; it has been purely specific, levied upon Dutch standard, two and five for all below seven, till it reaches a duty of five cents per pound specific. Dissatisfaction arising from that system has been apparent in that country. Notwithstanding that, several commissions have been appointed to treat this question, and that Mr. Wells, one of the ablest men in the United States, has been asked by the sugar refiners and importers to report on it, and that a very able and elaborate report was submitted; notwithstanding that a proposition has been recently before Congress with reference to this question, no change in the mode of levying the duty has been made. There seems no probability of their arriving at any other conclusion than a specific duty. I will say, for the information of hon. members who may not have studied this question, that the rate of duty imposed in the United States is under the Dutch standard. From No. 7 down they pay the lowest duty. It has been found the very best. Almost pure sugar, amounting to 96 per cent., or even above that, had been admitted at a low rate of duty. Under these circumstances the refiner would receive a drawback of three dollars per 100 lbs. on which he had paid but \$2.15. This principle of specific duty is found to work injuriously in many respects, but still Congress has not repealed or changed it. There have been very strong arguments

MR. TILLEY.

used in that country in favour of *ad valorem* duty, and in the Dominion as well. I do not hesitate to say that many of the arguments are most cogent in many respects. Mr. Wells takes the line that the *ad valorem* principle is the proper one. I may say that, after investigating this matter, if you adopt the *ad valorem* duty at all, it can best be done in the manner which we propose to do in this case. There is a mode in which you can test certain classes of sugar by means of an instrument, the polariscope. It is used satisfactorily for the purpose of testing all the classes of sugar below number 9, or in fact below number 13, especially the low class of sugar, but fails when applied to the yellow refined sugars largely mixed with glucose. Gentlemen who were interested in the importing of that class of sugar were in favour of *ad valorem* duties. I might say if they applied *ad valorem* duties solely they would find that the West India sugar of a bright good character, would be met by this yellow refined adulterated article, in appearance better than the West India sugars. Under these circumstances, seeing the difficulty on both sides, the difficulty in imposing a specific duty, and the difficulty in applying the *ad valorem* principle, the latter having, I admit, some advantages; still, feeling that that article came in and competed successfully with our importation of good grocer's sugar, the Government have fallen back on the proposition submitted in 1868, viz: a mixed duty, specific and *ad valorem*, there has been naturally a difference of opinion between the importers of sugar and refiners, in reference to the point at which additional duty should take place. At the present time the higher rate of duty took place at or above No. 13. The refiners were anxious to continue it at No. 13, whilst the importers desired it at a little higher. We have made a compromise and put it at No. 14. On all sugar above No. 14, Dutch standard in colour, 1c. per pound, and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. That covered all refined sugar. On sugar equal to No. 9, and not above No. 14, three-quarters of a cent. per pound, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. I call attention to the fact that the difference to the refiners is 5 per cent., that all below No. 14 have an *ad valorem*

duty of 35 per cent., giving to the refiners 5 per cent. On sugar below No. 9, half a cent. per pound, and 30 per cent *ad valorem*, provided that the *ad valorem* duty shall be levied and collected on sugar and melado, when imported direct from the country of growth and production, upon the fair market value thereof, at the place of purchase, without any addition for the cost of hogsheads, or other packages or charges, not including export duty, and expenses prior to shipment; anything contained in section 34 of the Act 46th Vic., chap. 10, to the contrary notwithstanding. It means this, that all sugar imported direct from the West Indies to the Dominion shall pay no duty upon packages and ordinary charges. We have added five per cent. to the present duty of 35 per cent. Sugar, not imported direct, will pay a duty on the packages, giving additional encouragement to our direct West India trade. Syrups, cane juice, refined syrup, sugar-house syrup, syrup of sugar, syrup of molasses or sorghum, five-eighths of 1c. per pound *ad valorem*. Melado, concentrated melado, concentrated cane juice, concentrated molasses, concentrated beet-root juice, and concrete, three-eighths of 1c. per pound, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. It is estimated, taking the sugar that was imported last year, as shown in the returns made, that this altering of the duties will yield \$200,000 less than under the existing tariff, through having no duty on packages remitted. Molasses, if used for refining, clarifying or rectifying purposes, or for the manufacture of sugar, when imported direct from the country of growth and production, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. Molasses for the same purposes, when not imported direct from the country of growth and production, 30 per cent. This is to encourage the importation of molasses direct. I cannot see why there was such an extraordinary discrepancy in the value of molasses imported into the different Provinces, 1878. It was, perhaps, owing, to some extent, to the fact that the very blackest and most inferior description of molasses, the refuse which New York and Boston refiners, sent into this country, and it was to prevent, as much as possible, the importation of such molasses that a distinction is made. Molasses, if not so used

when imported direct from the country of growth and production, 15 per cent. The same, when not imported direct from the country of growth and production, 20 per cent. This will be a loss to the revenue of something like \$90,000 or \$100,000; but we will be able to make that up, and more, from additional taxation imposed on other articles. Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery, 1c. per pound, and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. Glucose, or grape sugar, to be classed and rated for duty as sugar, according to grade, by Dutch standard, in colour. Glucose syrup 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. We now come, Mr. Chairman, to the article of tea. The House will probably be prepared, from the statements I made in the early part of the day, to hear that the Government propose to ask Parliament to reimpose a duty of 10 per cent. on tea coming from the United States. I may be pardoned for saying that I think it was a great mistake on the part of my predecessor in standing so firmly and refusing to reimpose this additional duty on tea, and I believe that this House is prepared for a reversal of that decision. It is our intention to ask Parliament to reimpose a specific and *ad valorem* duty, instead of the 5c. per pound now collected. A specific duty of 2c. per pound on black, and 3c. on green and Japan, and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. The result of our policy in that direction will be to decrease, to some extent, the revenue, say \$100,000, as the cost of the tea, when imported direct, is less than if bought in New York. Coffee, green, 2c. per pound; roasted or ground, and all imitations of and substitutes for, 3c. per pound. Cocoa paste and chocolate, not sweetened, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; cocoa paste, chocolate, and other preparations of cocoa, when containing sugar, 1c. per pound and 25 per cent *ad valorem*. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not taken up every article on which we propose to change the rate of duty, and, in order that the House and the country may not be led astray, I shall read the free list, because, unless I do so, it may be supposed that all the articles that I have not mentioned are in the free list. Animals for the improvement of stock; ancer; antimony; ashes, pot, pearl and soda; apparel, wearing and other apparel;

of household effects, not merchandise ; arsenic ; articles for the use of the Governor-General, foreign consuls, army and navy, army clothing, musical instruments, military stores, etc. ; bamboo reeds, no further manufactured than cut into suitable lengths for walking-sticks ; canes, in sticks for umbrellas, parasols and sunshades ; bamboo, unmanufactured ; barrels for Canadian manufactures, exported and filled with domestic petroleum and returned ; bells for churches, bismuth, bone ash for the manufacture of manure, bromide, bullion, gold and silver ; bichromate of potash, carriages laden with merchandise, cabinets of coins and models, canvass for the manufacture of floorcloth, gutta percha, cat-gut strings for musical instruments, citrons and rinds for candy ; clothing, being donations for charitable purposes ; coins, gold and silver, except United States silver coin ; communion plate, cotton waste and cotton wool ; diamonds unset, including black diamonds ; dyeing or tinting articles in a crude state ; earths, grass and pulp for the manufacture of paper, vegetable fibre for manufacturing purposes, fish-bait, fish-hooks, lines, fishing tackle, ginseng root, gold beaters' moulds, grease and grease scraps, for manufacturing purposes ; gravels, guano and other animal or vegetable manures, gums, gum arabic, hemlock bark, hemp undressed, hides raw, horse hair, india rubber, indigo, isinglass, glue, ivory, iron masts for ships or barges, iron cables and chains over one-half inch in length, shackled or unshackled ; jute, liquorice, roots, lemons and rinds of lemons for candying ; logs round, and unmanufactured timber not otherwise provided for ; lumber, plank and boards sawn, or box wood, pitch pine ; Spanish cedar, oak, hickory and white wood not shaped, planed or otherwise manufactured ; locomotives, passengers' baggage passing from one country into another, vanilla grass, mica, mineral specimens, models of invention and other improvements in the arts ; Iceland moss, horses, cattle, carriages, harness, under regulations to be provided by the Minister of Customs ; machinery for worsted and cotton mills of kinds that are not manufactured in Canada. There is an exception made in this case, because we have no cotton machinery in the country, and not likely to have ; therefore, in

MR. TILLEY.

order to encourage this industry, it is proposed to make them free. Nitrate of soda, nut galls, newspapers, cocoa-nut oil, palm oil, palm-leaf oil, carbolic oils, used in the manufacture of wooden pavement ; wood for building and railroad purposes, oxalic acid, mother of pearl unmanufactured, philosophical instruments and apparatus, including globes, when imported for the use of colleges, schools, scientific and literary societies ; phosphorus, pitch pine, plaster of Paris, pumice and pumice stone, precipitate of copper, rags of cotton, paper waste, and waste of any kind for the manufacture of paper ; rosin, rhubarb root, saffron and saffron flower, skins undressed, silicate of soda, sulphur in roll and flour, tampico, tanner's bark, tobacco unmanufactured, for excise purposes, under conditions of Act 31 Vict. chap 31 ; tortoise and other shells, turpentine, traveller's baggage under regulations, blue vitriol, verdigris, vegetable fibres, whiting, whalebone unmanufactured, whale oil in cask in the condition in which it was first landed ; wool. I have not touched upon all the changes we propose to make, and they will be carefully read, no doubt, from the Chair, but I have dealt with the larger and more important ones. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Government have endeavoured, and I think the House will agree with me—whether successfully or not—to carry out the policy that we were pledged to inaugurate. We have endeavoured to meet every possible interest—the mining, the manufacturing, and the agricultural interests. We have endeavoured to assist our shipping and ship-building interest, which is in a very depressed condition. We have endeavoured not to injure the lumber interest, because they now have a very important article used by their people at about the same rate of duty they had it before—I refer to pork. They have tea at a cheaper price than before ; they have molasses cheaper. These articles enter largely into consumption with them. They have, as have every other class of exporters in the Dominion, many advantages under the propositions that we are about to submit that they did not enjoy before, in the interest of lumbermen and of commerce generally. The present Govern-

ment, as well as our predecessors, have expended large sums of money for the improvement of the navigation of our rivers and of our coast, by the erection of lighthouses, and in their maintenance. This, of course, is an advantage to the shipping interests as well. A proposition is to be submitted to the House, which you will find in the Estimates, of extending a telegraph down the St. Lawrence. This proposition was submitted to the people of the Dominion by that able and experienced gentleman, a member of this House. I need not name him, because the interest he has taken is well known. This proposition is in the interest of commerce, and of our shipping, and of humanity. It is in the interest of every industry that exports any article from this country to the old world, because an expenditure of this kind will reduce the rate of charges in the shape of insurance and other charges on the shipping, and that is more absolutely in the interest of the exporter than in the interest of the owner of the ship. But while we have been looking around to see what new modes of taxation might be used in raising additional revenue—and you will observe, Sir, that, by these propositions, we are resorting to no new mode of taxation—it was suggested that the shipping interest might fairly contribute towards the maintenance of the lights. In olden times they did contribute. In some of the Provinces, before the Union, we obtained a sufficient amount from the shipping to maintain these lights, and the hospitals for sick and disabled seamen; but we thought it desirable to give the owners of shipping and the exporters, and, indeed, the importers, and the commerce of the country, the advantage of free lights. In our policy, as just propounded, we have dealt with the agricultural interest, the mining interest, the shipping interest, indirectly with the lumbering interest, and with very many interests, without touching heavily at all upon any other interest; and it does appear to me, Sir, that we have now arrived at the time when it becomes necessary for this country, for this Parliament to decide whether we are to remain in the position we now occupy, with a certainty that, within two years, with the existing laws upon our Statue-book, almost every manufac-

turing industry in the country will be closed up, and the money invested in them lost. The time has arrived, I think, when it will become our duty to decide whether the thousands of men throughout the length and breadth of this country who are unemployed, shall seek employment in another country, or shall find it in this Dominion; the time has arrived when we are to decide whether we will be simply hewers of wood and drawers of water; whether we will be simply agriculturists raising wheat, and lumbermen producing more lumber than we can use, or Great Britain and the United States will take from us at remunerative prices; whether we will confine our attention to the fisheries and certain other small industries, and cease to be what we have been, and not rise to be what I believe we are destined to be under wise and judicious legislation, or whether we will inaugurate a policy that will, by its provisions, say to the industries of the country, we will give you sufficient protection; we will give you a market for what you can produce; we will say that while our neighbours build up a Chinese wall, we will impose a reasonable duty on their products coming into this country; at all events, we will maintain for our agricultural and other productions, largely, the market of our own Dominion. The time has certainly arrived when we must consider whether we will allow matters to remain as they are, with the result of being an unimportant and uninteresting portion of Her Majesty's Dominions, or will rise to the position, which, I believe Providence has destined us to occupy, by means which, I believe, though I may be over sanguine, which my colleagues believe, though they may be over sanguine, which the country believes are calculated to bring prosperity and happiness to the people, to give employment to the thousands who are unoccupied, and to make this a great and prosperous country, as we all desire and hope it will be.

MR. MACKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman give us an estimate of the revenue of the coming year? We have heard nothing of that.

MR. TILLEY: I am very much obliged to my hon. friend. I was not aware that I had passed it over. I have

here a comparative statement, which I will read:—

| ORIGINAL ESTIMATE, 1878-79. | 1878-79. | 1879-80. |
|---|------------|-----------------------|
| Canals and minor Public Works. | \$ 445,000 | \$ 450,000 |
| Railways. | 1,481,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Post Office. | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Bill Stamps. | 190,000 | 200,000 |
| Interest on Investment. | 670,000 | 700,000 |
| Miscellaneous. | 600,000 | 600,000 |
| Excise (1879-80). | 4,614,000 | |
| Excise Revenue of this year collected in 1878-9 | 358,000 | 4,972,000 |
| Excise (1878-79)..... | 5,213,406 | |
| Less Excise of 1879-80 at old rates collected this year.. | 322,000 | 4,891,400 |
| C u s t o m s (1879-80).. | 14,000,000 | |
| Customs Revenue of this year collected in 1878-79.... | 500,000 | 14,500,000 |
| C u s t o m s (1878-79).. | 12,640,000 | |
| Less C u s t o m s of 1879-80 collected this year..... | 500,000 | 12,140,000 |
| | | 21,670,400 24,122,000 |

MR. MACKENZIE: What I desire was rather an estimate of the products expected under the proposed fiscal changes.

MR. TILLEY: I thought that would be better explained as we came to the items. I may state, however, that we estimate an increase from the operation of this new tariff of \$2,200,000. The Government have been exceedingly anxious, heavy as the imposition of some of the taxes are, that in the future we shall have no deficits. The credit of the country requires, and we believe the country will justify us in collecting such a revenue as will meet the requirements of the country.

MR. TILLEY.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Before you put those resolutions, Sir, I desire to make a few remarks upon the statement we have just heard, and also upon the general policy which is now, for the first time, propounded to a Canadian Legislature. It will not surprise you, Mr. Chairman, or those of my hon. friends who, in former days, were members of the House of Commons of 1873, if I venture to hint to this House that, if we are to judge of the present by the past, we may very well doubt, though we have got the Budget speech, whether we have got the Budget itself after all. Sir, I very well recollect the circumstances attendant on the delivery of the Budget speech of 1873; and, if ever there was an occasion when a Canadian Minister of Finance ought to have made a full and frank statement to the House of Commons, it was at the moment when we were committing ourselves to a huge host of enterprises which every man who knew anything whatever of the real state of Canada knew must tax our resources to the very uttermost. How did the hon. gentleman fulfil his trust on that occasion? He told the House to-day, and truly enough, that he was complimented by gentlemen on this side of the House on the mode in which he fulfilled his task; but he failed to tell the House that he obtained their commendations under false pretences; that, had the true statement which was ultimately submitted to the House been made then; had the facts as they appeared in the closing days of that Session been known at that time, never would a Budget have been so determinedly fought on the floor of the House of Commons as the Budget which the hon. gentleman then submitted. Fortunately for that hon. gentleman circumstances of a very peculiar character wholly diverted public attention from the Budget he then submitted; and his subsequent retirement from public life makes this practically the first public occasion on which he can be taken to task for the mode in which he then performed his duty. Sir, that hon. gentleman, in 1873, made a Budget speech, in which he informed us that the total expenditure in that year would amount to \$20,941,183, against estimated receipts of \$21,740,000, leaving an apparent sur

plus of \$800,000, on the fact of the existence of which surplus that hon. gentleman based his refusal to make any alteration in the tariff, or to make, at that time, any further provision for the huge mass of public works to which he was then committing the country. Now, to-day, we heard the hon. gentleman say, and say rightly enough, that it is extremely inexpedient—and I agree with him—to introduce, if it can possibly be avoided, any considerable number of Supplementary Estimates. Unhappily, in this, as, I fear, in a great many other cases, the hon. gentleman's practice lagged greatly behind his precepts. In that same Session, this gentleman, who now objects to the introduction of supplementary estimates, introduced, first of all, in addition to his original estimates, a supplementary estimate for \$368,340; then a second supplementary estimate for \$57,000; then a third supplementary estimate for \$100,000; then, by 36 Victoria, chapters 30 and 41, he added to our permanent liabilities by the assumption of the provincial debts, and by the subsidy to the Province of New Brunswick, \$819,349 more. By a provision of chapters 31 and 36 Victoria, he added \$300,550 to the annual permanent expenditure of Canada, for salaries and indemnities to members; and, by another Act, he added \$418,000 to our annual expenditure by the terms of the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Union; and, by a further Act for the organization of the mounted police, he added \$200,000 more. So that, by the time we come to add to his estimates the balances which were covered over under Order in Council, we find his estimate of \$20,941,000 swollen to \$23,689,000. And the surplus of \$800,000, on the existence of which the hon. gentleman based his right to avoid imposing increased taxation, was altered, even if he had received every farthing which he estimated for without making any provision for a deficit of \$1,684,000, or for various other heavy expenses, which he left behind to be defrayed by his successors. Sir, no speech could well be more instructive than the speech which the hon. gentleman delivered in 1873, and I hope every member of the House, without distinction of party,

will make a point of acquainting himself with it, from the first page to the last. The speech we have listened to to-day is the fit supplement of that speech. Then, Sir, from first to last, there was an almost unvaried tone of over-confidence, in spite of every warning. Although the hon. gentleman was shown as clearly as figures could show him; although it was pointed out to him that the very facts on which he relied proved that those large importations, which we were told were to furnish us with an easy means of meeting our future liabilities, were rather a proof of extravagance than of real progress, our cautions were in vain. All through, he showed a complete lack of apprehension of the real state of the case. In some very important particulars, he suppressed important facts, with which he ought to have been acquainted, or with which he was acquainted, and which most assuredly ought to have been brought to the knowledge of the people of this country. To-day we see the reverse of the medal. Here the hon. gentleman is face to face with the results of his own folly. We have to-day an evasion of the responsibility which that hon. gentleman had incurred, and all through his speech there is running a kind of complaint, in a minor key, and, like the royal Dane, he exclaims:

“The world is out of joint;—oh, cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right!”

He tells us the situation has its difficulties. Sir, I do not, for one moment, dispute that. Probably there are few men in this country who are in a better position than I myself to know what the difficulties of that situation are. But, Sir, the difficulties of that situation are not peculiar to this Government. They are in no respect peculiar to this country, nor to the hon. gentleman himself. I doubt whether, all over this continent, he could find one single bank manager, one single head of a great railroad, one single merchant carrying on an important business, or, for that matter, one single man connected with any large industrial establishment, who would not have the same story to tell of difficulties brought about, either by their own act, or by unavoidable misfortunes. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman might, perhaps, deserve our pity, were it

not for two considerations, and, first of all, for the course he has taken to-night. Had he come forward and told us, as he might, perhaps, fairly have done, that if, in time past, he had erred, if he had miscalculated the resources of the country; if he had made statements which have not, in the slightest degree, been borne out by the results; that, after all, at that time, he had only reflected the errors of a considerable majority of his countrymen, as, I fear, he must admit he has faithfully reflected a considerable majority of them now—that he regretted his mistake, and desired to let by-gones be by-gones. Had he done so, he might have been entitled to our consideration. The second reason why I cannot admit that the hon. gentleman has any just cause to claim our sympathy is this: that, if there ever was an hon. gentleman who was suffering the direct consequences of his own imprudence, of his own folly, of his own wilful negligence of the commonest precautions which he ought to have used, it is that hon. gentleman himself. Sir, there are two totally different subjects which this House will require to consider on the present occasion. We are called upon to consider what are the causes of the present commercial difficulties with which a considerable portion of the people of this country are now contending, and we are also called upon to consider what are the causes of the financial embarrassments of the Dominion of Canada. Now, as respects the first of these, I have always admitted freely that they were attributable, in part, no doubt, to the fault of our people themselves, and, in part, to unavoidable misfortunes. The other, I have no hesitation in saying, was entirely due to causes of our own creating, notably to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and more especially to that of the present Minister of Finance. Sir, I do not wish unnecessarily to revive old discussions, but I do say this: that our present financial difficulties are due, more than any other cause, to the deliberate wrong-doing of men who sought, by a profligate expenditure of the public funds, to purchase immunity for the betrayal of a great public trust. Let us consider, for one moment, how our immediate financial difficulties, of which the hon. gentleman has spoken, were

were brought about. I will put aside, in dealing with this matter, for the present, the whole question of the scheme for constructing the Pacific Railway, because for that the hon. gentleman, although jointly responsible with his colleagues, is certainly not wholly responsible. At the time that was undertaken he was but a subordinate member of the Cabinet, and I should be loath to hold him completely responsible for the Pacific Railway, knowing, as I do, that he was unable even to control the route of that part of the Intercolonial road which traversed his own Province. What was our condition in 1873? Beyond all question, very considerable dangers awaited us, if the project to which we had been committed, before that hon. gentleman brought down his Budget, had been carried out. But, Sir, till that time, they were far from being irrecoverable. His fault was that he had so complicated matters in 1873 as to render it almost impossible, without great sacrifices on the part of the people, for the man who succeeded to the position of Finance Minister, to prevent our being placed in the position we find ourselves in to-night. What I chiefly blamed the hon. gentleman for was this: I blamed him for allowing himself to be induced, under the then circumstances, to assume the provincial debts, as he then did, to admit Prince Edward Island on the terms he did, and to consent to a large increase of salaries. Now, Sir, the House knows very well, from the hon. gentleman's statement, that we really require, at this moment, to raise barely the sum of \$2,000,000 per annum. If they will add together the three sums I have named, \$819,000 for the Provincial debts; \$400,000, which we paid over annually to Prince Edward Island, and \$300,000, the increase of salaries, they will see that an unnecessary expenditure of \$1,520,000 a year has been going on for the past six years. They will also see that I am exact in saying that this entire sum of \$2,000,000 a year, is justly due, if they add the interest on the nine millions thus uselessly spent to the original \$1,520,000, to those acts of that hon. gentleman of which he gave us no sort of notice when he brought down his original Budget in the early part of 1873.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

And let me tell my hon. friend that the \$2,000,000 a year would cover every deficit which has ever occurred since, and a great deal more than that. It would provide, at this moment, for everything which is really needed to enable us to carry on the affairs of Government; and I say further, that these expenditures, if not absolutely worse than useless, were, at least, mischievous to a very great degree. Moreover, if the hon. gentleman had computed accurately what the additional public works thus proposed involved, he would have found that, for interest alone, the annual addition to the expenditure would be something like \$5,000,000. The most just complaint against the hon. gentleman was: that, in the very last days of the Session of 1873, when, to my personal knowledge, at least one third of the members had left Ottawa for good, and when, as he knows right well (and perhaps, that was the reason he delayed his proposal so long), it was utterly impossible to obtain an adequate or proper discussion of measures of that magnitude. Now, Sir, but one word more before I proceed to the more immediate business of this discussion. How were all these things to be paid for? How did the hon. gentleman then propose to meet this enormous expenditure which he confessed he was about to impose upon the people of Canada? Did he talk, then, of diminishing our imports and fostering our national industries? Was the hon. gentleman then dismayed at the balance of trade against us? Why, Sir, in the very closing passage of his speech, he declares that it could not be imagined, for one moment, but that our importations would go on increasing, and that the profits of these increased importations and the revenue so derived would enable us to meet our expenditure, while as for the adverse balance of trade, he hardly thought it worth while to expend more than a few sentences on the fact. What was the adverse balance of trade at that moment? The hon. gentleman has called attention to the fact that there has been for many years a serious adverse balance of trade against the Dominion of Canada. What was that balance in 1873? In that year, we imported \$128,000,000 worth of goods, against an export of \$89,000,000, so that there was, under the administration of this hon. gentleman himself, an adverse

balance of trade (if that be a matter of grave moment,) of \$38,221,259. If this question of the balance of trade be the question which is to measure the rule of merit of the two Governments, if it be, as he says, a matter of great moment to readjust this adverse balance of trade, I find that in the last year, during which I had the honour to be Finance Minister, our total importations were £93,000,000 as against \$79,323,000 exports, so that our adverse balance of trade then \$13,658,000, compared with \$38,221,000 in 1873. I do not pretend to say that that adverse balance by any means represents real loss to the country. I have never taken the ground that, on adverse balance of trade could be *per se* said to represent either the loss or the profit the country made in the transaction. It may show that we are driving a profitable trade, or that we are straining our resources to the utmost, and that our people are blindly pursuing a course of extravagance which threatens grave mischief to the whole country. But I call attention to the fact that, at that very moment, when the balance of trade was heavier against Canada than ever before, the hon. gentleman could tell us that we need not distress ourselves about this, and could look forward to a means of meeting those large engagements in the large increased volume of trade which he declared must eventually take place. I forbear to speak at present of the utterly unprovided-for engagements which that hon. gentleman left behind. Suffice to say now that, the very first step which I took when becoming Finance Minister was to ascertain what were the engagements which Canada would require to defray, in order to do all that the hon. gentleman had pledged to do, and without charging more than the \$30,000,000 which he, himself, assumed to be the total cost of the Pacific Railway; I found that, instead of \$60,000,000 being required to meet our engagements, we would require to provide \$96,000,000. With these facts staring us in the face, with the knowledge how inaccurately the hon. gentleman's calculations came out, I ask this House and I ask the country what grounds have we for believing that the hon. gentleman will be more accurate in his

calculations now than in 1873. What grounds have we for blindly trusting ourselves under his guidance to such a leap in the dark as was never before proposed to any people. The hon. gentleman has rather insinuated than actually made divers charges against myself and the Government of which I was a member. I will defer until such time as I can deal with the various items of the Estimates the discussion of some of the points he has brought up. But, at the same time, I will point out certain broad facts which appear in the public records, and in that very volume of accounts which he brought down the other day. I will leave it to all fair-minded, intelligent men in this House or out of it, to say on what ground he can fairly charge the late Government with extravagance or mismanagement, so far, at any rate, as the financial side of the question is concerned. Why, to listen to the hon. gentleman and his friends, we are compelled to assume that, whereas it was an act of great wisdom on their part to add \$9,700,000 per annum to the annual expenditure of Canada in seven years (throwing off the difference for Sinking Fund), and an act of still greater wisdom to go out of office leaving engagements wholly unprovided for, involving an addition to our national debt of \$96,000,000, and without having provided for six or seven millions of dollars per annum, to meet the interest on that debt, and divers other expenditures which could not be avoided. That, moreover, whereas they had so timed their arrangements that it would be necessary to negotiate great loans for the carrying out these great public works at the precise moment when large sums of existing indebtedness were about to mature in the English market, we are to be deemed guilty of extravagance, because, at the expiration of four years, during which a vast number of new charges had been thrown upon us, and during which the population had increased considerably, we have only been able to reduce the gross expenditure of Canada, allowing for the additional Sinking Fund, by about \$250,000, as anyone will see who will compare the expenditure of 1873 for \$23,316,000, with the expenditure of the last year, according to the Public Accounts, and simply deduct, as I

have a right to ask them to do, the difference of the funds paid on account of the Sinking Fund for these four years; while, if they refer to the ordinary expenditure, they will find that we were able to show a reduction of \$1,600,000, and that the \$96,000,000 of liabilities which they left behind them have, for all practical purposes, been reduced to \$16,000,000, while, in place of a huge mass of liabilities, ranging from \$6,000,000 to \$7,000,000 per annum, the total amount which needs to be added during the next five years to our annual expenditure should not exceed half a million dollars, irrespective of the sums to be added for the Sinking Fund. The hon. gentleman did not exactly charge the late Government with having been the cause of the depression which unfortunately exists, but he more than insinuated that we were blameworthy because we did not succeed in removing that depression. When he looks abroad and considers the unfortunate position of other countries; when he considers the unfortunate position of England, the country of all countries, which possesses at this moment the greatest amount of accumulated wealth, the most unrivalled advantages of commercial position; which draws, as he himself said, tribute from almost every nation of the earth; if he would look at the position of the United States, which is not, as he gave the House to understand, by any means in a prosperous condition—I wish it were, because I believe that the return of prosperity to the United States would be the best guarantee for the return of prosperity to Canada, but, I am sorry to say, that, in spite of the United States having shaken loose from particular errors and blunders which they committed under the pressure of their civil war, and though they have got rid of that mischievous delusion, their paper currency, and there are signs of a return to prosperity, no man who is in a position to judge of the state of affairs will say that the United States at this moment can, by any stretch of rhetoric, be described as being in a prosperous condition—he would find a better explanation of the true reasons of the depression in this country. Sir, I might ask the hon. gentleman to point to any civilised nation, at this moment, which can be said to be, in a [commer-

cial sense, in a prosperous condition, and the only point on which I can, perhaps, agree with the hon. gentleman was his admission that he believed that the people of Canada had really suffered less than any other country. Now, when we are charged with being responsible for the depression in this country, I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to what that charge really involves. If we are responsible for the depression that exists in Canada, it necessarily follows that we are responsible for the depression in the United States, which has been so great a factor in annihilating a very large branch of our trade and grievously crippling the rest. It would follow that we are responsible for the low rates of freight all over the world, which have resulted in great injury to the shipping trade and great loss, not only to shipowners, but to the large number of seamen employed by them. It would follow that we are responsible for the shrinkage in values to which the hon. gentleman very correctly called the attention of the House; that we are responsible for the universal fall of wages, not only on this continent but over the world, and, by consequence, for the rise in the value of gold. And this is a point to which I would call the hon. gentleman's attention, because, as I shall show him, it bears to a very great extent on the correctness of his argument in favour of substituting a specific for an *ad valorem* duty. Gold, which was a few years ago falling in value, has begun of late considerably to rise in value. To those whose indebtedness is not large, any alteration in the standard of value is a matter of small importance; but, to a people in the position in which Canada finds itself, with two-thirds of the total income practically pledged to the payment of interest on debts, subsidies, and such obligations as our treaty engagements with the Indians, a rise or fall in the value of gold is a consideration of the first importance—one to be seriously considered by the hon. gentleman and by all who desire to comprehend, with some degree of distinctness and accuracy, what are the conditions of the problem with which he has undertaken to deal. I desire to correct one or two errors

which the hon. gentleman has committed, as to the position in which this country now stands. I admit that it requires the exercise of energy and caution, but I do not admit that it is one which would justify any man in adopting a desponding tone with respect to the ability of Canada to discharge every legitimate engagement, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the late Government were fully prepared to deal with that question, although, in raising the requisite amount of revenue, we undoubtedly would have advocated a policy of so obtaining that revenue as not, in any respect, to add unnecessarily to the burthens of the people; not to take one penny more out of their pockets than was absolutely necessary to fill the Treasury of the Dominion. But, I may add, we were not prepared to injure any part of the community by the imposition of unjust taxes, and, moreover, we had laid it down as a cardinal maxim of policy that it was our duty, under existing circumstances, not to impose any taxes but such as could easily be removed and removed with the minimum of disturbance to all those numerous interests which are, of necessity, affected by any change of a material character in the tariff of the country. Sir, what we declined to do was this: to falsely arrogate to ourselves the power which Omnipotence may possess, but which Omnipotence, at any rate, has never chosen to exercise—the power, by artificial legislation, of relieving men from the consequence of their own blunders and their own folly. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman called our attention to the Estimates he has brought down. I desire to say a few words with regard to them before proceeding to the consideration of some other questions; and I warn the hon. gentleman, speaking from my own experience, that he will find it a vast deal easier to cut down those Estimates than to limit the expenditure under them. It may be possible, apparently, to reduce your Estimates, for a certain time, by allowing important public works to run into disrepair, and by ceasing to provide efficiently for the maintenance of certain services; but, almost invariably, wherever that is done, you find it necessary, at no distant day, to increase three or

four-fold the expenditure for the purpose of making good such imaginary saving. Looking at the statement which the hon. gentleman has submitted to us, I perceive that he brings down a total estimate of \$23,427,000. Now, Sir, I would be ready to say that the hon. gentleman has prepared those estimates with reasonable economy, did I know—what I am afraid we shall not know till this House is about to be prorogued—what Supplementary Estimates the hon. gentleman will find necessary to bring down for the service of 1879-80. I observe that the Estimates he has brought down are \$23,427,000, as against \$23,440,000, which were the original Estimates brought down by myself in the Session of the preceding year. It may be that he will be more fortunate than I was—that he may be able to resist the demands of his numerous friends for various little additions to the Estimates in various places. I promise him before hand that I will give him my best assistance in any endeavour to defeat all such attempts to add to the Estimates, more particularly if they are made by the gentlemen from Halifax, who gave me so much trouble last year, and who succeeded, greatly to my disgust, in compelling me to insert one or two items like the service from Halifax to Cork, which considerably increased the total, and I congratulate the hon. the Finance Minister on having had the courage to eliminate them from the existing Estimates. But, Sir, at present I desire to deal more particularly with the considerable Supplementary Estimates, which the hon. gentleman says it will be his duty to bring down for the current year, and will, which he says, swell the Estimates to the sum of \$24,000,000. With regard to the comparatively small estimates for the Dominion Lands and Post-Office, I have nothing to say at present; doubtless, when we come to discuss these, full information will be given as to his reasons for such additions. But fully one-half of the total amount is demanded by the Minister of Public Works, who asks \$187,000 to be added to the sum required for collections on the Public Works during the current year. Now, Sir, I am not in a position to say how far this may be a just demand. It may be possible that new traffic

has been developed, as was the case last year, which renders it fair that this sum should be asked for. But, if what has come to our ears be true, as to the failure of discipline on that road, in consequence of the dismissal of the very able man in charge of it a few months ago, I am afraid we must put down a great part of this \$187,000, as the price the country has to pay for the loss of Mr. Bridges as Superintendent of that road; and I am afraid, from my knowledge of the great ability of that gentleman, that this sum is only an instalment of the price that will have to be paid for gratifying the malice of his political opponents. The item of \$116,000 for Public Works is, as the hon. gentleman admitted, more than neutralised by the saving of \$163,000, for which he proposes to take re-votes. If my memory is correct, the entire sum of \$75,000, charged for redemption of debt, is due to a certain arrangement, made either by New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, with the Messrs. Baring, when they originally contracted the debt. Now, although I have no particular objection to the hon. gentleman making this a charge against the ordinary expenses of management, I would suggest to him that it might be worth his while to consider whether, as this was, to all intents and purposes, part of the original commission paid for the contraction of that debt, he would not be justified, in the case of last and the present year, in placing that as a charge on capital account. Of course, it was an engagement with which I had nothing to do, and which I suppose the hon. gentleman has satisfied himself, must be carried out under the terms of the agreement, or originally made with the agents. But it is, notwithstanding, one of those rather dubious items, which, in my own opinion, might not unfairly be charged to capital account. With regard to the saving the hon. gentleman has made, it appears to me that it does not require any great administrative ability on the part of the Minister of Public Works, to save \$200,000 in the annual expenditure, from the simple fact, that we have completed the replacement of iron by steel rails on the Intercolonial Railway, and this saving on the Public Works appears to arise

simply from the fact that these renewals are closed. Nor is it evidence of great administrative ability that we are not to have a general election this year, which is, perhaps, all the better after the tariff we have heard read to-night. Surely, the hon. gentleman does not mean to say that, because the railway is completed, because we have no general election and no expenses for the Paris Exhibition to provide for, the saving so effected show that they are entitled to any particular credit. I see no evidence of administrative ability in regard to any of the items, and, although I perceive in some cases, as in the contingent expenses of the Departments, he has made an attempt, which I hope will be successful, to keep the expenditures within just limits; yet, if the information we have had of the doings within this very Chamber, be correct, I am afraid the good acts of the hon. gentleman are likely to come very far short of his intentions. Then, there are divers matters in the background to which the hon. the Finance Minister has not alluded, which may materially affect the real position of this country as regards our expenditure for 1879 and 1880. But the other day the hon. the First Minister took through the House a Bill which enables him to add 200 men to the Mounted Police, by which a possible expenditure of from \$150,000 to \$200,000 a year may be inflicted on the country. We know, also, that negotiations are going on for the acquisition by hon. gentlemen opposite of the River du Loup branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, of which we heard nothing in the hon. gentleman's speech, but which, if carried out, may involve a great addition to our expenditure. Those Supplementary Estimates we are, of course, not entitled to attack till they are brought down; but there is one remarkable item to which the hon. gentleman made no allusion—that is the item of \$10,000,000 for new public works chargeable to capital. I see no provision in the Estimates for the contraction of a new loan, and I think it more than probable, unless he is determined to suspend all our great public works, that a very considerable addition will have to be made to the taxes to meet the interest on the new loan which he may find himself obliged to contract in London, or

elsewhere, in the course of a few months. And, Sir, this brings me to the loan which the hon. Finance Minister lately contracted in England. Now, I am bound to say that he did not, as his partisans have done, claim that that loan was a good one. He did not venture to tell the House that he had been successful in the operation. He expressly left it to me to defend his loan, a responsibility which I am not inclined to accept unreservedly or without very considerable explanations on my part. Unfortunately there can be no doubt, whatever, that the loan cost the people of Canada very considerably more than any of the three previous loans contracted by myself. I am quite prepared to admit that hon. gentleman went to London at a time when it was not very easy to float any ordinary loan on favourable terms; but I am not at all prepared to admit that the hon. gentleman took the best means of floating his loan; on the contrary, I say that the hon. gentleman, when he went to London, found himself most grievously hampered, in consequence of the very injudicious policy he had adopted, following in the wake of his colleagues with regard to the financial agents of the Dominion, and with regard to the best means of floating loans on the London market. Now, Sir, before I go further, I desire to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance to a return which was lately laid on the table of the House. In that return it is stated that the Department of Finance have no information as to whether the agents of the Dominion or the Bank of Montreal took any portion of the loan which was negotiated in London on the 9th of December last; and I ask the Minister of Finance whether he is prepared to state here, in his place, whether the agents bought or took any portion of that loan.

MR. TILLEY: In answer to the inquiry of the hon. gentleman, I may say that I heard, from a director of the Bank of Montreal, that they had taken a portion. I do not know whether the agents took any.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Then, I must say, that the hon. gentleman ought to have known; and I may remind the

House that I have never refused information as to whether any part of the loans floated in London were taken by the financial agents, though I was not able to give the names of ordinary subscribers. With respect to the rate which was obtained for this loan, I have a few words to say. The hon. gentleman offered a loan of three millions in London, one-half on the Imperial guarantee, and one-half in our own credit, which he succeeded in disposing of at £96 11s. From that sum were to be deducted allowances to a very considerable amount, leaving the net proceeds of that loan about 95½. Therefore, that hon. gentleman received, in round numbers, £2,860,000. From that should be deducted the sum of £1,537,500—being, at 1.04½, the amount which was received for the Imperial four per cent. guaranteed loan. The result, therefore, of this operation is that we have netted for £1,500,000 of our Canadian four per cent. bonds, the magnificent sum of £1,290,000, or about £86—between three and four per cent. less than the rate obtained in previous transactions. Now, Sir, I am not going to compare that loan with the loan effected by his predecessor, Sir John Rose. The latter obtained for Imperial four per cents., 110, and for our 5 per cents., 90 being the highest retail quotation. But, Sir, what I would call attention to is this: When, under circumstances of a somewhat difficult character, I effected a loan at the nominal price of 91—really at about 90—I very well recollect I was severely criticised by the hon. gentlemen opposite, because I failed to obtain the highest rate of retail quotations then rating in the London market. My action on that occasion was compared with the action of the agents of the Australian Colonies, and great indignation was expressed because we did not obtain as high a price for our securities as several Australian Colonies did for theirs. Well, Sir, about the 1st December last the Australian Colonies were selling their four per cents. actual business done, at something like 99¾.

MR. TILLEY: What were they quoted at in January?

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am quoting from the *Economist* of the 30th November and 7th December, and if the hon. gentleman desires, as I happen to have the *Economist* here, I will be happy to allow him to inspect the quotation. I will give actual business done. I find, Sir, that on the 30th November the New South Wales four per cents. were sold, last business done, at 99¾, and I find that on the same day our Canadian four per cents. were sold, last business done, at 92¼ ex-dividend. Now, I am not disposed to deal very hardly with the hon. gentleman in this matter. I admit that he is perfectly correct in saying that he went to London at a time which was unfavourable for the loan, but what I desire to call attention to—and I do not do this so much with a view to censure him, as with the view, if possible, of inducing him to emancipate himself from the trammels cast about him by the action of his colleagues—the danger of confining himself to any particular mode of floating a loan. I must say that the hon. gentleman, or his advisers, committed a grave error of judgment in attempting to float a loan at a time when the market was unfavourable for such operations in the manner he did. He ought to have taken every precaution to secure success, and if he had done so, Canada would not have been subject to the humiliation of seeing half of her loan, and that, too, a loan of which bore the important guarantee, fail to be subscribed for on the London Stock Exchange. I may take another occasion for discussing this question in some detail, but the hon. gentleman more than insinuated that I was responsible for the fact that he was not able to introduce this loan at an earlier date. As the charge has been made against me on several occasions, I take this opportunity of asking him to point out to this House when he would have desired to make that loan? Does he pretend to say that I was bound, in May or June, just six months before the money was required, to go to London and effect a loan? Why, Sir, if I had done so, and had a part of that money been brought to Canada and distributed among Canadian financial institutions, just prior to a general election, every hon. gentleman knows that every hustings would have rung with

accusations of the foulest corruption against the Minister of Finance. It would have been alleged, from one end of Canada to the other, that we were about to bribe the electors, and I would have been censured then, as indeed I was censured before, for borrowing money far in advance of my real wants, and that, too, when, as these worthy gentlemen would not have failed to point out, I had not only the fishery award, but \$11,000,000 of guaranteed loan to fall back on in any event. Or, if the hon. gentleman gives up the idea of making a loan in June, would he have wished me to have effected a loan after the 17th September? Would he not have declared, and justly too, that I had no right, especially after the opinions the hon. gentleman's colleagues had expressed on the floor of this House, to interfere further in the matter? I am aware, Sir, it is the unfortunate necessity of our political system—it is one of those things which necessarily occur when any violent interruption takes place in the political world; that many delicate negotiations like those, at that time in progress, for a new loan, must be interrupted, and, I may add that I regretted at the time that it was not in my power, as I would gladly have done, if circumstances had allowed it, to carry out those negotiations; but every one who remembers the line of criticism adopted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, with respect to the steps taken by me in floating former loans, will at once perceive that they had made it utterly impossible either for me to offer my services, or for themselves to accept any proposal of the kind. There is one point to which I desire to call the particular attention of the hon. gentleman. I do not know whether he was aware, although, if my memory serves me, I had communicated my intention to their agents and to Sir John Rose, that I was determined to make the most strenuous efforts to get rid of the necessity of increasing the sinking fund. I am not going to attack the hon. gentleman, under the circumstances, for not having done so, but I would call his attention to the fact that, at the present moment, the sinking fund of the Dominion of Canada is by far the largest which any nation possesses. Our sinking fund is, or will very soon

be, \$1,200,000 per annum, or something like five per cent. on the average income that the hon. gentleman expects to receive. That is out of all proportion too large. It is clear to everybody that a sinking fund of \$1,200,000, increasing at the rate of \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year, is one altogether larger than Canada, or any other country in its position, can really require. When next the hon. gentleman has occasion to go to London, I trust he will take the opportunity of releasing us from the necessity of paying any additional sinking fund on new loans. The necessity, or, at any rate, the extreme desirability of this is obvious. \$1,200,000, if continued for thirty-five years, would enable us to redeem \$118,000,000 of our existing liabilities. Under these circumstances, if properly explained to English capitalists, I think he would have no difficulty in getting rid of the necessity of paying any more sinking fund. Before leaving the matter, I must add that, though I do not at all desire to understate the difficulty which must always exist in floating a loan in London at such a time as that referred to, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that loans bearing Imperial guarantees are always most eagerly sought after in the London market at the moment when ordinary securities are most in disfavour, and that, by a judicious use of that circumstance, the hon. gentleman might have done much better than he did. Sir, at the very moment when the hon. gentleman was effecting his loan, I find that Imperial three per cents. stood at 96, and I venture to say that, when they stood at 96, there ought to be no difficulty whatever in obtaining 105, or thereabouts, for Imperial 4 per cent. guaranteed loans. And now to come to a question of vastly more importance, as involving the whole future of the Dominion of Canada, than any question of a few per cent. more or less, in the floating of a Canadian loan. Sir, we have had, to-night, expounded to us the long sought for National Policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite; and when I heard that policy, I felt that in one respect, at any rate, the hon. gentleman had fully explained the cause of his delay. I can well understand that as the thing grew on his vision from time

to time—as he began to realise the full enormity and iniquity of the project—I can very well understand that the hon. gentleman, like Frankenstein, was appalled at the spectre he had invoked. I doubt if there was ever brought down in any civilised country—unless in the United States, where, as is known, they dispense with any responsible parent for a scheme of the kind—I doubt if there was ever brought down a scheme so complicated, so intricate, a scheme which the hon. gentleman will find it so difficult to work out practically, and of the actual results of which he, himself, admits he is quite unable, at this moment, to make any accurate estimate. My objection to this scheme goes deep. I object to it, not merely on the ground of the increase of taxes it involves, or of its complicated details, but on a much higher ground than that. I deny entirely the justice of the course which the majority of the House appear, I fear, determined to follow. I admit their power, but I deny their right. I say that the principle which I have heard enunciated by the hon. the Minister of Finance—the principle that it is the duty of the Government to enable certain sections of the community to tax the rest of the people for their private gain—is of all others the principle which a free people should least submit themselves to. I say that it is the very essence of all injustice. I say that they could not be fair in the application of such a principle no matter how earnestly they might try. And I tell the hon. gentleman that when he says that, by any readjustment of the tariff, it is possible for him, or for any Government, that ever existed, to protect, by additional taxes, men who find the market for their productions in other countries, he commits himself to a palpable absurdity. I tell him that, if he wishes to protect the great interests of the country, if he desires to protect the lumbermen in the extreme prostration of their business, if he desires to do justice to the fishermen, to the shipping interests, to the great carrying interests of the country, or even to the agriculturists, to whom he has given a sham protection in this tariff, if he does honestly desire this, there is but one expedient for him to take, and that is the old and well-known expedient—not of

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

giving a miserable drawback on manufactured articles, but of giving a direct bounty on the articles produced by these classes. If you desire to be honest, if you desire to do justice to the classes I have named, there is but this way of doing it, and, if you plead that this is an impossibility, that nothing you can do will enable you really to recoup to these men what you are now taking out of their pockets by your present tariff,—then, I say, that that statement may be true enough, but that had you made the attempt we could at least have admitted that, great as was your folly, you were, at any rate, honest in your folly, and not guilty of deliberately deceiving those who placed you where you are. These are the classes whom, of all others, a statesman should desire to protect, and I repeat, there is but one way for you to do it. Estimate if you can—I admit it will be a task of a great deal of difficulty—how much you are going to enhance the cost of production of these men's products, by this tariff you have brought down, and then pay these men a proportionate bounty on the articles they produce. This special legislation, such as we have now got to deal with, is inconceivably bad. It is the very thing which every free country has always fought against. I say that you are committing a gross retrogression, you are going back for centuries, although I admit that the hon. gentlemen opposite—some of them—are the very men for their work, and that it will be nothing strange for them to convert their dupes into their serfs. But, when the people come to understand what is now being proposed, the chances of my hon. friend ever succeeding in regaining his place in this House is, if I know anything of the temper of his constituents, problematical to the last degree.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about your own constituency?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am afraid I paid too much attention to other people's constituencies. I fear there is no doubt that if I had devoted myself to my own old constituency for three or four weeks immediately preceding the election, I would not have had the honour of representing the noble riding which I now

represent, but which, I may say, for the information of the hon. gentleman, I entered an utter stranger, hardly knowing a single soul therein, on the 14th October, and left it in eighteen days their representative, by a majority of four hundred votes. I tell the hon. gentleman that this policy of his, dangerous under any circumstances, is likely to be most peculiarly dangerous in our case. Were we an isolated community, like Australia, were we separated by five or six thousand miles of sea from any neighbouring country, then I could understand that such an experiment might be safely played out without risk of violent interference. But what is our position? Every man here knows that Canada is a country which we have found great difficulty in consolidating. Every man knows that, from one end of Canada to the other, there are many discordant elements; that we comprise within our borders large classes who differ in race, differ in religion, differ in language, differ in almost every way in which civilised men can differ from each other. You know that there are numerous conflicting interests, that there are great geographical difficulties to be overcome, that our Eastern Provinces are separated from our central ones by a large track of uninhabitable country, and that, when you go westward again, you have a very long stretch of similar country, which, for many years, cannot be bridged over by a railway, and that we are dependent for the means of keeping up communication with the North-West, at least for one half of the year, on the privilege of passing through a foreign country. And, under all these circumstances, knowing full well that our political position is, at the present moment, of a most precarious character, you are entering on a policy which seems purposely contrived to exasperate all these difficulties, and to split our new Confederation into a thousand pieces. Do not let any man imagine that only mere pecuniary results are involved in this tariff. These may be affected to a great degree, but I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that vastly more important results are involved here. If this country has come to that pass that it requires to be governed by a system of paternal rule, then, I say,—and if I could

get at the real sentiments of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, they would agree with me in that,—then, I say, that this country is not fit for a Federal system. I say that our whole system is on trial, if you choose to put this tariff into force. I know that, in time past, a great deal of the clamour which arose against the late Government arose really from ignorance; arose from the people not having been trained—yes, from ignorance in the House and out of the House. I say, a great deal of it arose from this fact, that our people were untrained, unaccustomed to a Federal system; that they did not know how to separate responsibilities attaching to the local Governments and to municipalities from those attaching to the Dominion of Canada. And, I say, it was largely from overlooking these facts, that a great deal of unjust clamour arose against us because we were unable to produce prosperity which, for our own sakes, if for no higher considerations, we must have been most earnestly desirous to secure. I must remind the hon. gentleman of the manner in which he and his colleagues obtained power. I am willing to admit that, though they have certainly not redeemed all their pledges, although they could not, by any possibility, redeem them all, I am willing to admit that they have gone great lengths in particular directions. But all who paid any attention to or took any part in the political discussions of the last few months, will remember the magnificent professions that were made on the part of the hon. gentlemen and their followers. We were told that, if they could get back to power immediate confidence would be restored, the price of stocks would go up, the price of grain would rise, factories were to be established in every village, the United States were to be terrified into submission, and, failing that, we were to have reciprocity of trade or reciprocity of tariffs. Sometimes a presumptuous mortal dared to ask how all these good things were to be paid for, and suggestions were made that if, as the hon. gentleman proposed to do, you put prohibitive tariffs on all goods which could be manufactured in Canada, and did not increase the tax on the goods that cannot be manufactured here, there would be serious

difficulties in the matter of the revenue. Why, I think the hon. the First Minister suggested that, under the prosperity he was to introduce, every working man would have as much brandy as he pleased, and every working man's wife would have as many silk dresses as she liked, and in that way the funds would be provided for carrying on the Government of the country; that I suppose being the hon. gentleman's reading of the good old Roman maxim for the government of the multitude, "*Panem et circenses.*" These, we were told, would be the visible fruits, the first results of the change of Government and of the introduction of the National Policy. I need not tell the House that stocks, so far from going up, have gone on shrinking until they are now something like 30 or 40 below what they were on the 17th of September. The prices of grain have fallen, our cattle are threatened with pleuro-pneumonia, and the United States obstinately decline to be frightened at any price. It is true we have had one gain, we have realised a plenteous crop of official assignees, being perhaps the only act of the hon. gentleman which indicates a realising sense of the probable ultimate fruits of this policy. What are the demands of the country? Their demands, as I understand them, are two-fold. First, the people require, as they have a right to require, that the hon. gentlemen shall provide the ways and means for discharging those engagements into which they formerly entangled the country, contrary to our protest, contrary to our warning, contrary to all experience, and contrary to every indication which they ought to have gathered from the signs of the times. The second is, that the Government must give us the prosperity which they promised, and which they pledged themselves should be restored to us as soon as they got back to power. How do these hon. gentlemen propose to do it? As I understand the case, before you can expect to remove a disease it is necessary, to some extent, to understand the causes which produced the malady of which you complain. Now, so far as I can judge, the chief economic blunders which Canada is suffering from may be briefly summed up as these: Unfortunately, in Canada, in common with al-

most every English-speaking country, our people have been guilty (there is no use in denying it) of much extravagant speculation and of the folly of locking up a great amount of capital they could very ill spare in unproductive works of all kinds, both public and private. Any man who chooses to look at the Returns of Trade and Navigation for the last few years, and particularly for the years from 1870-74, during which we had an adverse balance of \$108,000,000 against us, will see that there assuredly was extravagant speculation, that there was a great deal of undue importation on the part of the people of this country. That, Sir, was one cause, and a very material cause, of the distress of which the hon. gentleman complains. There is another cause, springing no doubt, in part, from honourable motives, but which has had a very material effect in injuring the prosperity of the people of Canada, and that is the unfortunate aversion of many of our people to the honourable employment of agriculture, or, indeed, to manual labour of any sort. We know that all through North America, in Canada as well as in the United States, a vast number of men who might be usefully employed as farmers have crowded into our towns and cities much to their own injury, and to the injury of their competitors in business, and thereby they have induced, to a considerable extent, an overgrowth of our towns, which has resulted disastrously to the best interests of our country. As to the first point, I do not believe that there is a single manager of a large bank, or wholesale house in Canada, who would not admit candidly, if any hon. gentleman chose to put the question, that for many years together there was both an excessive over importation, and an excessive stimulus to all kinds of unproductive expenditure going on in this country. It is a matter of common notoriety that it has been for a long time a rare thing to find a business man in Canada who would content himself with attending to his own legitimate occupation, and who was not more or less engaged in speculations alien thereto. There are very few localities, at any rate, in my own Province, where there has not been a great amount of unproductive expendi-

ture, a great desire to plunge into enterprises from which no return could reasonably be expected in a very long period. While, as to the notorious aversion of many of our people to manual labour, if any one looks at the Census Returns for 1871, he will see this remarkable fact staring him in the face: that, out of 700,000 able-bodied men there were at that time about 75,000, or more than 10 per cent., apparently engaged in wholly unproductive occupations, such as those of lawyers and doctors—if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) will allow me to include them in that class—or put down as engaged in commercial occupations, or as tradesmen of various classes, and that precisely the same thing has occurred in the United States. I know that many hon. gentlemen have chosen to deliberately pervert my words as to the overgrowth of towns and cities, and I beg expressly to declare that no man is or can be more anxious to promote the legitimate increase of our towns than myself; but I say, that when you consider that the census of 1871 shows that out of a population of about 3,400,000, about 800,000 were collected in towns and cities in the Dominion of Canada, you will see that we possessed our full proportion of urban population. We know that that population has increased to a considerable extent in the years which have elapsed since then; and the hon. gentleman can do this country no greater disservice than to adopt a policy which would prevent our people from engaging in agriculture, and would encourage them to betake themselves in the future, as well as in the past, to towns and cities. If hon. gentlemen must legislate, if hon. gentlemen are determined to interfere in every trade, business and avocation of life, if they will go back to the middle ages for a policy, I advise them, at least, to be consistent. If our forefathers, in their wisdom or unwisdom, determined to shut out foreign competition, they, likewise, determined to regulate domestic competition; and I recommend the Minister of Finance, if the Government are determined to keep the people prosperous in despite of themselves, to take a leaf from that early legislation. I advise him to regulate the domestic competition, from which many of our people suffer so much. I do not

think it would do much more harm if he were to regulate the number of those legal worthies who are licensed to set Her Majesty's subjects by the ears, or who are licensed to kill them *secundum artem*, or of tradesmen to adulterate cheap goods. There is not one whit more mischief, or one whit more tyrannical interference, in such a step than in the present policy of the Government, and, for the matter of that, I rather think that the Minister of Public Works used to preside over a body of gentlemen who had strong views as to confining the right of killing Her Majesty's subjects to duly licensed practitioners. Sir, when I consider the magnitude of the issues involved, and the general scope of the policy which the Minister of Finance now proposes, which is, practically, a revolution, I must say that I think the hon. gentleman fails altogether to recognise the great gravity of the situation. Has he thought out at all the effects likely to be produced by this interference with every class of business in Canada. Has he considered the effect that will be produced on our revenue. Has he considered the stimulus which he will undoubtedly give to smuggling?—of which our custom officials could give too many proofs, if they confessed all they knew of our own dealings with the United States in times past? Has he considered how it will affect the great interests I have indicated? How it will affect our political relations—a matter that will require his most careful consideration and that of his colleagues in the Government. How it will affect and alter the whole distribution of wealth in this country. If he has really thought out all this, I must repeat he gave very little evidence in his address that he had fairly considered how vast an alteration, how great a revolution, and how tremendous a change he proposed thus suddenly to introduce in the whole business relations of the country. As for the tariff itself, though I paid all the attention to it I possibly could, I can only now speak in very general terms. I regret that the hon. gentleman did not find it convenient to have it printed and placed in our hands, although, I suppose, if as he says, changes were being made in it from time to time, even up to the very last hour, he may have considered it inexpedient to trust it

in the hands of the printers too long in advance. Sir, in times gone by, in the early part of the present century, the Government of the United States saw fit to introduce a tariff somewhat similar to this. That tariff is familiar to students of American history, as the "tariff of abominations;" and it has been admitted by competent judges to have been one of the main causes which alienated the North from the South, and to have been largely instrumental in producing the great civil war from which that country suffered so much. I do not know that this rises to the dignity of the American tariff I have named, but the Canadian student may, perhaps, fairly describe it as a "tariff of corners." There is scarcely one single proposal in which men accustomed to deal with such questions, will fail to see concessions to some particular clique, to some particular interest, to some prominent political partisan, or to some particular class whom it is desirable, for political reasons, to conciliate. How or in what manner that tariff has been evolved from the mind of the presiding genius, it might be impertinent in me to speculate. You have admissions here, concessions there, and injustice everywhere. The hon. gentleman appears, in framing the tariff, according to his own confession, to have adopted a plan somewhat similar, to what Carlyle declares to be the impossible problem, namely, out of the united action of a community of dishonest men to evolve an honest policy. I should say that the principle predominant in the mind of the hon. gentleman has been: Get political influence—revenue if you can, but political influence anyhow." The hon. gentleman talks of his good intentions. He tells us, and I do not doubt it, that he is sincerely desirous of promoting the welfare of his country by the proposals he has made. Well, Sir, I am here to judge of his acts not of his motives. The hon. gentleman's intentions may be good; they may be as excellent, indeed, as if he had taken a contract to pave the whole of the broad path, which, I am afraid, will lead to our political and financial perdition at his sole charge; but that will not relieve us from the consequences. This tariff, so far as we know it—and he says we only know a part of it yet—ap-

pears to me to be the most extraordinary conglomeration ever put together. I think the hon. gentleman will find it a matter of the extremest difficulty to provide himself with the experts, who alone can put this tariff into operation; and I fear that the additional sum demanded for Customs will be all too small to enable him to carry his intentions into effect. It reminds me of nothing so much as the contents of the witches' cauldron in Macbeth:—

"Eye of newt, and toe of frog,
Wool of bat, and toe of dog,
Adder's fork, and blind worm's stung,
Lizard's leg, and owlet's wing:—
For a charm of powerful trouble,
Like a hell-broth, boil and bubble,"

with the hon. gentleman as the first witch, to keep the cauldron stirring, and the father of all unjust tariffs looking on, well pleased, in the not remote background. If there is any class of our community who may expect to derive benefit from this tariff, doubtless it is the manufacturers of Canada. Now, of what do they complain? What is the cause of this depression? Why is it they assert that they are unprosperous at present, and find a difficulty in making both ends meet? That alleged cause, as he well knows, is the unfair competition to which, they assert, they are exposed, and against which, they say, an average tariff of seventeen and a half per cent. is no adequate protection. I tell these gentlemen that this tariff is going to afflict them with competition to a far worse degree than anything they have now; that they will find that this kind of tariff, as it has done in the United States, will infallibly produce the most vehement domestic competition, and a competition as much worse in its results for them as a civil war is sure to be worse than a foreign war. If they knew their true interest—and here I would observe that I am speaking of those only who propose to go on manufacturing—because there are two classes of manufacturers concerned. There are first, the sagacious men, who know that, being on the ground, and having secured a good start, they can, under just such a tariff, retire after a very short time, with a fortune, and with these I have little to do. There is also a class of men who desire to make a living by

manufacturing, and who are likely to go on manufacturing, whom we do not sufficiently consider. Those men, whether they know it or not, are signing their death warrant when they consent to a tariff which must assuredly create here, as it did in the United States, a most intense home competition, in place of a very moderate foreign competition. Now, Sir, practically speaking, what you do by this tariff, is to discourage by law, in the case of manufacturers, self-reliance, ability, invention and superior industry. You encourage them to think that the one thing needful to secure in a manufacturing business, is to secure, rightly or wrongly, political influence. I know, to their honour be it said, that there are many manufacturers throughout Canada, who acted honestly and honourably throughout the late election, and who, though they may have believed that their own individual interests would be served by deserting their party principles, still held fast to these principles through good report and evil report. But I know, also, there were many other manufacturers who offered themselves for sale as shamelessly as it was possible for men to do. They were as frankly cynical about the matter as the Norman chief, who told the French Archbishop who proposed to convert him to the true faith.

“As for thy creed, a Sea-king's gods
Are those which give him most.”

So these gentlemen's politics were, as they openly declared: “The politics which would give most,” and no doubt they did exercise a most powerful influence in displacing my hon. friend, and of enabling hon. gentlemen opposite to return to power. Sir, it may seem a paradox, but I think it can be said most truly, that, since the days of Confederation, there, probably, never was a contest in Canada in which less hard cash was spent in direct bribes to the electors, or in which more corrupt and debasing influences have been used against us than in the late struggle. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman what is to be the cost of all this. I doubt much if the hon. gentleman has ever taken into serious consideration what is the amount which Canada has to pay, even under the present moderate tariff of 17½ per cent. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us, not

many hours since, that were this tariff not adopted, every manufactory in Canada would be closed in two years. Sir, I had the curiosity, not very long ago, to enquire from a gentleman, himself a very large shareholder in a very important cotton manufactory, what was the real condition of this manufactory under the existing 17½ per cent. tariff. As a practical illustration will convey to the House a correct knowledge of the working of the old tariff far better than a theoretical discussion, I call the attention of hon. members to the facts which that gentleman was kind enough to supply me with. He told me that the total capital employed in that factory amounted to \$300,000. The business done in 1878 was \$430,000, and the net profits (not the gross) amounted, under the 17½ per cent. tariff, to the miserable figures of \$76,000, a paltry 25 per cent. for an industry which then employed 270 hands. These, doubtless, are the kind of industries that were to be extinguished within two years under the 17½ per cent. tariff, and this tariff will give them an additional bounty of 12½ per cent., if I correctly took down the figures of that hon. gentleman. Sir, I believe the real state of the case is this, that of all classes in Canada, excepting the agricultural classes, those who suffered least from the hard times were those manufacturers who were conducting their business prudently and properly. They got their materials cheaper and their labour cheaper. The rate of interest was not raised against them, and they had a fair opportunity of carrying on their business, no matter what foreign competition might be brought against them. The lumber interest, the shipping interest, and the commercial interest, have especially suffered in the immediate past, and I ask by what possible process the hon. gentleman purposes to help and protect these three classes. If his tariff has an effect at all for good, that effect will be to aid those who least require it. It has given another illustration to the scriptural doctrines: “To him that hath shall be given, and to him that hath not shall be taken away, even that which he hath.” And I would say this to my manufacturing friends: Surely they have already uncertainties enough in the ordinary course of trade, and if they will

voluntarily and deliberately add to the uncertainties of which they already complain, still further uncertainties, by mixing up their affairs with the oscillations of political parties, they have only themselves to thank for the great and serious disasters which will surely result from such a course. This tariff assuredly cannot stand. Manufacturers will obtain no permanent relief from it. For one, two or three years they may succeed in making considerable profit out of the operations of the tariff, but in the end they will find that it was the greatest misfortune to encourage the undue home competition which will inevitably take the place of the foreign competition of which they complain. Nor can they, with any degree of justice, raise the plea of vested interests, which has been often used to prevent alterations of the tariff as it stood. Where men have created a business under the operation of the tariff framed for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the whole people, I admit a great deal may be said against any violent alteration or interference with what has been the settled policy of the country. But when men deliberately sell themselves to this or that political party for the avowed purpose of taxing the rest of the community, for their private benefit, there are no vested rights in such case, though there may be vested wrongs enough for the people, when they come to their senses, to redress. Sir, let us consider some of the propositions which this hon. gentleman has submitted. First of all, let me say a few words on the very difficult and very debated question of the sugar duties. Now, I have always taken the position that sugar ought to be dealt with mainly from a revenue standpoint. Although not, perhaps, an absolute necessary of life, it is precisely one of those things which enter largely into the general consumption of every family. Our only justification for taxing sugar as heavily as we do, is, that we raise \$3,000,000 from it, which amount is nearly one-fourth of the whole customs duty; and, therefore, you cannot, by any possibility, afford, just now, to deprive yourselves of any considerable portion of that sum. There is, I admit, a very considerable difficulty in ascertaining exactly how much revenue will accrue from the propositions the

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

hon. gentleman has made, and I, therefore, speak under correction, because, when I have the hon. gentleman's proposals in my hands, in print, it may come to be seen that there are some points which I have omitted, which may possibly modify the conclusions I have arrived at. But, first, I would ask the hon. the Minister of Finance whether his object is simply to encourage the West Indian trade, or whether he expects that any considerable amount of sugar is to be refined in this country?

MR. TILLEY: Yes.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: He does. Well, has the hon. gentleman the least idea of what the probable cost to the people of the country is going to be? I take his own statement. He proposes to tax sugar, below No. 14, at $\frac{3}{4}$ c. specific duty, and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*. Well, assuming that No. 10 would be laid down at something like \$3.30 per 100 lbs., though, of course, its price varies from time to time, it is quite clear, that 100,000,000 pounds, plus about 10 per cent., which fairly represents the waste which occurs in the process of manufacture,—and I may tell the hon. gentleman that that 10 per cent., according to statements made to me by some most eminent refiners in Canada, would be a very liberal allowance, indeed,—you find the total sum paid into the Treasury for 100,000,000 lbs., would be some \$1,980,000, as against \$2,920,000, which we would receive under the proposed tariff, if we continued to import the same qualities of sugar we now consume. In other words, if his scheme be successful, if we refine our sugar in Canada, we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that for the pleasure of washing our own sugar, we shall have to pay something like \$1,000,000 per annum,—whether it be taken out of the pockets of the people, or whether it be taken out of the public treasury,—for the gratification of half-a-dozen influential gentlemen engaged in sugar refining in Halifax, Montreal, or elsewhere. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the article of tea. Here also, from the beginning, I took the position that beyond and above all other considerations, revenue considerations should be paramount; and I say it

is most unjust to the whole people of Canada, that for the benefit of a few importers, the people of Canada should be compelled to pay 10 per cent. more than the true value of a large part of the tea that they consume. I say that the fiction of a direct trade with China has been exploded long ago. Not one of the numerous deputations that waited upon me on that subject ever pretended that there was the least likelihood of now establishing a trade with China *viâ* the St. Lawrence. For years I believe one ship per annum was the utmost limit of the direct trade with China that came to Canada *viâ* the St. Lawrence, and I do not think there would be found one merchant to-day who would say that this trade would ever be permanently revived. No, Sir; if that direct trade comes, it will come in American bottoms *viâ* San Francisco or New York. The practical result of the hon. gentleman's proposal in this respect will be that a few large houses will import large quantities of tea through those channels, and many hundreds of small importers will be deprived of their natural market, and of the privilege of purchasing tea where they can purchase it cheapest and best, and all this for the purpose of gratifying a few political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. It may be, however, that the mischief which would have accrued a few years ago is not likely to accrue now, if, as I am informed, considerable alterations have taken place in the course of the tea trade, and consequently the hon. gentleman may not be able to effect all the mischief that he intends and expects to effect by the reimposition of a differential duty that never brought into the Treasury more than a fraction of the cost which it added to the price of the tea consumed by a large part of the people of Canada. With regard to the tax on iron, all I can say is this: hitherto it was supposed that iron should be free as forming the raw material of an immense number of industries which he professes a desire to encourage, and I tell the hon. gentleman that when the real effect of what he proposes to do comes to be known, it will be useless for the hon. gentleman to delude himself into the idea that he is going to escape from the deputations who are likely to wait upon him, in regard to the injustice of this and a

good many other taxes he now proposes. And I beg to call his attention to this fact, that, as far as the Customs returns show, this tax on iron is directly levelled against Great Britain. A great proportion of our manufactured iron is brought from Great Britain to this country. In this case, at any rate, there is not the paltry excuse of the reciprocity of tariffs, because we put a tax on a chief product of almost the only country in the world that admits our products free. As for the tax on salt, does not the hon. gentleman know, that vastly the greatest proportion of the salt brought into this country comes in British bottoms? Even in other cases, how is the Customs officer to tell how much of it is intended for the fisheries, and how much for other purposes? I am afraid, although as I represent a constituency which takes an interest in this question, I ought, perhaps, to consider this as a polite concession to them and myself, that, when the operation of the tax comes to be tested, the hon. gentleman will get extremely few thanks from those interested. As it is, we can beat the Americans in their own market; at this moment Canadian salt manufacturers command the country as far down as Kingston; and the hon. gentleman knows full well that, under the policy he proposes, all the salt brought into Canada is certain to continue to be brought in. In respect to the article of coal, the hon. gentleman proposes to put a tax of 50c. per ton on every kind and description. What can have induced the hon. gentleman to inflict such a tax I cannot imagine, unless it be the overpowering influence of the redoubtable Minister of Public Works. I am sure, as an inhabitant of St. John, he must know that, when he imposed that duty, he was working against the best interests of his own constituents. Now, if there be a principle of political economy clearer than another, it is the principle that the worst tax which can be imposed is a tax on a necessary of life, like coal. Moreover, it is a tax exceedingly partial and unjust in its operation. It will fall on the poorest classes of the community, in the depth of the Canadian winter. It is absolutely sectional, pressing heavily on the people of Ontario, and not at all on the great mass of the people through the other

Provinces. It will form a standing grievance; it will cause agitation in a great number of places. When he considers the subject, and the special effect it will have on railways, he will see that, if he wished to impair our standing in England, he could hit on nothing more likely to do so than to impose this special tax on coal, by which something like \$100,000 a year will have to be paid by one railway, \$60,000 to \$70,000 by one or two others, which are already in a condition of extreme embarrassment. The effect will be to deprive that small number of English bondholders who derive interest on their investments in Canadian railways of any chance of receiving further dividends. It is a most doubtful benefit to Nova Scotia, and I doubt if there is any reasonable chance of one hundred thousand tons more being sold under this duty. I had occasion to look into this matter in detail; and I question if it will be possible to place even the small amount I have indicated in the market under existing circumstances. As to the duty on flour and other articles, I must, perforce, omit comment on those until we have more full details. If they are to have any effect beyond pure waste, it must be to enhance the cost of necessities of life to the poorest classes of the community. When he comes to woollen goods, I find that, on a certain class where the hon. gentleman proposes to impose 10 cents per square yard.—

MR. TILLEY: Seven and a half cents.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: In that case, on certain classes of woollen goods worn by the poorer classes of the population, the tax would amount to about 30 per cent., and on goods of a higher class it would amount to about six per cent. He found by this judicious taxation, that the worst clothed people paid rates ranging from 25 to 26 per cent., and those able to afford expensive raiment paid from 8 per cent. to 12 per cent. Surely this is one of the most curious ways I have ever heard of, of promoting the greatest happiness of the greatest number. I do not propose at present to go through all the tremendously elaborate details which he was kind enough to read to us to-night. That discussion will keep us in work for several weeks yet, but

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

there is one point deserving of special notice. He has furnished us, by this general increase all along the line which he proposes, with a most admirable illustration of the mode in which this benevolent scheme of his is going to alter the distribution of wealth throughout the country. It is a matter of great difficulty to ascertain what is the actual quantity of goods held in stock, including those which have been imported during the four long weeks which this tariff has been in suspense. But I am inclined to believe that very nearly forty million dollars worth of goods are in stock in this country, which will be largely affected by the increased duties proposed. Who will be benefited by this? Here is an average of ten to fifteen per cent. added by one stroke of the hon. gentleman's pen to the value of stocks held by individual merchants and wholesale houses throughout the country. These men toiled not, neither did they spin. They only over-imported, and, as far as they possibly could, assisted, in too many cases, to bring about that extravagance which has gone so far in producing the present depression, and, as a practical reward, a beneficent legislator proposed to pay them four or five million dollars, in the shape of a bonus on the stock of goods they now possess. I had occasion to make some enquiries as to how this was going to affect certain individual parties engaged in trade, and I obtained from a gentleman of very high standing the following estimates of the quantities of goods, which were held by certain individual houses (as nearly as he could ascertain), in anticipation of the existing tariff. Some considerable time ago, according to this gentleman, eight important houses in the dry goods trade, held about \$1,635,000 of dry goods, wholly exclusive of American goods, and the probability is that these eight houses now hold about \$3,000,000 worth collectively, and, consequently, among these eight houses, about \$360,000 will be distributed by this tariff, and taken from the pockets of the people. I found that, in one case, the bonus would reach the trifle of \$65,000, in another \$30,000, another \$25,000, and so on, until the last unfortunate gentleman was obliged to put up with the miserable pittance of \$15,000. That is only one

example of the result of these violent alterations of the tariff, and shows how difficult and dangerous it is to exercise any such discrimination as that which the hon. gentleman has chosen to attempt. Now I know very well you cannot alter a tariff under an existing system, without allowing certain men to make unreasonable profits of this kind at the expense of the people at large. And in an ordinary case I might pass this over as a necessary evil, but there is one thing I desire to ask the hon. gentleman. It has been stated to me on good authority, which I cannot disregard, although I can hardly bring myself to believe it, that, wholly apart from the natural effect of the long and unfortunate delay in bringing down the tariff, which has disturbed commerce in no ordinary degree, the Minister of Finance has actually encouraged this fraud—shall I call it?—that he has made agreements with the various banks in the country by which they were encouraged and aided, in affording facilities to their customers, in anticipating the tariff, and in obtaining, at the expense of the public, a large augmentation on the value of their stocks in hand. And I desire now to ask the hon. gentleman if I have been correctly informed.

MR. TILLEY: Persons who desired to obtain discounts to pay duties, met with difficulties, because, under the arrangements, the money deposited was to be paid to the Bank of Montreal, and instructions were given that cheques received by the Customs Department should be paid into the banks holding those cheques.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am informed the money was to be left there for a certain period.

MR. TILLEY: No; the arrangement was subject to the call of the Government at any moment.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: We all know what that means, and I say that the hon. gentleman is very much in the position of a merchant who has been assisting to rob his own till. By his own confession, he has connived at a system designed to aid a great number of merchants in an-

icipating his own tariff, and in making out of the imposition of these duties, which are brought down to-night, a profit which ought never to have gone into the pockets of individuals, but into the Treasury of the Dominion. Such a confession never yet was made by any Finance Minister in any civilised country in the world. I do not wish to say to the hon. gentleman what, under other circumstances, I might feel justified in saying, that this was a most immoral transaction, because I think he has gone into it blindly. But he should have known that every Finance Minister, when considering a change in the tariff, has always felt the extreme inexpediency of allowing individuals thus to make a profit at the public expense. It was his duty to be most careful in giving the slightest intimation of the details of the measure he was about to bring down.

MR. TILLEY: I gave no intimation. I say it was his duty to be most careful in giving the slightest hint of the measure he was about to bring down.

MR. TILLEY: I gave no information.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am sorry to say that a great many of those proposals that I heard to-night, were quite familiar to my ear. If he was discreet, a good many of the parties he took into his confidence were hardly equally so. Although it has been laid down by writers on the subject that, if it were possible, a tariff should be brought in, with a retrospective clause, for the purpose of preventing individuals from profiting, in any way, by the imposition of new duties, the practical inconvenience is so great that hardly any Government has ventured to adopt that plan. But I do blame the hon. gentleman for having, according to his own confession, connived with certain parties and allowed them to make, out of the pockets of the people, sums varying from \$50,000 to \$60,000 a piece. The hon. gentleman entered into elaborate explanations of the cause of his delay in bringing down the tariff. He is not blameworthy for not having brought it down before the 14th of March, but for allowing Parliament to be summoned before he was prepared to bring it down at all; and the country has suffered very

serious loss in consequence of the extreme delay. What that has involved, may be easily estimated. I was very severely censured by the present Minister of Public Works, in 1874, because there was a total anticipation of Customs to the extent of \$645,000. I was told that I had been guilty of great wrong by disturbing the whole valuation of trade and commerce throughout the country, What has been the case in February, 1879? The receipts were \$2,036,253. as against \$908,937 in the same of the preceding year, showing, therefore, the revenue has been anticipated to the extent, not of \$645,000, but of \$1,127,416, a great part of which represented goods on which an additional duty might have been obtained, had the hon. gentleman decided not to call Parliament till ready to bring down his tariff. He made it an excuse, that, although he had only entered office on the 19th October, and I on the 7th November, yet he had managed to bring down his tariff on the 14th March, ours only coming down on the 14th April. But he forgot to tell the House that the very first thing I was subjected to after I accepted office was a sharp contested election in my own county; and that immediately thereafter the general elections followed, extending into February, so that there was no fair comparison between the delay then and now. And now, Mr. Chairman, having obtained some sort of conception of the lofty moral principle which has inspired the tariff, and having got some slight idea of the great wisdom with which the details are being worked out, let me call the attention of this House to its probable results in the future. One caution here. I would advise my hon. friends beside me to remember that however clear the tendency of any particular line of policy may be, necessarily a considerable length of time is required to work them out. We can form a tolerably clear idea of what may be the ultimate result of the policy proposed, but we cannot possibly fix the exact date at which these results will become manifest. That is almost always true in every important transaction, but especially true as regards the operation of a new policy in Canada. Canada is a small state, largely indebted, and however rich we may be in potential resources, we do not

possess that accumulated wealth which would enable us to give prompt and immediate effect to even a tariff like this. Then there are a great many possible counteracting agents which may, for a time, interfere with the effects that will flow from the adoption of this policy, just as was the case in the United States. The Americans did enjoy a great apparent prosperity from 1866 to 1873, though thoughtful men all along perceived it would result in great ultimate disaster; and just in the same way it is possible, though I am afraid unlikely, that we may appear to succeed for a brief space. No doubt in dealing with the future of Canada a great deal will, of necessity, depend on the policy the United States may adopt. They may laugh at the hon. gentleman's attempts to frighten them; or they may allow wiser counsels to prevail as regards their own fiscal system, or they may possibly take it into their heads to retaliate upon Canada sharply; and I warn hon. gentlemen that if they do our position may easily become intolerable. Or they may choose to bide their time till the policy has worked its way, and then, as they have done before, strike us hard and sharply at the moment when there is most danger of the whole fabric being shattered to pieces. Much will depend upon whether the shrinkage of value continues; much on European complications; much may depend upon the development of our North-West territory, which may prove a greater source of prosperity to us than all the tariffs ever laid upon the table. Possibly there may be a revival of the great lumbering and shipping interests so greatly depressed, all matters with which hon. gentlemen opposite have very little to do. In regard to all this, Ministers can exercise no authority, though any one of them may very materially effect the whole future trade and commerce of the country. But for the policy itself, I repeat, the policy now submitted is radically bad. It is bad socially, financially and politically, bad in every way you can regard it. The longer it lasts, the harder it will be to cure and the worse the rebound. Looked at in its financial aspect, it means this: For every dollar you put into the National Treasury, you are going to take four from the pockets of the peo-

ple, possibly even more. You are going to divert labour and capital from fields where it can be profitably employed and turn them into channels where they will only injure those other industries, but too few, unfortunately, that were being profitably conducted heretofore. Socially, I do not conceive it possible to imagine a policy which is likely to do more to corrupt the people of Canada, than that brought down to-night. We have two dangerous classes to deal with; there is, at the base of society, always a class of shiftless and idle men, not having sufficient self-reliance to maintain themselves, and only too glad of any excuse to thrust the burden of maintenance on other persons, and you absolutely tell them then that it is the duty of the Government to make the country prosperous and provide employment for them all. Every one who knows anything of European affairs, is aware that one of the greatest dangers with which European statesmen have to contend, is the spirit of Socialism and Socialistic ideas among a large class of the population, and, Sir, you are here deliberately introducing a system which recognises the leading ideas of Socialism, which, indeed, practically justifies the leading tenet of Socialism, that property is theft, for assuredly property acquired in this way, under a tariff such as this, is very little better than downright legalised robbery. Then there are able and unscrupulous men who know that under such a system the short cut to wealth is best obtained by securing political influence enough to get the tariff fixed to suit their own ends. You offer a premium to these men in every possible way to corrupt the Legislature, and if the example of the United States can be relied on, you may rest assured that your labours will not be in vain. Politically, Sir, I fear the matter is likely to be even worse. I say that, if this expedient fails, if this mode of restoring prosperity prove, as I verily believe it will, a sham, a delusion, and a snare; if, after you have locked up many millions in profitless investments, and crowded men by the thousands into the towns and cities; if this system breaks down in Canada as completely as it is known to have broken down in the United States—I say you

will be confronted with the cry for larger markets at any cost. Up to the present time there have been two barriers which have assisted in maintaining our political independence, and in keeping us separated from the United States. One of these the belief which, rightly or wrongly, obtained among us that, after all said and done, our political system was better, and that the purity of our politicians was greater than those of the United States. This may have been only a bit of national self-conceit, but, if there ever did exist any belief in such superiority, that belief has been removed for evermore. No intelligent Canadian, no matter how patriotic he may be, can dare to say, with the spectacle now before us, that the politicians of Canada are one whit better or purer than the politicians of the United States. The other was that we possessed a superior fiscal system to the people of the United States. If you sweep this away—I put this question not only to the House but to the people of Canada—what will then remain to keep us apart from the great nation on our border? We know the direction in which our material interests are likely to draw us, and I tell those gentlemen that, if they desire to maintain our independence, they are taking the surest means to render our separate political existence impossible. Sir, if further proof was wanted we might find it in the open exultation of the foes of England when these hon. gentlemen acceded to power, and when it was known what sort of proposals they were likely to bring down. We have had renegade Englishmen supporting the policy of the right hon. gentlemen opposite, not because, as they avowed, they thought it wise or good, but because they believed it would speedily render the position of the people of Canada intolerable, so that we should soon be forced to seek refuge from the position we had brought ourselves into in annexation to the United States. But a few weeks have passed since both sides of this House were uniting in expressing their gratitude to Her Majesty for having confided her child to our care. If that illustrious lady should return to England I am afraid she will be obliged to tell her Royal Mother that the practical outcome of all this loud lip-loyalty was a policy directly antagonistic to the in-

terests of Great Britain—a policy which, whatever may be the intentions of the hon. the Finance Minister and his colleagues, seems, in its practical results, especially designed to injure British interests and hamper British trade. Sir, there are other contingencies which are likely to flow from this policy in the not very distant future. If it works as I believe it will, I fear that we shall be speedily confronted with the problem of a demand for an irredeemable currency like that of the United States. All history teaches that an irredeemable currency is the twin sister of Protection, and we have already seen evidence of the likelihood of that system following in the line of the hon. gentleman's policy. When you find men sufficiently deluded to believe that increased taxation is going to make a people prosperous, it is natural enough they should be also foolish enough to suppose that they can be made rich by printing paper-promises to pay. Hon. gentlemen must remember that, so sure as we find ourselves unable to raise the large sums of money we require to carry on the Government of this country without inconvenience, so sure will the attempt be made to bring about the abolition of our system of local government. No doubt plausible reasons enough may be urged in favour of that course. These Local Governments have made mistakes, and have been expensive in many ways, and when the cry of false economy goes up, there may be men found indiscreet enough to abolish our Federal system, and to re-introduce the legislative system, a system to which I for one would be extremely opposed, and which every man who has the slightest interest in the well-being of his country would bitterly deplore to see inaugurated. But I fancy that will be an exceedingly likely consequence of the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I acquit the Minister of Finance to a great extent of doing these things designedly. I do not believe he or the majority of his colleagues have seriously considered the effect of the proposals he is now bringing before the House. But there are some among them who, in so doing, are deliberately sinning against light and knowledge; who know that they are

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

doing what is likely to bring all or many of those evils I speak of upon their country, and to these men I say that, great as was their guilt in the transaction for which the country originally banished them from power, that guilt is nothing to the guilt they incur in thus empoisoning the springs of our national existence for a few short years of dishonourable power. Sir, let me, in conclusion, say a few words as to the general bearing of this whole policy. The hon. gentleman told us that this country is in financial straits, and the hon. gentleman proposes to relieve this country from its financial difficulties and to aid our people—how? By trebling or quadrupling, unnecessarily as he himself admits, the present taxation of the people. We are to become rich by being subjected to a taxation three or four times as great as would otherwise be required. Being in power at a time when, of all others, the soundest judgment is needed—when it is the especial duty of every man having any pretensions to the character of a statesman not to yield to every plausible popular delusion, but rather to do his utmost, as far as in him lies, to disabuse the minds of the people of their mistakes—we find him apparently ready to pander to every error. If any folly has been committed, we find him prepared to perpetuate that folly. If any danger is clearly manifest, he seems determined to take such action as must inevitably bring us into collision with it, all warning to the contrary notwithstanding. Knowing as the hon. gentleman cannot fail to know, because he is a man of experience, a man who has been conversant for many years with the affairs of this country—knowing that one of our most besetting national sins is a passion for extravagant speculation and for locking up money in utterly unproductive enterprises—we find him deliberately legislating so as to increase that tendency. Knowing, as he cannot fail to do, that the uncertainty of trade and abuse of credit are most crying evils in the mercantile community, we find him introducing a system of legislation which will deliberately force the most intelligent of our people to turn business into gambling, and will render it impossible for any man to calculate from year to year, or almost

from month to month, what changes, what alterations, may be made in the laws under which his business must necessarily be conducted. Knowing, as he cannot help knowing, that there is no one thing statesmen should more resolutely discourage than a disposition on the part of any class in the community to rely on the Government for aid or support, we find him deliberately proclaiming that it is the duty of the Government to make all classes prosperous. Knowing, as he cannot help knowing that, at this present moment, there is no problem harder to solve than the proper distribution of wealth in any country, that, if there is one thing which threatens our civilisation more than another, it is the existence of monstrous fortunes at one end of the social scale and masses of paupers at the other; knowing, as he must do, that, if there is one thing more than another which the American tariff has succeeded in producing, it has been great profits for a few successful manufacturers, and great misery to great masses of men collected together in their cities we find the hon. gentleman deliberately legislating so as violently to alter and disturb the distribution of wealth in this community. Knowing, Sir, that there are, say what he will, always great mischiefs arising everywhere from the tendency to crowd together in large cities; knowing that this is a special evil in North America, from causes which I cannot now properly discuss and analyse, we find the hon. gentleman fostering and encouraging that evil. Knowing, in a country like this, the imminent danger of encouraging sectional feeling, and showing one part of the country that your legislation is framed so as to serve another part of the country at its expense, we find him bringing down a tariff which will furnish every man in several Provinces with a ready mode of agitation and a ready standing grievance, which, by reason of the enormous excess of duty it imposes as compared with the taxation which existed in the hon. gentleman's own Province prior to Confederation, cannot fail to produce a deep-rooted and deep-seated discontent with the working of Confederation. Knowing, as I have said, the grave physical difficulties in the way of achieving our independence, we find him legislating so

as to put our whole fiscal policy at the mercy of the United States. Knowing that there is much trouble always experienced in collecting sufficient revenue, in a time of depression like this, to meet the ordinary wants of the country, and that, along an extensive frontier like ours, it is a matter of the extremest difficulty to avoid extensive smuggling, we find him introducing a tariff which gives every possible inducement for hundreds of miles, to men to engage most actively in the business and occupation of smuggling. Knowing, as we do, from dearly bought experience, how grievously this Legislature, and our Provincial Legislature have suffered in times gone by, from improper influences brought to bear upon them by wealthy and powerful corporations, or even by wealthy and powerful individuals, we find him deliberately making it the interest of the wealthiest and most active classes of the community to obtain anyhow, and by any means whatsoever, power over the Legislature of the country. I cannot stop to analyse how much of this may fairly be attributed to folly and incapacity, how much to a reckless desire to obtain power at all hazards, how much to ignorance of the very elemental principles of political economy; how much to deliberate evil design. That I cannot tell, but I do know that, although it may be true that the people of Canada must reap as they have sown, although they have yet to learn that the nation which forfeits its own self-respect, has gone far towards forfeiting the right to its own political existence, and although time will have to be taken in order that they may understand the full extent of the mischief done to them; the time is coming, and coming fast, when they will wake up from their short-lived delusion to find themselves wiser and poorer, by many and many a million, than they are to-night; and I warn the hon. gentleman that then he will find that, for the sake of obtaining a temporary party triumph, he, and those who support him, will, in the long result, prove to have utterly and hopelessly wrecked, not only their own fortunes, and the fortunes of their party, but, I very much fear, the fortunes of the country that have been, most unfortunately, committed to their charge.

MR. TUPPER: I confess that I am very much surprised at the forcible, though fallacious, address to which we have all listened for the last two or three hours. I did suppose, Sir, that, brought face to face, as the people of this country have been under the administration of public affairs by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, with a condition of things that is calculated to arrest the attention of every patriotic man in Canada—I did suppose that that hon. gentleman would feel that it was a duty he owed to this House, that he owed to this country, not to indulge in such animadversions as he has indulged in in reference to the proposals that have just been made to the House, but to lend to the Ministry of the day, and to my hon. friend, the Finance Minister of Canada, all the aid and all the assistance that he could, in order that some measures might be adopted to retrieve that position of affairs into which that hon. gentleman has largely contributed to bring this country. The hon. gentleman talks of incapacity, talks of recklessness, talks of ignorance. I ask the members of this House who have listened to him for the last five years, whether in the whole of this country can be found a more striking monument of all those excellencies than the hon. gentleman himself? Five years ago, when I ventured some modest criticisms of the policy that he propounded to the House, he expressed his regret that no Finance Minister of the then late Administration had a seat in the House. That regret was not confined to himself. No man felt it more than I did. No one felt it more than the gentlemen who were associated with me, and I am glad to know that that feeling became widespread throughout the country; that every year the experience that the people of Canada had of the administration of its fiscal and financial affairs by the hon. gentleman, induced a deeper, wider and stronger feeling as to the absolute necessity of bringing back to the aid and assistance of this country the gentleman under whose financial management it had prospered before. The hon. gentleman himself has heard the plaudits given to-night to the Budget speech delivered by my hon. friend, coming, I was going to say, from the whole House, so small

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

was the number of those who did not join in applauding the able effort of my hon. friend, that it seemed to come, not from a section of this House, but from the entire Chamber. I congratulate the House, I congratulate the country, that my hon. friend (Mr. Tilley) is back in the position he occupied in 1873—back in the position he occupied when the late Government handed over to their successors in office, the conduct of the affairs of the country, which was then in the highest condition of prosperity of any country on the face of the globe—back to the position he occupied when the hon. gentleman, instead of inheriting years of accumulated deficits, inherited years of accumulated surpluses,—back, I say, to a condition of things that would compare favourably with the administration of public affairs in any country in the world. The hon. gentleman says that he is glad to have an opportunity, at last, face to face with my hon. friend, of criticising his policy. He has, year after year, done all that he could, in the absence of my hon. friend, to denounce his policy, to assault his policy, to assault it in unfair and unwarrantable terms; but at last he has, he says, the opportunity of meeting him here and of challenging that policy. What is the policy that he challenged? Why, he brings against him three prominent charges in relation to his policy—the readjustment of the debt, the bringing of Prince Edward Island into the Union on the terms on which she came, and the increased salaries of ministers and indemnities to members of this House. Now, let me try the hon. gentleman by his own reasons, which he has submitted to the House as his ground for assaulting the financial reputation of my hon. friend. Why, will the House believe it—they would hardly believe it—that the hon. gentleman's memory should be so short! They will hardly believe that, when he was concentrating his point of attack—when he was himself bringing down his declamatory assaults upon my hon. friend, that he was assaulting, at that moment, nine Cabinet Ministers that have sat side by side with him in the Cabinet. Will it be believed that, when he was denouncing my hon. friend as having been utterly ignorant of the financial

position of this country, in his having been utterly reckless in his wilful and extravagant waste of the public funds, by that false, and injurious, and ruinous policy of the readjustment of the debt of this country—will it be believed that nine of the gentlemen who have been selected by the late Premier to govern Canada, were men who supported and sustained that policy in this House? Not only is that the case, but instead of this having been done at the close of a Session when the members had departed to their homes, if he will turn to the 420th page of the journals of 1873, he will find that that motion was carried by 110 members, including no less than 35 friends of the late Administration, and including nine gentlemen, who, as I have already stated, were members of the Cabinet along with himself. That is the fact, and I place it before the young members of this House who have not, like myself, been accustomed to listen to the fallacies, the delusive fallacies, that the hon. gentleman is wont to indulge in when he addresses the House in relation to these questions. What about Prince Edward Island and the ruinous terms upon which she was brought into the Union? Did he make any objection on that occasion? If he did let him point to the speech, let him open the journals and show the vote that he gave in opposition to the terms of that union. Let him search the records of the press and he will find that only five years ago, when it was insinuated that those gentlemen were not as friendly to the terms, and did not support those terms as heartily as we did, it was met with an indignant denial, and the press was pointed to as evidence that not a word was uttered in opposition to those terms. What are we to say of the salaries? We raised the salaries and we increased the indemnities to members of Parliament to the position that they occupy now. But what was the case? Why the fact was that at that time we were rolling up surplus revenue, after all our liberality in the expenditures which we devoted to the improvement of the public services of this country. We were rolling up surpluses to the extent of two million dollars per year. We were at

the same time reducing the taxes to the extent of two million dollars per year. And yet, under those circumstances, if we did increase the salaries of Ministers and indemnities of members, I want to know why the hon. gentleman who stands in the Opposition to assault that policy in the presence of this House and of the country—why, when he and his friends had an overwhelming majority at their backs, he continued to pocket those increased salaries yearly, not when he had millions of surplus at the end of the year, but when the credit of the country was sinking beneath his feet? And yet down to the last hour, without the money, without the means of paying these salaries, the hon. gentleman took advantage of the privilege they had and continued to take the increased salaries until they are again in the cold shades of opposition. These are the three great points, the three great questions upon which he undertook to assault the policy of my hon. friend. One would have supposed that the recollection of the last five years, the contrast, the startling contrast, between the condition of the country five years ago and its condition now, would have closed his mouth, and that he would have been the last man to raise a discussion here or any where in relation to the manner in which the public affairs of this country have been dealt with. He has talked about the credit of the country. What did he find? He found the credit of Canada raised to the very highest pitch by the accumulated surpluses, year by year, amounting to something like thirteen millions of dollars during the period that this Government was in power before. The hon. gentleman succeeded to a heritage of prosperity and of financial credit for the country, such as he ought to have been doubly grateful for instead of spending, as he had spent, the last five years in vain and impotent denunciations of the policy of the men under whom Canada attained a pitch of prosperity such as she has never since had the pleasure of witnessing. The hon. gentleman says that there was a lack of comprehension on the part of my hon. friend, that he was unable to forecast the future needs of the country, to gauge its trade, and that he vainly supposed that the condition of prosperity which the country enjoyed at that time was likely to

continue. Did the hon. gentleman himself exhibit no lack of comprehension? Did the hon. gentleman himself exhibit no lack of ability to gauge the future of the country? I can point to his Budget speech in which he declared that he anticipated the trade and business revenue of this country were going to remain at the point which they had reached. And yet the hon. gentleman's eyes were not opened when he found that, having asked for three millions additional taxes to be imposed upon the people of this country at the end of the second year, he was obliged to come down to Parliament with the humiliating confession that he had a deficit of two millions, notwithstanding all the additional taxes, to receive which he had pledged his reputation to Parliament as a public man, that if they would give him that amount he would not only not come back for any more, but he was going to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that his colleague, Mr. Blake, went to his constituents and declared that, although they had asked for three millions of taxes it was not for any necessity that existed, but for the purpose of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that in the very speech in which he asked Parliament to give him that three millions of money, he declared that if they would give him the money they would not see him back upon the beggar's errand again. But after these three millions were gone, at the end of two years, he had to come back and ask for additional taxes to meet his two millions of deficit. And yet, Sir, year after year this wonderful financier, this heaven-born financier, this man who now stands up and would lead the people of Canada to believe, and would lead the new members—he cannot deceive the old ones in this House—to believe that his wonderful sagacity, his marvellous prescience alone can save Canada, came back with these steadily accumulating deficits, until, at the end of his five years of office, he found himself, notwithstanding his three millions of additional taxation for which he asked Parliament, and the tariff which he gave to the House, face to face with a deficiency, during the last four years, of no less than seven millions of dollars.

MR. TUPPER.

This year, without what the hon. gentleman calls this disturbance of the trade of the country, without this accumulation of money in the Treasury, caused by the expectation in the change in the tariff, he knows that we would have had to encounter, on the 1st of July, another deficit of \$2,400,000; and yet he adopts a style that would lead people to imagine that he possessed the accumulative wisdom of all the financiers of the world. I say, Sir, that it ill-becomes the hon. gentleman, as everyone will see who contrasts his management of the finances of this Dominion with that of his predecessors, to adopt the tone he does here to-night. He did the last Parliament the credit to say that there was a great deal of ignorance in the House, and he paid the people of Canada the compliment to say that there was a great deal of ignorance outside of the House. He reminds me of a story I have heard of a lunatic, who thought he was the only sane man in the world. When he was asked how he came to be shut up in his cell in a lunatic asylum, he said that all the people were mad, and he was sane, but they unfortunately differed from him in opinion, and they being the stronger had locked him up. The hon. gentleman believes he has all the information, all the financial knowledge of the country locked up in his own person, and so he paid the House that compliment to which I have referred, and I am afraid he paid the same bad compliment to this House, seeing, as he did, the manner in which the overwhelming majority of its members receive the financial speech of my hon. friend to-day. But it appears that the hon. gentleman was in a minority, and, like the lunatic that was locked up, his wings were clipped, his hands were deprived of the power of manipulating or mismanaging the public affairs of Canada, which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance comes back at the end of five years to endeavor to remedy, and which, I believe, he will remedy, and which this House and the people of this country believe he will remedy, by the adoption of a policy other than that of helpless paralysis in the face of great national disaster. Why, Sir, where was the hon. gentleman when he found that,

year after year, the credit of the country was sinking beneath the accumulated deficits? What did he attempt to propose? He has spent two or three hours in criticising the attempt of my hon. friend to lift our common country out of the slough into which we found it sinking in his hands: and in that condition of things I say that the hon. gentleman was bound to adopt a different tone, and at all events, to confess to the House that he must question with some little diffidence a policy propounded to change a state of things which he found himself powerless to change. Mr. Chairman, either the hon. gentleman knew the remedy and refused to use it; knew what Canada required and refused to apply that remedy, or he was ignorant of what the necessities of this country required in order to change the existing condition of affairs. Was the hon. gentleman not aware of the disaster he was bringing on the country? In his first Budget speech when he brought down a proposition to add three millions of taxes to the people of Canada, what did he say? Did he tell them that a deficit had occurred? No, Sir, but, with his wonderful prescience, he told them that he was afraid one would occur; and although it has been proved to a demonstration, and stands so proved on the pages of *Hansard* placed beyond controversy, that the year would have closed with a surplus if the country had never heard of the hon. gentleman as Minister of Finance, still he said that so imminent was the case, though no deficit had occurred, but one might occur, and the very possibility of one would be so disastrous to Canada in its then condition that he proposed to take measures to avoid such a possibility. He said that if a deficit occurred we would find the credit of Canada ruined. We would find her bonds down at a ruinous discount in the market, as they were many years ago; and he implored the House to grant the means to arrest the catastrophe of a single deficit upon the people of Canada. I recall that to his attention and to the attention of the House to prove that he was not ignorant of the serious consequences that must result to a country like Canada, from having to go into the market to borrow money for public

purposes. Knowing that, how did he show his fitness for the high position which he occupied? Why, by presenting an appearance of helpless paralysis to the House and the country, by admitting that all his powers were exhausted, and that he knew of no means by which he or his colleagues could come to the rescue of a country whose credit was going, and whose prosperity was rapidly passing away. Sir, the hon. gentleman has criticised my hon. friend's Budget speech; but he has not told the House what he would do if he occupied the position of my hon. friend to-day. He has left us nothing but the record of the past helpless incapacity in the face of national disaster and the admission by the course that he pursued before, and the declaration he made on the floor of the House, that he knew of no means by which Canada could be prevented from sinking down day by day, until, at the close of four years, instead of possessing a surplus of \$13,000,000, she was loaded down with a deficit with something like \$7,000,000. I say that the hon. gentleman admitted that in terms—not only by his attitude, not only by declaring the impossibility, not only of himself, but his colleagues, doing nothing to avert the disaster that had overtaken the country, but in terms. Read his last Budget speech, and you will find the only remedy left to the hon. gentleman stated in distinct terms. He said he had exhausted the sources of taxation in the vain effort to save the credit of the country, and the only solution he could offer to the House was that, if he had the means of collecting it, he would propose an income tax; and, at a later period when a motion was made in this House in reference to home-grown tobacco, he said it would take away half a million of revenue from him, and, if he were stripped of that half a million dollars of revenue, he knew of no means by which he could replace it, except by direct taxation. I ask this House, and I ask the people of Canada, if that is the solution they prefer in contradistinction to a policy which, in other countries, has been found successful—I will not say in other countries—my eye lights at this moment upon the face of one of the most distinguished men who have ever

adorned the Parliament of Canada, I mean Sir Alex. Galt, and I say that in 1858, by just such a policy, he lifted this country out of just such an emergency, and accomplished the desired object; and I say that this policy will be now as sufficient for the object as then, and more so, because, by the extension of our boundaries, by the extent of country we cover, by the enormous addition to the producing power of Old Canada, by the means we possess of bringing industries into life, which were scarcely applicable to Old Canada, but which exist under the Confederation of British North America, we have far wider means of bringing it into force than they had then, when it proved to be eminently successful. The hon. gentleman knows, I suppose, that direct taxation is not a particularly popular thing, that it does not commend itself very cordially to the sympathies of the masses of the people in this country; and I suppose that was the reason why, notwithstanding he admitted necessities of the country, he was not in a position to indicate what he would do were he in the position of my hon. friend. It is proverbial that it is easier to tear down than to build up. It requires much humbler intellectual power to tear down a splendid edifice than to build one up, until you have crowned it with its top stone. The hon. gentleman, while prepared to destroy, has given to the House and the country no hint, no suggestion, by which this country was to be released from the condition of things that he and every intelligent man in the country is obliged to admit it occupies in relation to this question to-day. The hon. gentleman said that the country was suffering in consequence of my hon. friend's imprudence. Why, Sir, what had his imprudence to do with it? Has his imprudence expended all the people's money in this depressed condition of things, in this our hour of need, in this condition of our poverty, when year by year we are suffering from large annually increasing deficits? Was it the expenditure of my hon. friend that continued to swell the expenditure of this country? Was it the policy of my hon. friend, I say, that placed \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 increased expenditure upon the shoulders of the people of Canada? I undertake to

say that no gentleman has ever been able to challenge the accuracy of my statement, that in the comparative statements of receipts and expenditures, as shown in the Public Accounts, \$1,021,000 must be taken out of the expenditures of 1873-4, and which is charged against us by the hon. gentleman. I showed how, by doing the greatest violence that could be done to the Public Accounts—and when the hon. gentleman did it, it was not a mistake, one of the oldest financial officers in his service told him what he was doing, and yet he did it,—for the purpose of deceiving the country the hon. gentleman took half a million of dollars of money voted by Parliament for capital expenditure, and expended, and charged it to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I say I am prepared to go before the Public Accounts Committee and bring his own officer, and prove that he did it with his eyes open. And so Sir, I say, making this statement a fair and honest statement, it will show we are charged with over a million of dollars that cannot rightfully be brought into the comparative statement made.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No.

MR. TUPPER. Yes, I will establish it anywhere, as I have now established it beyond the power of hon. gentlemen to controvert it. Then take his own statement of his own expenditure, and you will find that he closes his five years with an increased expenditure of seven millions. This poverty-stricken Government, this Government that had no surplus, this Government that was destroying the country with a series of fearful deficits, expended public money which they did not possess, and this expenditure, but for the much-absurd Washington Treaty, would have formed an increased public debt on the people of this country about \$7,000,000 over and above our annual expenditure. And yet these hon. gentlemen tax my hon. friend with suffering in consequence of his imprudence. Was it his imprudence that, in the face of interests of Canada, that in the face of the absence of the money with which to pay the claims, added year by year thus enormously to the expenditure over and above the expenditure of their predecessors, at a time when they had two millions

MR. TUPPER.

a year of an annual surplus, and were able to reduce the taxation of the people two millions a year. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the ignorance of this House and the ignorance of this country, as he is pleased to term it. I believe he is sincere in his contemptuous estimate of the intelligence of this House and of this country. I believe he is perfectly sincere in this, or he would never have ventured to utter the criticisms he has uttered upon my hon. friend's policy. What is this frightful disaster that is to be brought upon this country? In the hon. gentleman's contention there were two postulates which were irreconcilable. His final postulate is that out of the hard earnings of the people we are going to build up private fortunes. His second postulate is that you are going to bring about a ruinous competition that will destroy the manufacturers. Now, Sir, will the hon. gentleman reconcile these two statements?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Yes.

MR. TUPPER: I have no doubt his estimate of the intelligence of this House and of the country is such that he thinks he can make statements so utterly irreconcilable, and in direct contradiction to each other. The hon. gentleman says, if you foster these industries, you create monopolies, and these monopolies increase the prices of the articles, and that the increased cost has to be paid by the people. The hon. gentleman has answered the only argument in which there is a shadow of a possibility of doubt, connected with the policy of my hon. friend, and that is that the effect of the industries being protected from unfair and injurious competition from without is to bring capital into the country, furnish labour for the masses of the people, create industries, and protect the people, at the same time, from oppressive and injurious prices by the competition thus engendered among manufacturers. The hon. gentleman has answered himself, and overthrown the only semblance of an argument which can be brought against this policy. But, Sir, what is he obliged to confess, while he says, the policy is disastrous in the highest degree, and will result in the destruction of the country.

He says that he places great hopes in the benefit that is to accrue to Canada from the return to prosperity of the trade of the United States. The hon. gentleman is not alone in his discovery of the increasing prosperity of the United States. Every man who has examined the condition of that country, has rejoiced to find that the depression which affected it is passing away. There are signs of prosperity from one end of the country to the other, and that in a country that enjoys, or "suffers under," as the hon. gentleman would put it, the most severe protection in the world. In this highly protected country, without any change or amelioration of the tariff—notwithstanding that measure after measure has been propounded for the purpose of lessening the amount of protection to American industries without result—a country which at the close of a gigantic war and frightful internecine struggle, overwhelmed with an enormous debt that threatened to break down the prosperity and credit of the country, re-sorted in that emergency to a protective policy, with a balance of trade against it of \$150,000,000, in this country, I say, we are observing a prosperous reaction from the recent general depression. Is there any better evidence of prosperity than the fact that, instead of increasing the taxes, they have been wiping the taxes off by hundreds of millions—\$300,000,000 of taxes swept off in the course of eight years. This has been done, too, with that objectional policy which the hon. gentleman has also commented upon, of an irredeemable paper currency. The United States is a country which, in relation to public affairs, will challenge comparison with any country in the world. And yet this country, the only one on the horizon of the world the hon. gentleman can point to as exhibiting an increasing prosperity, is the country, unfortunately for him, which has carried out to the fullest extent a policy, of which this is only a feeble counterpart. I say, under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman went on to answer his own argument, until he left me at this late hour very little to do. If my remarks are somewhat desultory, the hon. gentleman must excuse me, as I am obliged to refer to the subjects he referred to, and in the

order he referred to them. The hon. gentleman once gave me credit for having prepared an elaborate speech to denounce an increase in the tariff, and then finding that no increased tariff was to be offered to the House, I was quite equal to the occasion. Well, he did me too much credit on that occasion. I am surprised the hon. gentleman should think I was not prepared to receive a Budget calculated to protect the interests of the country. I am not at all surprised the hon. gentleman concluded that, from the manner in which cabinet secrets will leak out, that the country knew that it was believed that the Cabinet of the day, at that moment, in order to meet the serious deficiency they were compelled to admit existed, were prepared to bring down an increase of the tariff to a very considerable extent. The *Toronto Globe* gave the country the information on the morning the Budget was brought down, that there would be an increase of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the tariff which would have been an increase to 20 per cent. A member of the Cabinet was the proprietor of a paper in Prince Edward Island. A telegram was sent to that paper—as all newspaper men are anxious to have the first possible intelligence—preparing its readers to meet an increase of the tariff that day. But, Sir, it did not occur. Why, Sir, because the hon. gentleman was just as deficient of political principles then as he is now. Now, Sir, he can denounce by the hour the policy of my hon. friend, but he has nothing to propound in its place. The hon. gentleman was waited upon by a gentleman from the Maritime Provinces, representing a tolerably formidable phalanx of maritime members threatening that if he increased that tariff as the Government proposed it should be increased, they would vote against the Government. What did the Government do? Did they say, "Gentlemen, we see that it is our duty to increase the tariff, the country is in danger; we find we have a deficit of \$2,000,000 to meet, with nothing to meet it, and we know the deficit will be increased next year, unless we take measures to meet it." No, they found it became a question of office or principle, and they clung to office. The deficit appeared at the end

of the year. They had the humiliation of having succumbed to the threat of being deprived of support. If they had known what passed in the room of the right hon. leader of the Government and myself, they would never have abandoned their policy. While they were closeted and taking into consideration what they should do to keep office, and came to the ignoble resolution to take care of themselves and let the country suffer, my right hon. friend and myself were also discussing what our duty to the country was under the existing condition of affairs. We heard the rumour that the Finance Minister was coming down the next day with the proposal to increase the tariff to 20 per cent. We thought that would be a great disaster to ourselves; that it would relieve the necessities of the country and would damage the chances of the Opposition in their efforts to obtain power. But my hon. friend said, injurious as it may be to us, we have but one course to pursue, and that is the course which the necessities of Canada require. It may lessen our chances of office, because it will undoubtedly be accepted by the people as a step in the right direction. It is necessary to retrieve the public credit; and there and then my hon. friend and myself agreed that if that proposal came from the hon. Minister of Finance we would give it our most cordial support. When I listened to the hon. gentleman to-night, I came to the conclusion that no man was more dissatisfied than he when he found that the right hon. the leader of the Government, would redeem his pledges to the country, and I can see the dismay which was pictured on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, as the hon. the Finance Minister dealt, point by point, with the varied and important interests of Canada, and showed that this Government had come to the rescue with a policy calculated to foster Canadian interests and to develop the business and trade and revenue of the country at the same time. The hon. gentleman seems to think that an industry cannot be protected without destroying the foreign trade of a country. Take the question of sugar refining, and what do we find? The hon. gentleman seems to have

changed his view upon that since he introduced his tariff in 1874, when he came to the conclusion that sugar refining was a very important industry, and proposed to increase the duties on sugar for the purpose of protecting that interest. An influential friend from Kingston—a man who seems occasionally to have guided the ship of State—came down to Ottawa, and, through his influence, the policy of the hon. gentleman was changed in a night and dwindled ultimately into a paltry effort, which only resulted in the loss of revenue, without affording the protection necessary to provide for sugar refining in this country. Notwithstanding the absurdly wild calculation he had made in reference to the loss of revenue, the Minister of Finance does estimate that the people of this country will pay something like \$200,000 a year less for sugar than they are paying now. We believe in building up the great West India trade of the country, which will give life and vitality to our shipping interests, that interest which every Canadian deplores to see sinking, as it has been under the disastrous policy of the hon. gentleman opposite for the last five years. The West India trade means new life and vigour, not only to the shipping interests, but to the great fishing interests of this Dominion. There is no step which this Government has taken that will more redound to the increase of trade and business than a policy which, without undue aid to sugar refiners, will give them a sufficient margin to carry on that industry in Canada. Then we were told, not as he told us in his Budget speech, that it was desirable to have this great interest fostered, but that it was a great mistake; that if the United States would take money out of their treasury and let us have sugar cheaper, we ought to eat it and enjoy it. That policy was tried with the result that, no sooner was the sugar-refining interest destroyed and the people who depended on it obliged to seek in other lands the prosperity denied them by their Government—than up went the price of sugar. Under the operation of this policy, the people had to pay a cent a pound more for

the pleasure of having their sugar refined in Boston and New York then when their own refineries were in existence. One of the reasons why the hon. gentleman is in opposition to-day is that the intelligent people of Canada came to the conclusion that they would not support a Government which would make Boston and New York the capitals of this country. The hon. gentleman says that the tea trade was exploded long ago. Of course it was, in the same way the sugar refining interest was by the policy of transferring the trade of our own merchants to the merchants of Boston and New York. Had the hon. gentleman the right to use the expression that this Government was bringing us to the feet of the Americans? The whole policy of the late Government was directed with the view of making the Canadians hewers of wood and drawers of water to their American neighbours. No man had opposed that policy stronger than the right hon. the Premier, who said to the people that the time had come when Canada must adopt a Canadian policy, as the United States had adopted a United States policy. The hon. gentleman found a good deal of fault with the attempt to reduce the expenditure. It is only a part of our policy to foster the industries of the country by increased taxation, but it is a most important part of our policy that we should take up all the great interests of the country; the mining, the mineral, the agricultural, the manufacturing and the shipping interests, and give them all such fostering protection as the interests of Canada required. That is only a part of it. While attaining two objects, the means of preserving the credit of the country, by increased taxation, rendered inevitable by the action of our predecessors, and adopting that policy in such a way as to foster and promote Canadian interests, we carry out what has always been a cardinal maxim with us—a policy of retrenchment and economy. If you want an evidence of this I give it to you in the fact that with an enormous surplus revenue we expended in the government of this country \$7,000,000 less than did the hon. gentleman in the five years that he was in power. So my hon. friend brings down an estimate which he is sorry to have to submit. I

do not hesitate to say that I regret deeply to be obliged to pare down services that I would have been exceedingly glad to foster. We were called on before to deal with this question. We felt we could do Canada no better service than promote the improvement and increase the facilities of her trade. But when we consider the fact that her credit is sinking; that hon. gentlemen opposite brought matters to such a state as made their late Finance Minister unwilling to show his face in the European money market—when he found he had to confess his failure—when he could no longer point to the enormous growing revenue and the prosperity the country enjoyed in our time—when he had to confess that he himself with three millions fresh taxes was met with seven millions of a deficit in four years—no wonder he shrank from appearing in the world's money market to borrow money sadly wanted. His confession convicts him either of incapacity or want of patriotism. At any rate, he made various shifts to meet the public demands, by borrowing privately. Why was he thus borrowing? If he had sufficient means, he was doing a foul wrong to the financial interests of Canada in adopting that course. He found that, with his record, he would be unable to borrow money in the market at anything like terms received when he was under the shadow of our record. He criticised the present hon. Finance Minister for allowing the period when money was at two per cent. to pass unimproved, and borrowing when it was worth five to six. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) thinks he can trifle with what he imagines the ignorance of the House in venturing to propound a fallacy so difficult to sustain. But where is his authority for saying my hon. friend the Finance Minister met with difficulties on the part of our agents. They were willing to give him every support, though he was not obliged to adopt their advice in all matters. The financial agents did not first fix the price and then say how much of the loan they would take. My hon. friend operated in the ordinary way.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: With what success?

MR. TUPPER.

MR. TUPPER: Taking into account the state of the money market at the time, with much success. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) was responsible for some of the difficulties experienced, in thinking of the interests of his party, instead of his country, and working for his objects, here, thus allowing the proper time for obtaining money cheaply to pass. The hon. gentleman who brought the credit of the country into its present condition and neglected the duty for which he was paid; who spent the time labouring for his party in Canada which should have been employed for the benefit of his country, ventures to challenge the Finance Minister with not having achieved all the success in the dark days of November that he would have encountered in April or May. Nor does the ex-Finance Minister seem to like the attempts at retrenchment and economy. He is afraid that, as his Administration of public affairs contrasted very badly with his predecessor's, it showed equally bad with his successor's management. His claim was that, with all desire to reduce the expenditure, it was utterly impossible. I have stated that our expenditure was generous when we had a surplus, when the outlay was advantageous to the country. But hon. gentlemen, when they knew there would be a deficit of two millions, went on spending, some of it to influence the elections in various counties. They were afraid of the contrast of their management with that of this Government. I believe that we shall be sustained in our course, instead of being unduly pressed that the patriotic gentlemen who supported this Government, instead of pressing their necessities upon us, will readily give us hearty aid in bringing the country back to the state enjoyed under our administration before, when we shall be only too glad to provide for the public services as before. The hon. member for Centre Huron takes exception to the reduction of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, and great exception to the \$186,000 required in the Supplementary Estimates to cover the expenditure of the current year, which, he fears, is owing to the disastrous condition of things in consequence of the change of the General Superintendent of the railway. I am glad to be able to relieve

the hon. gentleman's mind on that subject, and say that I believe Mr. Brydges would not endorse his statement that I or any hon. member of the Government have been actuated by any malice in relation to the matter. The hon. gentleman knows that after his party had spent twelve years in denouncing Mr. Brydges as incapable to manage a railway, as soon as his services could be useful to them they went back on all their assertions, and besought him to manage the Intercolonial. I told them at the time that they could not afford to do so; that public sentiment would arrive at the conclusion, either that the denunciations of that gentleman by the *Globe* and other Reform authorities were false and unfounded, or that he was unfit for the position in which that party had placed him—a position of the greatest trust and responsibility. I have never assailed Mr. Brydges personally, though I differ with him on many important points in connection with the Intercolonial. It would not require a great stretch of the imagination to come to the conclusion that both he and myself felt, under those circumstances,—believing, as I do, and as I have stated in this House, that the management of the road was somewhat extravagant,—that it would be inconsistent to ask him to remain in office under him as Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) has exulted in the disasters on the Intercolonial, urging from the late collision and damage to property, that it was wrong to remove the superintendent. But it is also true that lives have been lost and property destroyed under his management. The train-despatcher, station-master, conductor and engine-driver involved in this occasion, held those situations in Mr. Brydges' time. So it is impossible to connect this disaster with the change in the management. The hon. gentleman also wants to know why the \$186,000 are required. He will, however, accept Mr. Brydges' statement that he asked my predecessor for \$1,700,000, as the least that would suffice for the operating of the road. That the estimates passed in this House were \$100,000 less than what he stated would be required, and that experience proved his correct-

ness in asking for the larger estimate. I may also show the hon. gentleman the estimate of Mr. Brydges for the year commencing 1st July next, saying that \$1,700,000 is the least that the road can be operated for from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1880, and I think, when I tell the hon. gentleman that I have only asked for \$1,500,000 for that service he cannot question the reduction. Now the hon. gentleman says he wonders the Finance Minister is not appalled at the spectre which is conjured up before us. Well, Sir, I think my hon. friend, looking round this Parliament—which I am proud to say, in my judgment, surpasses in independence, character, intellect and talent, any Parliament that ever sat within these walls—my hon. friend must see that the great mass of the representatives of the people are not appalled, and that if there is any spectre present it is in the hon. gentleman's imagination. Let him look at Canada today, and compare it with what it was when he assumed the financial management of this country, and what will he find? Where wealth, prosperity, happiness and progress were in Canada, he will find gaunt poverty and distress pervading the country from end to end. That is what he will find. I do not envy the hon. gentleman his feelings when he casts his eyes over the horizon of his country, and finds here and there spectres gaunt with famine and distress; poverty where wealth existed before; hunger where plenty was known. I sympathise with the hon. gentleman when he feels that had he addressed himself like a statesman to meet the emergency as my hon. friend has met it, the prosperity we enjoyed when he took office would be enjoyed now. There are spectres, but they are not spectres of which my hon. friend the Finance Minister need be afraid, and if his policy is what I believe it is, and if it has the effect in Canada it had before, he will have nothing to regret. We are told that it is un-British. When did it become un-British? How did Great Britain attain the position of prominence and distinction she occupies as a manufacturing country? Was it by a Free-trade policy? Was it by unnecessary expenditure and deficits that all the interests of the country were

allowed to become impoverished! No. It was by protecting and fostering the industries of the country, by developing the great resources Providence had given to the country, that she became so great and prosperous. When she followed that policy long enough to be enabled to bid defiance to the world she changed her policy, believing that the example she was giving would be followed by other countries. Unfortunately for England that policy was not followed by other countries, and the most thoughtful men, the most able statesmen, the most distinguished men in commercial circles, are to-day turning their attention seriously to the question as to whether, in adopting that policy of free trade, England had not made a mistake, and as to whether it might not well, at no distant day, be re-considered. They say it is not British. But I say it is eminently British. From what source do we find the industries of Canada paralysed? Is it from competition with England? No. That is fair and legitimate competition—a competition in which we have the protection of 3,000 miles of sea. That which breaks down the industries of Canada is the policy of unfair, unjust and illegitimate trade on the part of our American neighbours who have their own market for themselves, and can afford to send their surplus products over here, at slaughtering prices knowing that, when they have thus stamped out Canadian industries, they can put up the price and recoup themselves. What about the iron industry? Every person who knows anything about the subject is aware that Providence has given us, not only magnificent mines of iron and coal, inexhaustible and of the best quality, for the manufacture of iron in close proximity to the iron deposits. The moment that interest was established, and British and Canadian capital was invested in that industry—the moment Americans found that American iron was being driven out of this market—they sent their agents here to ascertain at what price iron could be bought. They said, “We can supply you with iron equal in quality and at less cost than you can obtain it elsewhere.” It is, indeed, well known that the agents came here and stated, whatever was the price of iron

in Canada, they would supply it at ten per cent. less. That was not from a charitable disposition, or a desire to promote the prosperity of Canada, but from a desire to crush our industries, and enrich themselves after our industries were destroyed. Under these circumstances it is not strange that the idea should force itself upon the minds of members of the Government, looking to the prosperity of the country, “it is necessary, not that we should adopt a hostile attitude against our neighbours, but that we should pay them the compliment of saying that their policy is so wise and just that we are disposed to follow it.” I believe the result of the imposition of a duty on coal will be to bring about free trade in that article between the two countries. Nova Scotia coal, which formerly was largely shipped to New York and Boston markets, was shut out by a duty of 75 cents per ton. Was not free trade to be expected as the natural result, when the Americans find Canada declaring that if they shut Nova Scotia coal out of the market of the Eastern States, we must adopt a policy of protection to our own industry as they were protecting theirs, and give Nova Scotia coal owners the Ontario market. I believe within two years from the adoption of the National Policy—not a policy of hostility to the United States, but one of following the system they had adopted to foster their industries—they will give us a free market for coal in the United States. While adopting measures to meet the Government of the United States by a tariff somewhat analogous to their own, and to protect the mining, manufacturing and agricultural interests of Canada against the unfair competition of our neighbours across the lines, my hon. friend the Finance Minister also proposes to insert in the Bill the statement that when the Americans shall reduce their tariff on these natural products we will reduce ours to the same extent, and that when they wipe out the duties altogether, we will admit their products free. At no distant day we shall enjoy all the advantages which we possessed under the Reciprocity Treaty. I believe, in the interests of Ontario, it is a wise policy to develop the coal industry of Nova Scotia. That Province is our important part of the

Dominion, and twelve million dollars of capital invested in coal mines cannot lie dead and unremunerative without inflicting great injury on the whole country. Nova Scotia has common interests with the other Provinces, and contributes to the general revenue, and it is, therefore, the duty of Parliament to adopt all legitimate measures to promote and foster its industries. What would be the effect of pursuing a contrary course? In the present state of the labour market in the United States, coal can be produced at exceedingly low prices, and if the Nova Scotia coal industries are not fostered they will be crushed out, and the people so employed will go to swell the ranks of those engaged in building up that great country to the south of the line. Send your own people to populate the United States and what happens? When the coal industries of Nova Scotia are destroyed, the Americans will raise the price of coal to the people of Ontario and they will have to pay it. And why is not coal a legitimate subject for taxation? Do you not tax cloth, hats, boots, and indeed everything that the poor man consumes? You are willing to tax sugar 50 per cent. and impose heavy duties on tea and coffee. And where can you draw the line between fuel and the other necessaries of life? My hon. friend the Finance Minister has reduced the duties on the necessaries of life by \$400,000 a year. He has decreased the expenditure for the year by about \$500,000, taking into account the Sinking Fund and interest on the additional debt that was required. The hon. member for Centre Huron objected to the iron industry being fostered in the manner proposed. The hon. gentleman objects to coal being fostered in the same way. Does he not know that the history of the world shows that every country that possesses coal and iron has risen to greatness just in proportion as it has developed those industries. This I know, that, in England and Belgium, where coal and iron abound, the progress of those countries is indicated as by a barometer, and has risen just in proportion to the output of the coal and the development of the iron mines. The coal industries of the country will not only be benefited by protection, but the very fact that these industries are pro-

motored,—that there is an increased demand for the coal,—will lower its cost for consumption to every person who requires to use it. If a mine has a capacity for an output of 100,000 tons of coal, and there is only a demand for 30,000, it will cost the miner \$1.50 a ton to put that coal at the pit's mouth, whereas if there was a larger demand he could bring it out at a better profit for \$1.25. So, looking at what nature has endowed this country with these deposits of coal and iron, I believe that a wiser and more judicious policy, could not be contemplated than the policy under which these great industries are to have fair play, and to have the same consideration that all other industries are entitled to. I did not intend to prolong these observations for two reasons, first, because it is not necessary as the hon. gentleman, as I have already said, in his somewhat rambling speech, managed to knock down all the men of straw he considered he had set up, and left little for me to demolish. But there is one thing I must refer to, and that is the denunciation of my hon. friend for allowing duties to be paid in anticipation of this tariff. Does he forget that he was so anxious to get money paid in, in anticipation of the duties of 1874, that he actually put it in the Governor's Speech?

Mr. MACKENZIE: What did you do?

Mr. TUPPER: The circumstances were entirely different.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER: Hear, hear! Does not the hon. gentleman know that for three long years we have been saying from these benches that the tariff would be reconstructed in this sense the moment we came into power? Does he not know that, from one end of the country to the other, we have openly put it before the country as a question of public policy from which there was no escape, that either this country must go to ruin, or that there must be a radical reconstruction of the tariff? But when there was no such expectation, when no man in this country dreamed of a deficit except himself—and he did not dream of it, because he had the evidence to the contrary before his eyes—the hon.

gentleman, knowing that, and having that knowledge within himself, put into the Governor's Speech the announcement that startled every man in this country, and drove them, with a rush, to the Custom-houses. And, yet, he has been denouncing my hon. friend of being guilty of a great moral turpitude, for declaring to this country that we intended to make this change in its fiscal affairs. I have but one remark more to make, and I sit down. I did not believe that any party necessity, that any feeling of jealousy of the gentleman who had gone before him, or of the gentleman who came after him in the administration of the Government, could have induced the hon. gentleman to invite the hostile action of the United States. I say the language the hon. gentleman used—the language that he unfairly, unpatriotically, and dishonestly used, because, Sir, it is not true—I say that language was unworthy the mouth of any Canadian statesman. I say that declarations on the floor of the Parliament of Canada, going to-morrow morning down to New York and Washington, that we are at the feet of the Americans—the declarations that we are as clay in the hands of the potter, that we live by their favour, that they have it in their power to adopt a policy that will crush us—I say that that was an unpatriotic statement, and I repeat that it is not true. We have one-half of this Continent, and not the worst half of it either. We have a country of divers resources of the most varied character. We have the great granary of the world, for a finer granary does not exist than the great Northwest; and with this great and magnificent country and all its enormous resources, were we to assent to the view of the hon. gentleman, we would be unworthy the name of freemen, of the British origin of which we all pride ourselves—we would be unworthy of numbering among our people that great nationality descended from old France, having the same energy of character that has rendered France today one of the most prosperous countries—and under the protective system—that has ever been seen. The hon. gentleman deploras the different nationalities and the different religions. Why, it is that which makes a country great. I say that this country is a greater country,

MR. TUPPER.

because there is a different race and a different language and a different religion. It has been found in all countries that nothing tends to stimulate the progress and prosperity of a country, and to develop all its institutions, whether civil or religious, more than a natural rivalry among freemen that is to be found in such a country as this. Under these circumstances, I trust never to hear from the mouth of any Canadian statesman, in this House or out of it, the unpatriotic declaration that this great country of ours occupies so humiliating, so degrading a position as that which the language of the hon. gentleman indicated.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am not at all surprised, Sir, at the speech of the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Tupper). The hon. gentleman is remarkable alike for the energy of his speech and the energy of his statements. It is to me a most humiliating spectacle to find a large majority of the representatives of the people rejoicing at the prospect of an immediate and large increase in the taxation of the country. It is a humiliating spectacle to find so large a body of intelligent gentlemen as are now assembled, representing Canada, taking up the cast-off clothing of older nations and wearing it, in adopting a policy that has ruined other countries, and rejecting a policy that has made the Mother Country great and prosperous beyond all precedent. And, Sir, it is amazing that such an exhibition could have been presented in an intelligent country in a position of observing, as we are in a position of observing, the results of Protection in the neighbouring country. The hon. gentleman, in commencing his speech to-night, referred to various matters in connection with the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Cartwright). To some of these remarks, I propose to confine myself this evening. The hon. gentlemen referred, in the first place, to what had taken place in 1874, and I need not say that the hon. gentleman, in referring to that, has but reiterated the remarks which we have heard during every Session. He has constantly alleged that there was then no prospect of a deficit; that the revision of the tariff in 1874 was wholly unnecessary, although it has been proved to him, time

and again, that that revision was absolutely necessary to prevent a deficit of over a million of dollars. The hon. gentleman says that this deficit was created by wrongly charging certain expenditure on railways to revenue which ought to have been charged to capital. We take the ground that, after the railway was completed, everything in connection with the running of that railroad ought afterwards to be charged to revenue and not to capital, and, therefore, the half million which is alleged to have been wrongly charged to revenue, was properly charged against revenue during that year. The hon. gentleman seems to think that, because he happened to be in power for a few years when there was an abnormal expenditure of money in the country, when we had excellent crops, when the country had all the benefits of an enormous sale of all its products to the United States, which country was almost depleted of all its stock, all its agricultural resources were exhausted during the long war,—the hon. gentleman seems to think that, because adventitious circumstances occurred during those years, he and his colleagues are entitled to the credit of having created a prosperity which they had no more to do with than those who were then in opposition. The hon. gentleman, on the other hand, says that, wherever deficits exist, they prove the incapacity of the Government of the day, and the hon. gentleman to-night amused me by pointing out a distinguished statesman, a personal friend, no doubt, of both of us, Sir Alexander T. Galt, as a man who held the views which he is now propounding to the House, though I doubt much if he has any warrant for making such statements as that. But, assuming that Sir Alexander T. Galt did represent those views, admitting that the policy he pursued as Finance Minister was the same which the hon. gentleman says he holds now, what were the results of that policy? It is well known that, when Sir Alexander T. Galt was Finance Minister, from 1858 up to the time of the Union, in the first year, there was a deficit of \$1,500,000; in the second year, a deficit of \$1,973,000; in the third year, \$1,999,000; in the fourth year, \$2,000,000. The hon. gentleman who is now the leader of the Govern-

ment was then the leader of the Government, or one of the leaders of the Government, during the whole of that time; and, if it be true, if it be a correct political axiom, that any Government which has a deficit on its hands is incapable, I advise the hon. gentleman to apply the term to his colleague, who, in five or six years, ran up a debt of \$10,000,000, at the very time when, by his own statement to-night, he had a policy in operation which he is urging us to-night to adopt as the only proper thing for the occasion. I may refer, however, to something that may come home, perhaps, a little closer to the hon. gentleman himself—that is, if it is possible, which I greatly doubt, to bring anything home to him at all. The hon. gentleman has indulged to-night in some taunts to my hon. friend from Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright), because some changes were made in the tariff of 1874, after being presented to the House. Does the hon. gentleman not remember—do not any of the Nova Scotia gentlemen in the House remember—that, in 1870, when the then Finance Minister brought down his tariff in the afternoon at four o'clock, the same gentleman who has just been addressing the House, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, set to work and got up a cabal in the evening between six and half-past seven o'clock, and this cabal of some Eastern Province members compelled the Finance Minister to come down and move to the right-about-face later in the evening. And yet he has the assurance to mention with disapprobation the willingness of my hon. friend (Mr. Cartwright) to make certain changes in his tariff in 1874, thinking, apparently, that we have all forgotten the events of that remarkable evening. But the hon. gentleman says that the true policy is propounded for promoting the prosperity of this country; he says that a protective policy is the one thing needful in order to make the nation great and glorious, and he has pictured to himself and to the House a great and magnificent country, flourishing and prosperous with Protection. He says we have the best half of the continent; I only wish it were true. But the statement is rather an extensive one for the hon. gentleman to make.

Everyone knows, at least I supposed everyone knew, that we have the worst half of the continent. We have a very good country, which we can make something of, but not by such exaggerated statements, which only make us the laughing-stock of other people. Does the hon. gentleman forget that, in 1870, when the National Policy was first born—born prematurely—and presented to this House, who were its opponents, and who were its friends? We remember that, when the duty was put on coal and flour, in one year, 1870, the very men who introduced the system of taxing bread and fuel came down, after a year's experience, and, by their own votes, voted it out of existence. As I have often told the hon. gentlemen, they murdered their own child, and yet, now, when it suits the political exigencies of the times, the hon. gentleman is up again to enlogise in 1879 what, in 1871, he denounced, and by his votes, as recorded on the Journals, declared to be a policy which did not suit Canada, and ought to be abolished. These are the sort of men who are now charged, unfortunately, with the administration of affairs in this country, and they endeavour to picture to the country and to this House the glorious era of prosperity which is to be inaugurated by an immense system of taxation. It is incredible to me how anyone in his senses can imagine that a country is to become great by the imposition of taxes. The hon. gentleman said that my hon. friend, the member for Centre Huron, could not logically allege, on the one hand, that the system inaugurated here to-night would make a comparatively small number of manufacturers rich at the expense of the working classes of the country, and at the same time, in another part of his speech, declare that the system would ruin the manufacturers. I think, Sir, that both statements are true and provable, beyond a doubt. The protectionist system of the United States was inaugurated before the war, or just when the war was commencing. All the men available were sent to the war, labourers became scarce, and wages rose high. Everyone had an abundance of money. Between four and five thousand millions of dollars were spent during that terrible struggle. The country was depleted of men and materials of every

kind, and just then the Protectionist policy was brought into play; but how long did it last? From 1862 to 1870 it undoubtedly enriched a number of manufacturers; but the prosperity which was partly accidental and partly owing to a Protectionist policy—the effects, of which will be always shown in this manner—reached its culminating point in 1870. Then it began to decline, and before 1877 more than two-thirds of the whole manufacturing class of the United States were ruined; more than a half of the iron blast furnaces were closed, and more than a hundred million dollars was lost in that one interest in those few years. No doubt the country was exceedingly prosperous in those few years; and no one can now deny that the most extensive misery has prevailed through the manufacturing classes in the cities of the United States since 1873. In New York and its suburbs, I was told, by one of the officials, that there were 80,000 men out of work. What gave rise to the Communistic movement in Pittsburg and the great manufacturing centres of Pennsylvania? Was it not that the Protectionist policy had reduced the people to beggary; that their employers had been ruined by it; that employment could not be found, and that they thought, as a mob thoughtlessly will sometimes, that the only remedy was an equal distribution of property, that assailing the rights and property of the rich was the way to obtain a share for themselves of what was enjoyed by some classes in the country. In this new country, I had fondly hoped to be able to look forward to see an earnest desire to follow the path of the Mother Country, and thereby become a prosperous community, a great and powerful nation in connection with the Mother Country. I had hoped to see our country follow in the wake of the land which has shown such an example to the world of the immense benefits to be derived from freedom in trade and commerce. But it seems, Sir, that we have a certain class of politicians here who seek to obtain power, not for the purpose of using that power for the benefit of the nation, but for personal aggrandizement and selfish purposes. Every candid man will admit, and I am sure the hon. the Minister of Public Works, in his cool

moments, speaking to himself, will also admit, that no Government can be held responsible for the depression which will occur in commercial affairs, from time to time, and that no commercial system can avert such calamities. There are periods when some mysterious influences seems to creep over the whole commercial community, and I am sure that those who remember the events of 1856, 1857, 1858, and 1859, will remember how much more serious the depression was in Canada then than it has been during the last four or five years. What was the policy then of the Liberal party? Is anyone able to point to a single speech of myself or of my colleagues, or of the then leaders of the party with which we are connected, which can be tortured into an accusation against the Government of the day that they were responsible for the commercial depression that overshadowed the country. The hon. gentleman knows very well, and everyone should be ready to admit it, that it is the duty of the Government, under such circumstances, to consider not what would have the appearance of obtaining a sufficient revenue, or of encouraging, as he says, certain industries, but what is the best policy to be pursued with reference to the whole mass of the people. At a time when employment is scarce and money not plentiful, is it not desirable to make everything as cheap as possible to the poorer classes? We felt that it was not our duty to impose additional taxation—whether it was the interest of our party or not, is another matter. The hon. gentleman has taunted us with not seeing that it was our interest. I never failed to perceive that it was possible to secure the conciliation of certain manufacturers by imposing protective duties two or three years ago; but, Sir, I would rather go out of Parliament, as well as out of power, than adopt a principle so affecting the near, as well as the remote, interests of my country. The hon. gentleman was a Protectionist in 1870, denounced Protection in 1871, and in 1874 denounced us on the ground that we were introducing the thin end of the wedge of Protection. In 1876, as he admitted to-night, he was prepared to denounce us if we introduced a protective policy. But, as it turned out, he was

equally prepared to denounce us because we did not. The hon. gentleman stated to-night that a member of the Government telegraphed to his paper in Prince Edward Island, that certain changes were to be made in the tariff.

MR. TUPPER: I said it was a telegram sent to a paper owned by a member of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then, Sir, I would advise the hon. gentleman not to make such rash statements in future. I have had the paper in question examined, and am informed there is no such telegram in it during that month. Then it seems that the statement appeared in the *Globe*, and, because the correspondent of a paper in Toronto sends a telegram, containing news, no doubt, picked up on the streets, the Government, and the whole Government party, is to be charged with it. Is this the character of statements to be made by a gentleman who has always claimed to be a statesman? It was perfectly well known to my colleagues as well as myself, that there was no foundation for the statement. Everyone knew there was a deficit, and, probably, expected that some legislation would take place to meet it. The hon. gentleman is to-day blaming us upon such evidence with having foretold what our policy was, and, at the same time, defending what has taken place. Now, when it is shown that the Finance Minister made known, weeks ago, his scheme of taxation, then, Sir, in order to get quit of the blame and inconsistency with which he is saddled in this matter, he says the circumstances are different; that every person knew that there was to be a change at present. Well, how did every person know? How could it be possible that every person knew? I ask any of the gentlemen here who have traced the history of the hon. gentleman, his leader and his colleagues during their whole political life—I ask if anyone could be certain of that promise until it was performed? Now, I tell the hon. gentlemen that I was very sceptical indeed about their intention to bring down the sort of tariff that has been brought down, and I am quite sure that, if they had failed to bring it down, I would have been no more disappointed than I am that they have brought it

down, and I believe that is the general feeling throughout the country. Why, Sir, you could not meet a man on the street without his putting the question: "Well, do you really think they will do anything?" One would say: "My impression is, that they will raise the duty to 20 per cent., and that they will put a special tax upon a few articles, but further than that they will not go." Well, Sir, it seems they have gone the whole hog.

MR. MILLS: The whole elephant.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, the whole elephant; I beg the elephant's pardon. I was somewhat amused to-night, Sir, when the hon. gentleman opposite passed a compliment upon a distinguished statesman to whom we have both alluded. I think he is a distinguished statesman, and I have the very highest personal regard for that gentleman; but I could not help remembering that that gentleman a few years ago, who is so distinguished now as a statesman in the estimation of the Minister of Public Works, propounded the theory that it was high time that Canadians should manage their own diplomatic affairs. I had the honour of supporting him in that movement, and I recollect well a gentleman opposite denounced him as entertaining a doctrine that, from a colonial point of view, was not to be entertained for a moment. It was to be productive only of a feeling inconsistent with our colonial relations, and lead to independence absolutely. But, Sir, time passed on; circumstances changed, and it became convenient for gentlemen opposite to change also; so they sent this same gentleman on a diplomatic mission. Such is a specimen of the political tergiversation of hon. gentlemen opposite. We all remember that that gentleman declined to go on a mission with certain other gentlemen opposite, for what reason he has not explained to me, though possibly he has to them.

MR. MILLS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Cumberland says the moment we came into office, speaking of the tariff and the system of taxation which the then Government had inaugurated, we pulled down a noble edifice. Well,

MR. MACKENZIE.

Sir, the noble edifice was their own tariff. He was speaking in connection with the sugar duties; and he is under the impression, for he stated it in his speech, that, after undertaking to deal with the sugar duties in 1874, we only made a small but mischievous change. The hon. gentleman forgets, and I am sure he ought to know, and I am sure he will find by looking at the books, we made no change at all. There was no change whatever made, but it seems we pulled down the noble edifice of sugar duties they had left us and brought ruin on the refineries.

MR. TUPPER: If the hon. gentleman will ask his colleague he will tell him that he did make a change.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: None in 1874.

MR. MACKENZIE: We made no change in 1874; but afterwards, acting upon power contained in the Customs Acts, we reduced the duty on a certain class of sugars 25c. per 100lb. There was no change made at the time in the tariff. I was about to explain what he, no doubt, alluded to, and I merely mention it to show that the statements made by the hon. gentleman are sometimes inaccurate. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the moment this change was made in 1874, when no change at all was made, the price of sugar went up a cent a pound because the refineries stopped; and that, from the time the refineries stopped in Canada, sugar went up. Now, the refineries did not stop for two years after that, and the refiners had not made any of this class of sugars for two years before that, so no possible effect could have taken place from that cause; and, besides that, the price of sugar did not go up; the price of sugar went down. So the hon. gentleman is wrong in every particular. He is absolutely without a shadow of foundation for any of the statements that have been made. Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose, for a moment, to revert to the hon. gentleman's statement concerning the coal duties. The hon. gentleman says that there is no reason why coal should not be taxed, and he gave as a reason why it should be taxed that we had already taxed blankets and the clothing of the poor; and that, because

we had taxed some things already, it was right and proper and just that we should tax everything they wore or eat. Why, Sir, I imagined that there were two things in our cold climate that were essential to human life—that is : food and warmth. Now, Sir, in the great cities of Ontario—for some of them are getting to be great cities—in the city of Toronto, for instance, almost the entire fuel of the population is coal. The winter is not so long there, doubtless, as it is in Montreal and Quebec ; but in all these cities the price of coal is a very material factor in every household. And I say it is, apart from all other considerations, one of the most cruel enactments that ever a Government was guilty of preparing. Anything that taxes the absolute necessities of life is, in principle, wrong. It may be sometimes unavoidable that some articles—such as fruit—should be taxed ; articles such as rice, sago, and that species of food, have always been more or less taxed. It may be unavoidable that such articles should be taxed to a certain extent, but these are not the prime necessities of life. To tax flour and breadstuffs of all kinds ; to tax coal upon the supposition that hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted, that it will raise the price of these articles ; if that is true, then it is wrong legislation, it is a cruel enactment, and one that will touch most nearly the poor in winter. I believe, in a very large proportion of the Dominion, that the tax on flour will produce no effect, though, in some districts, a great hardship. I believe that the tax upon grain, upon nearly every kind, will only produce this effect—that it will destroy our carrying trade, and it will shut up our oatmeal and wheat mills. Hon. gentlemen will say that this will not affect the carrying trade, as grain and flour can be carried in bond.

MR. TILLEY : Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE : My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says "Hear, hear." Now, I am sure that the hon. gentleman has not studied this subject. It is impossible he could have studied it, or he would not have made that remark in disapproval of my statement. My hon. friend must know this : that, within the

last two or three years, a prodigious change has taken place in the transportation of grain to the interior of this continent. Now, we have railroads doing an amount of business they were incapable of doing some years ago. We know that even now it is very nearly impossible for us to carry even our share of the great traffic of the west. We find that, while the proportion is increasing enormously in the cases of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, that we have made practically no increase in the carrying trade which we have taken through our country. I am not absolutely certain about last year, but I am informed that there is a great decrease in it, although it was a year of great plenty. My firm conviction is that, if the slightest obstacle is placed in the way of the carrying trade, you destroy your hopes of revenue from your canals ; you destroy your hopes of building up a Canadian marine on the lakes ; you destroy your hopes of employment for hundreds and thousands of seamen ; you destroy the entire trade that results from a large and important navy engaged in commercial affairs on our inland waters. Hon. gentlemen have spoken about the importance of maintaining our shipping trade, and of having our ships sent abroad into every sea. I can understand the importance of foreign commerce, but I say this : that, if you mean to have any commerce at all, you must not begin by loading yourself down with weights that destroy commerce. The present First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Smith), a good Conservative, compared a Protectionist to a man who, about to run a race, loaded himself down by filling his jackets with stones in order that he might be properly weighted in the race. This is precisely what the hon. gentlemen are proposing to do with their tariff. They are imposing a duty on grains which pass through our country, they are imposing taxes upon everything that can be conceived of, and they expect, Sir, that everyone is to buy from us, and that we are to buy nothing from them ; that we can have a one-sided commerce. They are content to have Canada for the Canadians. I am content with no such limited sphere. I am satisfied that, by a free system of commerce, we can not only unburden ourselves of the difficulties with which

we have now to contend, but that we may maintain the carrying trade we have, and, if we adopt wise measures to that end, increase it. If we adopt serious measures to that end, I believe we can, not merely take the carrying trade on the lakes, but we can have a larger portion than we have now of the carrying trade at sea. Everyone must know, who has studied the subject, that, immediately after the United States adopted their protective policy, their marine progressed backwards. That, from that time, there has been a steady decrease in the American marine, not merely a relative decrease as compared with their increase of population, but an absolute decrease. Previous to then, the Americans were carrying 78 per cent. of the traffic from the great port of New York; they are not now carrying over 27 per cent.; while British ships, free from every restraint, with her harbours open to all nations, have taken the place of United States ships, even in American ports. Who does not know that the trade of the United States with Cuba, Venezuela, and indeed with all the States in South America, is actually carried on by British steamers, and at this moment the United States have only one steamer of their own plying from New York to South America, while English steamers are able to do all this trade. Is it because the people of the United States are less enterprising, less ingenious, than the people of England, that this is the case? No; it is because they have a protective tariff—a prohibition against purchasing vessels built in any other country, and because a protective policy has made native-built ships dear, thus preventing them from carrying on their own traffic. It is not the time now to discuss, in detail, the resolution which the Government has placed before the House, but I might call the attention of the Committee to some anomalies in that resolution. Everyone knows, who knows anything of the manufacture of flour, that $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of good wheat are required to make a barrel of flour; well, $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels at 15c. amounts to 67½c., while the tax upon flour is 50c. Is it intended there shall be a discrimination against the millers? How is it there is a larger tax put upon wheat than upon the flour?

MR. MACKENZIE.

An HON. MEMBER: Protection to the Americans.

MR. MACKENZIE: This, no doubt, must be intended, if we are to take the figures as they exist as an intimation to the millers that they are to receive no protection, as the difference, 17½c. per barrel, is quite enough to enable foreign millers, if the protection, as the hon. gentleman states, proves effective, to obtain a monopoly of the trade. I was quite gratified to find that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) was perfectly candid for once. He frankly confessed that Mr. Tilley's loan was a poor one, compared with the previous loan, by Mr. Cartwright, but asked us to consider the circumstances. I am willing to make all allowances for the circumstances, but what was the course of the hon. gentleman himself? Did he consider any circumstances? Did he not spend hours in denouncing, with the utmost virulence, the loans which men like Sir Francis Hincks declared to have been the best ever made? Was he not then willing to decry the credit of the country? He says my hon. friend, by his criticism of the loan, was injuring the credit of the country. Everyone knows the extreme ground taken by the hon. gentleman in all his violent speeches, even to the extent of imputing improper motives or actions to my hon. friend who contracted that loan. The hon. gentleman said that this last loan should have been obtained before this Government came into office, that we were without any money or means to meet our obligations. Far from it. We had all the money we wanted; we had the Imperial guarantee, the prospective Fishery Award, and we knew there could be no difficulty whatever to prevent the Finance Minister, whoever he might be, in November, from going to England to get a loan. I do not doubt that the Finance Minister did his best in raising this loan. I would scorn to take the ground taken by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) on every occasion in connection with previous loans, that the Ministers who made them had mismanaged them, and acted with improper motives. During the administration of the late Minister of Finance, he managed to reduce

the total expenditure from year to year, as everyone who took up the Public Accounts could see at a glance. He not only succeeded in carrying on the affairs of the country with a vastly increasing responsibility, and with no increased taxation worthy of mention, but also raised the credit of the country to a higher pitch than it had ever enjoyed. No man ever before obtained the same price for an English loan. We know that, while in 1877-78 the entire expenditure was only \$23,500,000, or a little over that in 1873-74, for the expenditure of which year the hon. gentlemen opposite were responsible, for it was within \$20,000 of this amount, although in 1877-78 we had to pay nearly a million and a quarter dollars of increased interest, and to discharge obligations of another character, in connection with the North-West, the Supreme Court, Administration of Justice in some of the Provinces, an expenditure, altogether, of nearly \$2,500,000, the actual expenditure for the same purposes as those for which the money was spent in 1873-74 was, instead of \$23,360,000, not over \$21,000,000 altogether, showing the immense economy practised by my hon. friend. Such attacks as were made upon him to-night are utterly baseless in fact. I may say, in connection with the tax upon cloth, which discriminates so directly against the poor man, that I knew of that tax eight weeks ago. I heard from a manufacturer who had been in Ottawa, that either 7½c. or 10c. per lb. was to be levied on such cloth. We find that rumour was correct. Wholesale merchants in Toronto came to know of it, and every person, apparently, who has had information of this serious change was put in the position of obtaining immediate credit for the payment of duties by the Finance Minister's intimation to the banks. I did not intend to speak at length to-night, and will deal with these subjects in detail when we go into Committee on them. It seems to be the policy of the Government to tax the poorer classes, on all articles, at a higher rate than the other classes, with the exception of brandy, champagne and sparkling wines. The better classes of fine cloth, which will cost from 12s. to 15s., sterling, per yard, will have an additional

rate of 6c. per yard, while the cheaper classes, weighing 14oz. per yard, selling at 50c. per yard, will have an additional rate of more than twice that amount. I have simply to say that the Protection introduced will, in my opinion, have the effect of degrading the working classes, building up the fortunes of a few manufacturers, and, in the course of a few years, ruining even those manufacturers, after they have accomplished the ruin of the working classes. The tariff is so arranged that the burden of taxation is placed upon those who are the least able to bear it. He said he had considered all interests; that there could be no just system of Protection which did not protect all classes alike. If everyone is protected alike, then we are so much the worse off by the cost of giving that protection. It is not possible to give protection to all, and the hon. gentleman knows it. I do not know what the views of the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald) are as to the Chinese, but I know his colleague (Mr. DeCosmos) is determined to exclude every Chinese labourer from the Pacific Province, and, if they excluded every foreign labourer from the United States and Europe, in order that our own labourers may have Canada for themselves, there would be some consistency in their policy. But, while they adopt a policy that makes everything dearer and invites foreign labourers, the Canadian labourer is not treated justly, and the Government are hypocritical in their pretensions.

Question put on the resolutions.

MR. MACKENZIE: We cannot allow it to be adopted in this way.

MR. TILLEY: The hon. gentleman will have every opportunity of discussion.

MR. HOLTON: Are these resolutions printed?

MR. TILLEY: They were placed in the printer's hands at three o'clock this afternoon.

MR. HOLTON: Surely the hon. the Finance Minister does not ask this House to take this motion without having seen

it—to take it *en bloc*. Probably the tariff scheme has been so much discounted that we would not lose much revenue by doing as he desires. We could not, with any respect for Parliamentary law, consent to two stages in a Money Bill being taken in one day.

MR. TILLEY : It has been done every Session.

MR. HOLTON : Never since Confederation ; we have never been asked to do it ; it would be inconceivable that we should be asked to amend a tariff in one resolution, making a host of changes. We are asked to adopt a resolution not yet printed, making a wholly new tariff. I suggest, if both sides are agreeable, that this resolution pass the Committee to-night, and be reported to the House. The Minister of Finance would then put it into operation for revenue purposes, but with the understanding that, when the resolutions come up for discussion on the question of concurrence, we shall have the same freedom of debate as if in Committee, and that the vote shall be taken on the propositions *seriatim*.

MR. MACKENZIE : There is this to be said, also—that hon. gentlemen opposite have not submitted this as a revenue, but as a Protection tariff, and are not entitled to as much consideration as is given the promoters of a revenue tariff merely. Surely the Finance Minister does not ask us to commit ourselves to a Protection policy in a moment.

MR. TILLEY : There is revenue in it as well as Protection.

MR. MACKENZIE : I do not believe it.

MR. TILLEY : I think we will satisfy the hon. gentleman that there is revenue in it.

MR. MACKENZIE : There is revenue in the coal tax. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tilley) has no right to the courtesy the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) proposes ; but, in order to show him how generous we can be, we adopt the suggestion.

MR. ANGLIN said only one particular resolution should, according to Parliamentary practice, be now adopted. He

MR. HOLTON.

did not know whether the adoption of one or a series was proposed.

MR. HOLTON : The resolution is very comprehensive, embracing all the changes in the Customs and Excise Laws. It would be better to come to some compromise that would enable the revenue to be collected from to-morrow morning.

MR. MACKENZIE : I desire it distinctly stated that there shall be the most perfect liberty to discuss all the propositions *seriatim*.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not think the hon. gentleman could claim that as a matter of right. The practice adopted by the Minister of Finance was quite regular. He had a right to move all the proposals in one resolution, and have them reported if the Committee chose, and enforce the new duties from to-morrow. The hon. leader of the Opposition had no right to make a special condition, unless the other side chose to agree.

MR. HOLTON said the right hon. gentleman was correct in one way, but he had no right to ask them to sit till a vote could be fairly and legitimately reached, on such a mass of propositions. There was no objection to the hon. gentleman putting his new tariff in force, on a report of the Committee, hon. members having a right to continue the discussion at the subsequent stages, as if the Chairman was presiding, instead of the Speaker.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not suppose the Finance Minister would object to that course, as a matter of convenience ; but he objected to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) insisting on it as a right, for none such existed.

MR. MACKENZIE : It must be a matter of right.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman could discuss every item when going into concurrence. Every item of the resolution could be moved against, beyond a doubt.

MR. HOLTON said they had frequently done this very thing. They had passed motions in Supply late at

night, with the understanding that the same freedom of discussion, as to speaking to the motion more than once, conversational debate, etc., should take place, on concurrence with the Speaker in the Chair, as they had when discussing in Committee. The advantage of discussing every item in Committee was very great indeed. They got on very much faster that way.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could not admit that there was any irregularity in the way of his hon. friend's resolution. He took it that the duties could be collected, and then afterwards the discussion could go on. He had no objection to every one of the items being called and discussed. He did not agree to it as a matter of right, but, as a matter of understanding, he had no objection.

MR. ANGLIN said there were a great many hon. members who would like to address themselves to the subject as a whole, and they would not have an opportunity of doing so unless there was an understanding to that effect when the Speaker took the Chair. Therefore, he thought there should be an understanding that discussion on concurrence should not be confined to any particular item.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : certainly.

Resolutions agreed to, and ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, as follows :—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal all Acts, and parts, or Schedules of Acts, and all Orders in Council imposing any duties of Customs upon goods, wares, and merchandise, or providing for the exemption of goods, wares, and merchandise from Customs duty, when imported into Canada, and to make the following provisions in lieu thereof.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient that the following articles shall be subject to the several rates of duties set opposite to each respectively :—

| | |
|---|------------|
| Acid, Sulphuric, half a cent per pound..... | ¼c. p. lb. |
| Acetic, twelve cents per Imperial gallon..... | 12c. |
| Muriatic and Nitric, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |

[But carboys containing acids shall be subject to the same duty as if empty.]

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Agricultural implements, not otherwise herein provided for, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles (six quart and twelve pint bottles to be held to contain one Imperial gallon) eighteen cents per Imperial gallon..... | 18 c. p. I. g. |
| Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks, or otherwise than in bottles, ten cents per Imperial gallon..... | 10 c. p. I. g. |
| Animals, living, of all kinds not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Artificial flowers, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. |
| Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, bound or in sheets, not being foreign reprints of British copyright works, nor blank account books, nor copy-books, nor books to be written or drawn upon, nor reprints of books printed in Canada, nor Bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books, six cents per pound..... | 6c. p. lb. |
| British copyright works, reprints of six cents per pound, and in addition thereto twelve and a half per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 6c. p. lb. & 12½ p. ct. |
| Bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn books, five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 5 p. ct. |
| Books, periodicals and pamphlets imported through the Post-office, for every two ounces in weight or fraction thereof, one cent..... | 1c. for 2oz. |
| Blank books, bound or in sheets, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Printed, lithographed, or copper, or steel plate bill-heads, cheques, receipts, drafts, posters, cards, commercial blank forms, labels of every description, advertising pictures or pictorial show-cards or bills, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. |
| Advertising pamphlets, one dollar per hundred..... | \$1 p. 100. |
| Maps and charts, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Printed music, bound or in sheets, six cents per pound..... | 6c. p. lb. |
| Playing-cards, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. |
| Book-binders' tools and implements, including ruling machines, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. |
| Billiard tables, without pockets, four feet six inches by nine feet, a specific duty of twenty-two dollars and fifty cents.... | \$22.50. |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------------------|
| On those of five feet by ten feet, a specific duty of twenty-five dollars..... | \$25. | Cheese, three cents per pound.. | 3c p. lb. |
| On billiard tables with pockets five feet six inches by eleven feet, a specific duty of thirty-five dollars | \$35. | Chicory, raw or green, three cents per pound | 3c. p. lb. |
| And of those of six feet by twelve, a specific duty of forty dollars | \$40. | Chicory, or other root or vegetable, used as a substitute for coffee, kiln-dried, roasted or ground, four cents per pound.. | 4c. p. lb. |
| And in addition thereto ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> ; each table to include twelve cues, and one set of four balls, with markers, cloths, and cases, but no pool balls | and 10 p. ct. | China and porcelain ware, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Brass, old and scrap; in bars, bolts and sheets; in wire, round or flat; on seamless drawn tubing and on plain, fancy tubing, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | Clocks, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 35 p. ct. |
| On manufactures of brass, not elsewhere specified, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | Coal, anthracite and bituminous, fifty cents per ton of two thousand pounds | 50c. p. ton. |
| <i>Breadstuffs, viz.:</i> — | | Coal tar and coal pitch, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| Barley, fifteen cents per bushel | 15c. p. bsh. | Cocoa-nuts, one dollar per hundred | \$1 p. 100. |
| Buckwheat, ten cents per bush | 10c. p. bsh. | Cocoa paste and chocolate, not sweetened, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Indian corn, seven and a-half cents per bush | 7½c. p. bsh. | Cocoa paste and other preparations of cocoa containing sugar, one cent per pound and twenty five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Oats, ten cents per bush | 10c. p. bsh. | Coffee, green, two cents per pound | 2c. p. lb. |
| Rye, ten cents per bush | 10c. p. bsh. | Coffee, roasted or ground, and all imitations of, and substitutes for three cents per pound.. | 3c. p. lb. |
| Wheat, fifteen cents per bush. | 15c. p. bsh. | Coke, fifty cents per ton of 2,000 pounds | 50c. p. ton |
| Pease, ten cents per bush.... | 10c. p. bsh. | Copper, old and scrap, in pigs, in bars, rods, bolts, ingots, sheets and sheathing, not planished or coated; copper wire, round or flat; and copper seamless drawn tubing, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| Beans, fifteen cents per bush. | 15c. p. bsh. | Cordage for ship's purposes, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| Buckwheat, meal or flour, one-fourth of one cent, per pound | ¼c. p. lb. | Cordage, all other, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Cornmeal, forty cents per barrel | 40c p. brl. | Copper rivets and burrs, and on all manufactures of copper not elsewhere specified, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. |
| Oatmeal, one-half cent per pound..... | ½c. p. lb. | Corks, and other manufactures of cork-wood or cork-bark, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Rye flour, fifty cents per barrel | 50c. p. brl. | <i>Cotton, manufactures of, viz.:</i> | |
| Wheat flour, fifty cents per barrel | 50c. p. brl. | On grey or unbleached and bleached cottons, sheetings, drills, ducks, cotton or canton-flannels, not stained, painted, or printed, one cent per square yard, and fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 1c. p. s. y. and 15 p. ct. |
| Sago flour, two cents per pound | 2c. p. lb. | On all cotton jeans, denims, drilling, bedtickings, gingham, plaids, cottons or canton flannels, ducks, and drills, dyed or coloured; cottonades, pantalon stuffs, and goods of like description, two cents per square yard and fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 2c. p. s. y. and 15 p. ct. |
| Brick, for building, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | On all cotton wadding, batting, batts and warps, carpet-warps, | |
| Brooms and brushes, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. | | |
| Butter, four cents per pound.... | 4c. p. lb. | | |
| Candles, tallow, two cents per pound | 2c. p. lb. | | |
| Candles, parafine wax, four cents per pound | 4c. p. lb. | | |
| All other candles, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |
| Carriages, waggons, railway cars and carriages, sleighs, wheelbarrows, and other like articles, 25 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. | | |
| Cement, raw or in stone from the quarry, one dollar per ton of thirteen cubic feet..... | \$1 p. ton. | | |
| Cement, burnt and unground, seven and a half cents per one hundred pounds..... | 7½c. per 100lb. | | |
| Cement, hydraulic or water lime, ground, including barrels, forty cents per barrel..... | 40c. per brl. | | |
| Cement, in bulk or in bags, nine cents per bushel..... | 9c. p. bush. | | |
| Cement, Portland or Roman, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| knitting yarn, hosiery yarn or other cotton yarns under number forty, not bleached, dyed or coloured, two cents per pound and fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> . | 2 c. p. lb. | Flax fibre, hackled, two cents per pound..... | 2c. p. lb. |
| And if bleached, dyed or coloured, three cents per pound and fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | and 15 p. ct. | Flax, tow of, scutched or green, one-half cent per pound. | ½c. p. lb. |
| On cotton warp, on beams, one cent per yard and fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 3c. p. lb. & 15 p. ct. | Flax seed, ten cents per bushel. | 10c. p. bsh. |
| On cotton seamless bags, two cents per pound and fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 1c. p. yd. & 15 p. ct. | Fruit, dried, viz : apples, currants, dates, figs, plums, prunes, raisins, and all other, not elsewhere specified, one cent per pound..... | 1c. p. lb. |
| On cotton shirts and drawers, woven or made on frames, and on all cotton hosiery, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 2 ct. p. lb. & 15 p. ct. | <i>Fruit, green, viz. :—</i> | |
| On cotton sewing-thread, on spools, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | Apples, forty cents per barrel.... | 40c. p. bl. |
| On cotton sewing-thread, in hanks, twelve and a-half per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, two cents per quart..... | 2c. p. qt. |
| On all clothing made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component part of chief value, including corsets, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 12½ p. ct. | Cherries and currants, one cent per quart..... | 1c. p. qt. |
| On all manufactures of cotton not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | Cranberries, plums and quinces, thirty cents per bushel..... | 30c. p. bsh. |
| Drain tile, and on drain pipes and sewer pipes, glazed or unglazed, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Grapes, one cent per pound..... | 1c. p. lb. |
| Earthenware and stoneware, brown or coloured, and Rockingham ware, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Peaches, forty cents per bushel. | 40c. p. bsh. |
| Earthenware, white, granite or iron-stone ware, and "C.C." or cream coloured ware, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | Oranges and lemons, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Electro plated ware (see plated ware.) | | Fruits in air-tight cans, including cans, three cents per pound if sweetened, and two cents per pound if not sweetened.. | 3c. p. lb. & 2c. p. lb. |
| Essences, viz : of apples, pear, pine-apples, raspberry, strawberry, vanilla, and other fruits, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon. and twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | \$1.90 p. Imp. gal. & 20 p. ct. | Fruits, preserved in brandy, or other spirits, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon..... | \$1.90 p. I.g. |
| Essential oils for manufacturing purposes, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | <i>Furs, viz :—</i> | |
| Excelsior for upholsterers' use, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Fur, skins, dressed, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. |
| Feathers, ostrich and vulture, undressed, fifteen per cent.; and dressed, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. & 25 p. ct. | Caps, hats, muffs, tippets, capes, coats, cloaks and other manufactures of fur, twenty five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. c. |
| Fire-brick, or tiles for lining stoves and furnaces, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Furniture, house, cabinet or office, thirty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 35 p. c. |
| Fish, fresh, salted or smoked, except fish free of duty as provided by the Treaty of Washington. one cent. per pound.... | 1c p. lb. | Gas, coal-oil or kerosene fixtures, or parts thereof, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. c. |
| Flax fibre, scutched, one cent. per pound..... | 1c. p. lb. | <i>Glass and Manufactures of, viz. :—</i> | |
| | | On carboys and demijohns, or pressed bottles, flasks and phials of every description; on telegraph and lightning-rod insulators, and on fruit jars and glass balls, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. |
| | | On lamp and gas-light shades, lamps and lamp chimneys, globes for lanterns, lamps and gas lights, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. |
| | | On ornamented, figured and enamelled stained glass, and stained, tinted, painted and vitrified glass, and stained glass windows, or figured, enamelled and obscured white glass, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. |

On common and colourless window glass, and on coloured glass not figured, painted, enamelled or engraved, twenty per cent. *ad valorem* 20 p. ct.
 On all other glass and manufactures of glass not herein otherwise provided for, twenty per cent. *ad valorem* 20 p. ct.

Gunpowder and other explosives, viz :

On gun, rifle and sporting powder in kegs, half kegs, or quarter-kegs and other similar packages, five cents per pound. 5c. p. lb.
 On cannon and musket powder in kegs and barrels, four cents per pound. 4c. p. lb.
 On canister powder, in pound and half-pound tins, fifteen cents per pound. 15c. p. lb.
 On blasting and mining powder, three cents per pound. 3c. p. lb.
 On giant powder, dualin, dynamite and other explosives in which nitro-glycerine is a constituent part, five cents per pound, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem* 5c. p. lb. & 20p. ct.
 On nitro-glycerine, ten cents per pound, and twenty per cent *ad valorem* 10c. p. lb. & 20p. c.
 Gutta-percha, manufactures of, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem* 25 p. ct.
 Hair, curled, twenty per cent. *ad valorem* 20 p. ct.
 Honey, bees', in the comb or otherwise, three cents per pound. 3c. p. lb.
 Hops, six cents per pound. 6c. p. lb.
 India rubber, boots and shoes, and other manufactures, twenty-five per cent *ad valorem* 25 p. ct.

Iron, and Manufactures of, viz :—

Pig, two dollars per ton \$2 per ton
 Old and scrap, two dollars per ton \$2 per ton
 In slabs, blooms, loops or billets, twelve and a-half per cent. *ad valorem* 12½ p. ct.
 In bars, rolled or hammered, including flats, rounds, and squares, band and hoop; sheet, smoothed or polished, coated or galvanised, and common or black; boiler and other plate; Canada plates or squares; nail and spike rods, and all other iron not otherwise provided for, seventeen and a-half per cent *ad valorem* 17½ p. ct.
 On rolled, round wire rods, in coils under half an inch in diameter, ten per cent. *ad valorem* 10 p. ct.

On iron rails or railway bars for railways or tramways, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem* 15 p. ct.
 On railway fish-plates, frogs, frog-points, chairs and finger-bars, seventeen and a-half per cent. *ad valorem* 17½ p. ct.
 On tin plates, ten per cent. *ad valorem* 10 p. ct.
 On iron and steel wire, not over number 18 wire guage, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem* 25 p. ct.
 On casting in the rough, twenty per cent. *ad valorem* 20 p. ct.
 On stoves and other finished castings, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem* 25 p. ct.
 On car-wheels, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem* 25 p. ct.
 On mill-irons and mill-cranks, and on wrought forgings, for mills and locomotives, or parts thereof, weighing 25 pounds or more, twenty per cent. *ad valorem* 20 p. ct.
 On locomotive engines and on stationary, fire or other steam engines and boilers, and on other machinery composed of iron, or of which iron is the component part of chief value, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem* 25 p. ct.
 On locomotive tires of steel or Bessemer steel in the rough, ten per cent. *ad valorem* 10 p. ct.
 On seamless drawn boiler tubing, ten per cent. *ad valorem* 10 p. ct.
 On bedsteads and other iron furniture and ornamental iron work, twenty five per cent. *ad valorem* 25 p. ct.
 On tinned, glazed or enamelled hollow-ware, of cast or wrought iron, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem* 25 p. ct.
 On hardware, viz : builders, cabinet makers, upholsterers, carriage makers, saddlers, and undertakers, including coffin trimmings of metal, thirty per cent. *ad valorem* 30 p. ct.
 On bolts, nuts, washers and rivets, thirty per cent. *ad valorem* 30 p. ct.
 On tacks, brads, and sprigs, thirty per cent. *ad valorem* 30 p. ct.
 On horse-shoes and horse-shoe nails, thirty per cent. *ad valorem* 30 p. ct.
 On iron wire nails, called "Points de Paris," thirty per cent. *ad valorem* 30 p. ct.
 On iron and steel screws, commonly called "wood screws," thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem* 35 p. ct.
 On scales, balances and weighing beams, thirty per cent. *ad valorem* 30 p. ct.
 On chain cables over half an inch in diameter, whether

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| shackled or swiveled, or not, five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 5 p. ct. |
| On nails and spikes, cut, half-a-cent per pound, and ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | $\frac{1}{2}$ c.p.lb.&10p.ct. |
| On nails and spikes, wrought and pressed, whether galvanized or not, three-fourths of a cent per pound and ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | $\frac{3}{4}$ c.p.lb.&10p.ct. |
| On composition nails and spikes and sheathing nails, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| On sewing machines, whole, or heads or parts of heads of sewing machines, two dollars each; in addition thereto, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | \$2.00 20 p. ct. |
| On jewelry and other manufactures of gold and silver, and on watches, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Jute, manufactures of, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| On lard, tried or rendered, two cents per pound..... | 2c. p. lb. |
| On lard, untried, one and a-half cents per pound..... | $1\frac{1}{2}$ c. p. lb. |
| On lead, old and scrap, and in pigs, bars, blocks, and sheets, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| Lead pipe, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| On lead, shot, and on all manufactures of lead not otherwise specified, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Leather board, three cents per pound..... | 3c. p. lb. |
| Leather, on boots and shoe counters made from leather board, half-a-cent per pair.... | $\frac{1}{2}$ c. p. pr. |
| Leather, sole, tanned but rough or undressed, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| On morocco skins, tanned, but rough or undressed, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| On sole leather and belting leather, tanned, but not waxed; and on all upper leather, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. |
| On leather, as above, dressed and waxed, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| On japanned, patent or enamelled leather, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| On all other leather and skins tanned, not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| On boots and shoes and other manufactures of leather, and on leather belting, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Lithographic stones, not engraved, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. c. |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Machine card clothing, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. c. |
| Malt, two cents per pound..... | 2ct. p. lb. |
| Marble, in blocks from the quarry, in the rough, or sawn on two sides only, and not specially shapen, containing fifteen cubic feet or over, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| Marble slabs, sawn on not more than two sides, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. |
| Marble blocks and slabs, sawn on more than two sides, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| On finished marble, and on all manufactures of marble not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| On meats, fresh or salted, except bacon and hams, on actual weight, as received in Canada, one cent. per pound..... | 1c. p. lb. |
| On bacon and hams, dried or smoked, two cents per pound | 2c. p. lb. |
| On other meats, not specified, two cents per pound..... | 2c. p. lb. |
| Mustard seed, unground, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. |
| Mustard seed ground, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Nuts of all kinds, except coconuts, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Ochres, dry, ground or unground, washed or unwashed, not calcined, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| Oils, coal and kerosene, distilled, purified or refined; naphtha, benzole and petroleum; products of petroleum, coal shale and lignite, not elsewhere specified, six cents per wine gallon..... | 6 c. p. gal. |
| Carbolic, or heavy oil used in making wooden block pavement, for treating wood for building, and railway ties, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. |
| Cod liver, medicated, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Lard, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Linseed or flaxseed, raw or boiled twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Neatsfoot, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Olive or salad, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Sesame seed, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Sperm, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Oil-cloth for floors, stamped, painted or printed, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Opium, crude drug, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------------|
| Opium, prepared for smoking, and all preparations of opium, five dollars per pound | \$5 p. lb. | Plaster of Paris, ground, calcined or manufactured, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Organs, Cabinet, viz :—On reed organs having not more than two sets of reeds, a specific duty of ten dollars; having over two and not over four sets of reeds, fifteen dollars; having over four and not over six sets of reeds, twenty dollars; having over six sets of reeds, thirty dollars; and in addition thereto, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> on the fair market value thereof. | \$10 \$15 \$20 \$30 10 p. ct. | Plated-ware, electro-plated and gilt of all kinds, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. |
| Paintings, drawings, engravings and prints, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Plates, engraved on wood, and on steel or other metal, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Paints and colours not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Plumbago, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> ; and on all manufactures of plumbago, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. 20 p. ct. |
| Paper pulp for paper-makers, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | Pomades, French, or flower odors preserved in fat or oil for the purpose of conserving the odours of flowers which do not bear the heat of distillation, when imported in tins of not less than ten pounds each, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. |
| Paper-hangings, or wall-paper, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | Printing presses of all kinds, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. |
| Paper of all kinds, not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Proprietary medicines commonly called patent medicines, or any medicine or preparation of which the recipe is kept secret, or the ingredients whereof are kept secret recommended by advertisement, bill or label, for the relief of any disorder or ailment, in liquid form, fifty per cent.; and all other, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 50 p. ct. 25 p. ct. |
| Paper envelopes and all manufactures of paper not otherwise specified, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. | Pumice stone, ground or powdered, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Paper, union collar cloth, in sheets, not shapen, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | Putty, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. |
| Paper mill, board and straw board, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | Quills, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Paper collars, cuffs and shirt-fronts, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. | Quinine, sulphate of, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Perfumery, including toilet preparations: Hair oils, tooth and other powders and washes, pomatums, pastes and all other perfumed preparations used for the hair, mouth or skin, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | Rice, one cent. per pound | 1c. p. lb. |
| Phosphor bronze, in blocks, bars, sheets and wire, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | Rice, flour, two cents per pound. | 2c. p. lb. |
| Pianofortes viz : On all square pianofortes, whether round cornered or not, not over seven oct ves, twenty-five dollars; on all other square pianofortes thirty dollars; on upright pianofortes, thirty dollars; on concert, semi-concert or parlour grand pianofortes fifty dollars; and in addition thereto ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | \$25 \$30 \$30 \$50 10 p. ct. | Salt (except salt imported from the United Kingdom, or any British possession, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries, which shall be free of duty), in bulk, eight cents per one hundred pounds; in bags, barrels and other packages, twelve cents per one hundred pounds | 8c. p. 100 12c. p. 100 |
| Pitch, coal and coal tar, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | Salt-petre, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| Plants, viz : Fruit, shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Sand paper, glass and emery paper, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. |
| | | Seeds, viz.: flower, garden, field and other seeds, for agricultural purposes, when in bulk or in large parcels, fifteen per cent.; when put up in small papers or parcels, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. 25 p. ct. |
| | | Seed, mustard, unground, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> ; ground, | 15 p. ct. |

twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*..... 25 p. ct.
 Shingles, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*..... 20 p. ct.
 Ships and other vessels, built in any foreign country, whether steam or sailing vessels, on application of Canadian register on the fair market value of the hull, rigging, machinery and all appliances, an *ad valorem* duty of ten per cent. 10 p. ct.
 Silk, in the gum, not more advanced than singles, tram and thrown organzine, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*..... 15 p. ct.
 Sewing silk and silk twist, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*..... 25 p. ct.
 Silk velvets and all manufactures of silk, or of which silk is the component part of chief value, not elsewhere specified, thirty per cent. *ad valorem*... 30 p. ct.
 Silver, German, in sheets, ten per cent. *ad valorem*..... 10 p. ct.
 Slate, for roofing, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*..... 20 p. ct.
 Slate slabs, square or special shapes, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*..... 15 p. ct.
 Slate mantels, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*..... 25 p. ct.
 School and writing slates, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*..... 25 p. ct.
 Soap, common brown and yellow, not perfumed, one cent per pound..... 1c. p. lb.
 Soap, castile and white, two cents per pound..... 2c. p. lb.
 Soap, perfumed or toilet, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.... 25 p. ct.
 Spelter, in blocks or pigs, ten per cent. *ad valorem*..... 10 p. ct.
 Spices, viz.: ginger and spices of all kinds (except nutmegs and mace), unground, twenty per cent.; ground, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*..... 20 p. ct.
 Spices, nutmegs and mace, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*..... 25 p. ct.
 Starch, including farina, corn starch or flour, and all preparations having the qualities of starch, two cents per pound... 2c. p. lb.
 Spirits and strong waters not having been sweetened or mixed with any article, so that the degree of strength thereof cannot be ascertained by Sykes' hydrometer, for every Imperial gallon of the strength of proof by such hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strength of proof, and for every greater or less quantity than a gallon, viz.: Geneva gin, rum, whiskey, and un-

enumerated articles of like kinds, one dollar and thirty-two and one-half cents per Imperial gallon; and on brandy, one dollar and forty-five cents per Imperial gallon in bulk... \$1.45 p. I. g.
 On "Old Tom" gin, one dollar and thirty-two and one-half cents per Imperial gallon in bulk..... \$1.32½ p. I. g.
 Spirits, sweetened or mixed, so that the degree of strength cannot be ascertained as aforesaid, viz.: Rum shrub, cordials, Scheidam, Schnapps, tafia, bitters and unenumerated articles of like kinds, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon..... \$1.90 p. I. g.
 On spirits and strong waters, not elsewhere specified, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon..... \$1.90 p. I. g.
 Spirits and strong waters imported into Canada, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients, and although thereby coming under the denomination of proprietary mediines, tinctures, essences, extracts, or any other denomination not elsewhere specified, shall be, nevertheless, deemed spirits or strong waters, and subject to duty as such, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon..... \$1.90 p. I. g.
 On Cologne water and perfumed spirits in bottles or flasks, not weighing more than four ounces each, forty per cent. *ad valorem*..... 40 p. ct.
 On Cologne water and perfumed spirits in bottles, flasks or other packages weighing more than four ounces each, one dollar and ninety cents per Imperial gallon and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*..... \$1.90 p. I. g. and 20 p. ct.
 Wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, including ginger, orange, lemon, strawberry, raspberry, elder and currant wines, containing twenty-six per cent., or less, of spirits of the strength of proof, Sykes' hydrometer, imported in wood or in bottles (six-quart and twelve-pint bottles to be held to contain an Imperial gallon), twenty-five cents per Imperial gallon; containing over twenty-six and not over thirty-one per cent., forty cents per Imperial gallon; containing over thirty-one and not over thirty-six per cent., fifty-five cents per Imperial gallon; containing over thirty-six and not over forty per cent., seventy

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| cents per Imperial gallon; in addition thereto, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | | |
| On champagne and all other sparkling wines in bottles containing each not more than a quart and more than one pint, three dollars per dozen bottles; containing not more than a pint each and more than one-half pint, one dollar and fifty cents per dozen bottles, containing one-half pint each or less, seventy-five cents per dozen bottles; bottles containing more than one quart each shall pay in addition to three dollars per dozen bottles at the rate of one dollar and fifty cents per Imperial gallon on the quantity in excess of one quart per bottle; in addition to the above specific duty on sparkling wines, there shall be an <i>ad valorem</i> duty of thirty per cent..... | \$3 p. doz. \$1.50 p. doz. 75c. p. doz. | | |
| But any liquors imported under the name of wine, and containing more than forty per cent. of the spirits of the strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer shall be rated for duty as unenumerated spirits. | \$1.50 per 1 g. for all over one qt. p. btl's. | | |
| Stationery of all kinds not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |
| Steel and manufactures of, viz.; steel in ingots, bars, sheets and coils, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | | |
| Shovels, spades, hoes; hay, manure and potatoe forks; rakes and rake teeth; carpenters, coopers, cabinet-makers, and all other mechanics' tools; edge tools of every description, including axes, scythes and saws of all kinds, and on steel skates, thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | | |
| On cutlery; on firearms, viz: Muskets, rifles, pistols and shot guns; and on all manufactures of steel, and of iron and steel, not otherwise specified, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |
| On knife blades or knife blanks, in the rough, unhandled, for use by electro-platers, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | | |
| Stereotypes and electrotypes of standard books, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | | |
| Stereotypes and electrotypes for commercial blanks and advertisements, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |
| Stone, viz: rough freestone, sandstone, and all other building stone, except marble, one dollar per ton of thirteen cubic feet..... | \$1 per ton. | | |
| Water limestone, or cement stone, one dollar per ton..... | \$1 per ton | | |
| Grindstone, in the rough, one dollar and fifty cents per ton.. | \$1.50 per ton. | | |
| On dressed freestone and all other building stone, except marble, and on all manufactures of stone and granite, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |
| Sugars, viz: on all sugar above number fourteen Dutch standard in colour, one per cent per pound and thirty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 1 ct. p. lb. & 35 p. ct. | | |
| On sugar equal to number nine and not above number fourteen Dutch standard, three-fourths of a cent per pound, and thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | $\frac{3}{4}$ ct. p. lb. & 30 p. ct. | | |
| On sugar below number nine Dutch standard, half-a-cent per pound and thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | $\frac{1}{2}$ ct. per lb. & 30 p. ct. | | |
| Provided, that the <i>ad valorem</i> duties shall be levied and collected on sugar and melado when imported direct from the country of growth and production, upon the fair market value thereof at the place of purchase, without any addition for the cost of hogheads or other packages, or other charges and expenses prior to shipment, anything contained in section 34 of the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 10, to the contrary, notwithstanding. | | | |
| On syrups, cane juice, refined syrup, sugar-house syrup, syrup of sugar, syrup of molasses or sorghum, five-eighths of a cent per pound, and thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | $\frac{5}{8}$ ct. p. lb. and 30 p. ct. | | |
| On melado, concentrated melado, concentrated cane-juice, concentrated molasses, concentrated beet-root juice, and concrete, three-eighths of one cent per pound, and thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | $\frac{3}{8}$ ct. p. lb. and 30 p. ct. | | |
| Molasses, if used for refining, clarifying, or rectifying purposes or for the manufacture of sugar when imported direct from the country of growth and production, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. | | |
| And for the same purposes when not imported direct from the country of growth and production thirty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 30 p. ct. | | |
| Molasses when not so used when imported direct from the country of growth and production, fifteen per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 15 p. ct. | | |
| And when not imported direct from the country of growth and production twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |
| Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery, one cent per pound, and thirty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 1 ct. p. lb. 35 p. ct. | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Glucose or grape sugar, to be classed and rated for duty as sugar according to grade by Dutch standard in colour. | | Lumber, and timber, not elsewhere specified, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. c. |
| Glucose syrup thirty-five per cent <i>ad valorem</i> | 35 p. ct. | Whips, made of cane, or leather, or both, twenty-five per cent. . | 25 p. c. |
| Tallow one cent per pound..... | 1 ct. p. lb. | Wool and woollens, viz.: Wool, unmanufactured, hair of the alpaca, goat and other like animals | Free. |
| Tea, viz.: on all black tea two cents per pound and ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 2 ct. p. lb. & 10 p. ct. | On manufactures composed wholly, or in part, of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animals, viz.: Shawls, blankets, and flannels of every description; cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings, cloakings, felt cloth, of every description; horse-collar cloth, yarn, knitting yarn, fingering yarn, worsted yarn under number 30; knitted goods, viz.: Shirts, drawers and hosiery of every description, seven and a-half cents per pound, and in addition thereto twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> ... | 7½ p. c. and 20 p. c. |
| And on all green and japan tea three cents per pound and ten per cent <i>ad valorem</i> | 3 ct. p. lb. & 10 p. ct. | On clothing ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress or manufacturer, except knit goods, ten cents per pound, and in addition thereto, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. c. and 25 p. c. |
| Tin in blocks, pigs, bars, plates and sheets ten per cent <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | On all manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animals, not herein otherwise provided for, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. c. |
| Tiaware stamped and japanned ware, and on all manufactures of tin not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. | On treble, ingrain, three-ply and two-ply carpets, composed wholly of wool, ten cents per square yard, and in addition thereto, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 c. p. sq. yd. & 20 p. c. |
| Tobacco, leaf or unmanufactured for excise purposes, free of duty..... | free | On two-ply and three-ply, ingrain carpets, of which the warp is composed wholly of cotton or other material than wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animals, five cents per square yard, and in addition thereto twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 5 c. p. sq. yd. & 20 p. c. |
| On manufactured tobacco and on snuff, twenty-five cents per pound, and in addition thereto twelve and a-half per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 ct. p. lb. and 12½ p. ct. | Zinc, in pigs, blocks and sheets, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. c. |
| On cigars and cigarettes, fifty cents per pound and twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 50 ct. p. lb. & 20 p. ct. | Seamless drawn tubing, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10. p. c. |
| Turpentine, spirits of, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | Manufactures of zinc not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. c. |
| Trunks, satchels, valises, and carpet-bags, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. ct. | | |
| Type, for printing, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |
| Type metal, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. ct. | | |
| Varnish not elsewhere specified, twenty cents per Imperial gallon and twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 ct. p. gal. & 20 p. ct. | | |
| Vegetables, viz.: On potatoes, ten cents per bushel..... | 10 p. bush. | | |
| On tomatoes, thirty cents per bushel..... | 30 p. bush. | | |
| And on all other vegetables twenty per cent <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. ct. | | |
| Vinegar, twelve cents per Imperial gallon | 12c. p. I. g. | | |
| Watches, watch movements and watch cases, 20 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. c. | | |
| Wire of brass and copper, ten per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 10 p. c. | | |
| Wire cloth of brass and copper, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> .. | 20 p. c. | | |
| Wood and manufactures of wooden ware, viz.:—Pails, tubs, churns, brooms, brushes and other manufactures of wood not elsewhere specified, twenty-five per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 25 p. c. | | |
| Hubs, spokes, fellos, and wheels, twenty per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 20 p. c. | | |

On all goods not enumerated in this Act, or any other Act as charged with any duty of Customs, and not declared free of duty by this Act, or some unrepealed Act or provision,— shall be charged with a duty of twenty per cent. *ad valorem*, when imported into Canada, or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the value of all bottles, flasks, jars, demijohns, carboys, casks, hogsheads, pipes, barrels and all other vessels or packages; manufactures of tin, iron, lead, zinc, glass or any other material, and capable of holding liquids; crates, barrels and other packages containing glass, china, crockery or earthenware, and all packages in which goods are commonly placed for home consumption, including cases in which bottled spirits, wines or malt liquor are contained, and every package, being the first receptacle or covering enclosing goods for purposes of sale, shall in all cases not otherwise provided for, in which they contain goods subject to an *ad valorem* duty, be taken and held to be a part of the fair market value of such goods for duty, and when they contain goods subject to specific duty only, such packages shall be charged with a duty of customs of twenty per cent. *ad valorem*, to be computed upon their original cost or value; and all or any of the above packages described as capable of holding liquids, when containing goods exempt from duty under this Act, shall be charged with a duty of twenty per cent. *ad valorem*; but all packages not hereinbefore specified and not specially charged with duty by any unrepealed enactment, and being the usual and ordinary packages in which goods are packed for exportation only, according to the general usage and custom of trade, shall be free of duty.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that on all goods imported into Canada, subject under this Act or any other Act to *ad valorem* duty, upon which a drawback of duties has been allowed by the Government of the country where the same were purchased, the amount of such drawback shall in all cases be taken and considered to be a part of the fair market value of such goods, and duty shall be collected thereon; and in cases where the amount of such drawbacks shall have been deducted from the value of such goods upon the face of the invoice under which entry is to be made, the Collector of Customs or proper officers shall add the amount of such deduction, and collect and cause to be paid the lawful duty thereupon, and the fair market value of all goods, wares and merchandise imported into Canada shall be understood to be the ordinary wholesale price at which the same are sold for home consumption in the country where they are purchased, without deduction of any kind, because of any drawback paid or to be paid thereon, or because of any special arrangement between the seller and purchaser, having reference to the exportation of such goods, or the exclusive right to territorial limits for the sale thereof, or because of any

royalty payable upon patent rights, but not payable when goods are purchased for exportation, or on account of any other consideration by which a special reduction in prices might or could be obtained: Provided that nothing herein shall be understood to apply to general fluctuations of market values.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that any or all of the following articles, that is to say:—Animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including pot toes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meat (fresh, salted or smoked), may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation, when imported into Canada.

6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that if at any time any greater duty of Customs should be payable in the United States of America on tea or coffee imported from Canada than on tea or coffee imported from any other country, then the Governor in Council may impose on tea or coffee imported into Canada from the said United States, an additional duty of Customs equal to the duty payable in the United States on tea or coffee imported from Canada: Provided that tea or coffee imported into Canada from any country, other than the said United States, but passing in bond through the United States, shall be taken and rated as a direct importation from the country wherein the tea or coffee was purchased.

7. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that an allowance may be made for deterioration by natural decay or breakage upon all perishable and brittle goods imported into Canada, such as green fruits and vegetables, crockery, china, glass and glassware, provided such damage is found to exceed twenty-five per cent. of the value thereof, upon an examination to be made by an appraiser or proper officer of Customs, at the first landing, or within three days of such landing; but such allowance shall be only for the amount of loss in excess of twenty-five per cent. of the whole quantity of such goods contained, or included in any one invoice; and provided the duty has been paid on the full value thereof, a refund of such duty may be allowed and paid in the proportion and on fulfilment of the conditions above specified, but not otherwise, on application to the Minister of Customs.

8. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that, in determining the dutiable value of mer-

chandise, there shall be added to the cost or the actual wholesale price, or fair market value, at the time of exportation, in the principal markets of the country from whence the same has been imported into Canada, the cost of inland transportation, shipment and transshipment, with all the expenses included, from the place of growth, production or manufacture, whether by land or water, to the vessel in which shipment is made, either in transitu or direct to Canada.

9. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council shall, from time to time, establish such regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be required to secure a just, faithful and impartial appraise of all goods, wares and merchandise imported into Canada, and just and proper entries of the actual or fair market value thereof, and of the weights, measures, or other quantities thereof, as each case may require, and such regulations, whether general or special, so made by the Governor in Council, shall have the full force and authority of law, and it shall be the duty of the appraisers of Canada and every of them, and every person who shall act as such appraiser, or of the Collector of Customs, as the case may be, by all reasonable ways and means in his or their power to ascertain, estimate and appraise the true and fair market value and wholesale price, any invoice or affidavit thereto to the contrary notwithstanding, of the merchandise at the time of exportation and in the principal markets of the country whence the same has been imported into Canada, and the proper weights, measures or other quantities, and the fair market value or wholesale price of every of them as the case may require.

10. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that no refund of duty paid shall be allowed because of any alleged inferiority or deficiency in quantity of goods imported and entered, and which have passed into the custody of the importer under permit of the Collector of Customs, nor because of the omission in the invoice of any trade discount, or other matter or thing, which might have the effect of reducing the value of such goods for duty, unless the same shall have been reported to the Collector of Customs within ten days of the date of entry, and the said goods shall have been examined by the said Collector, or by an appraiser or other proper officer of Customs, and the proper rate or amount of reduction certified by him after such examination, and if such Collector or proper officer reports that the goods in question cannot be identified as those named in the invoice and entry in question, then and in such case no refund of the duty or any part thereof shall in any case be allowed, and all applications for refund of duty in such cases shall be submitted with the evidence and all particulars for decision of the Minister of Customs, who may then order payment on finding the evidence to be sufficient and satisfactory.

11. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the following goods shall be exempt from duty when imported into Canada, viz :—

Agairé,
Agates, unmanufactured,
Alkanet root,
Aloes,
Aluminium,
Alum,
Ambergris,
Ammonia, crude,
Aniline dyes,
Aniline oil, crude,
Aniline salts,
Animals brought into Canada temporarily, and for a period not exceeding three months, for the purpose of exhibition or competition for prizes offered by any agricultural or other association. But a bond shall be first given in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs, with the condition that the full duty to which such animals would otherwise be liable shall be paid in case of their sale in Canada, or if not re-exported within the time specified in such bond,
Animals for the improvement of stock under regulations to be made by the Treasury Board, and approved by the Governor in Council
Annato, liquid or solid,
Annato, seed,
Anchors,
Antimony,
Ashes, pot, pearl and soda,
Apparel, wearing and other personal or household effects, not merchandise, of British subjects dying abroad, but domiciled in Canada,
Argal, dust,
Argals, crude,
Arsenic,
Arseniate of aniline,
Articles for the use of the Governor-General,
Articles for the use of foreign Consuls General,
Army and Navy, for the use of,
Army arms,
Army clothing,
Army musical instruments for bands,
Army military stores and munitions of war,
Bamboo reeds, no further manufactured than cut into suitable lengths for walking sticks or canes, or for sticks for umbrellas, parasols or sunshades,
Bamboos unmanufactured,
Barrels of Canadian manufactures exported filled with domestic petroleum and returned empty, under such regulations as the Minister of Customs may prescribe,
Barilla,
Bells for churches,
Berries for dyeing or used for composing dyes,
Bismuth,
Bolting cloths,
Bones, crude and not manufactured, burned, calcined, ground or steamed,
Bone-dust and bone-ash for manufacture of phosphates and other fertilisers,
Borax,
Botany, specimens of,
Bristles,
Brimstone, in roll or flour,

- Brim moulds for gold beaters,
 Bromine,
 Broom corn,
 Buchu leaves,
 Bullion, gold and silver,
 Burgundy pitch,
 Burr stones, in blocks, rough or unmanufactured, and not bound up into mill stones,
 Bichromate of potash,
 Carriages of travellers and carriages laden with merchandise, and not to include circus troupes nor hawkers, under regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs,
 Cabinets of coins, medals, and other collections of antiquities,
 Casts, as models for the use of schools of design,
 Cornelian, unmanufactured,
 Canvas for manufacture of floor oil-cloth, not less than forty-five inches wide, and not pressed nor calendared,
 Caoutchouc, unmanufactured,
 Cat-gut strings or gut cord for musical instruments,
 Cat-gut or whip-gut, unmanufactured,
 Chalk and cliff stone, unmanufactured,
 Chamomile flowers,
 Citrons, and rinds of, in brine, for candying,
 Clays,
 Clothing, donations of, for charitable purposes,
 Cobalt, ore of,
 Cochineal,
 Cocoa, bean, shell and ribs,
 Coins, gold and silver, except United States silver coin,
 Communion plate,
 Coir and coir yarn,
 Calcothar, or dry oxide of iron,
 Conium maculatum, or hemlock seed and leaf,
 Cotton waste and cotton wool,
 Cork wood or cork bark, unmanufactured,
 Colours, viz. :—Bichromate of potash, blue, black, Chinese blue, cantile lakes, scarlet and marine in pulp, Paris green, Prussian blue, satin and fine-washed white, ultra marine, amber, raw,
 Diamonds, unset, including black diamonds for borers,
 Diamond dust or bort,
 Dragons' blood,
 Duck for belting and hose,
 Dyeing or tanning articles, in a crude state, used in dyeing or tanning, not elsewhere specified,
 Earths,
 Eggs,
 Emery,
 Esparts, or Spanish grass, and other grasses, and pulp of, for the manufacture of paper,
 Extract of logwood,
 Felt, adhesive for sheathing vessels,
 Fire clay,
 Fibre, Mexican,
 Fibre, vegetable, for manufacturing purposes,
 Fibrilla,
 Fish bait,
 Fish oil and fish of all kinds, the produce of the fisheries of the United States (except fish of the inland lakes, and of the rivers falling into them, and fish preserved in oil),
 Fish-hooks, nets and seines, and lines and twines, for the use of the fisheries, but not to include sporting fishing-tackle or hooks with flies or trawling spoons,
 Fur, skins of all kinds, not dressed in any manner,
 Flint, flints, and ground flint stones,
 Folise digitalis,
 Fossils,
 Gentian root,
 Ginseng root,
 Gold-beaters' moulds and gold-beaters' skins,
 Grease and grease scrap, for manufacture of soap only,
 Gravels,
 Guano and other animal and vegetable manures,
 Gums, amber, arabic, Australian, British, copal, damar, mastic, sandarac, shellac and tragacanth,
 Gunny cloth and gunny bags,
 Gut, and worm gut, manufactured or unmanufactured, for whip and other cord,
 Gutta serena, crude,
 Gypsum (sulphate of lime),
 Hair, angola, buffalo and bison, camels, goat, hog, horse and human, cleaned or uncleaned, but not curled or otherwise manufactured,
 Hemlock bark,
 Hemp, undressed,
 Hides, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted or pickled,
 Hoops, horns and horn tips,
 Hioscyamus, or henbane leaf,
 Ice,
 India-rubber, unmanufactured,
 Indian hemp, crude, drug,
 Indigo,
 Iris, eris root,
 Lingglass or fish glue,
 Istle or tampico fibre,
 Ivory and ivory nuts, unmanufactured,
 Ivory veneers, sawn only, not planed nor polished,
 Iron masts for ships, or parts of,
 Iron cables, chain, over one-half of an inch, shackled or swiveled or not,
 Jalap, root,
 Junk, old,
 Jute, butts,
 Jute,
 Kelp,
 Kryolite,
 Lac, dye, crude, seed, button, stick and shell,
 Lava, unmanufactured,
 Leeches,
 Liquorice, root,
 Litharge,
 Lit us and all lichens, prepared and not prepared,
 Lemons and rinds of, in brine, for candying,
 Logs, and round unmanufactured timber, not otherwise provided for,
 Lumber, plank and boards, sawn, of boxwood, cherry, walnut, chestnut, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandalwood, Spanish cedar, oak, hickory and whitewood, not shaped, planed, or otherwise manufactured,
 Locomotives, and railway passenger, baggage and freight cars, being the property of rail-

- way companies in the United States, running upon any line of road crossing the frontier, so long as Canadian locomotives and cars are admitted free under similar circumstances in the United States, under regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs,
- Madder and mungeet, or Indian madder, ground or prepared, and all extracts of,
- Manilla grass,
- Medals of gold, silver or copper,
- Meerschaum, crude or raw,
- Mica and mica waste,
- Mineralogy, specimens of,
- Models of inventions and other improvements in the arts, but no article or articles shall be deemed a model or improvement which can be fitted for use,
- Moss, Iceland and other mosses, crude,
- Moss, seaweed, and all other vegetable substances used for beds and mattresses, in their natural state, or only cleaned,
- Menageries—horses, cattle, carriages, and harnesses of, under regulations to be prescribed by the Minister of Customs,
- Machinery for worsted or cotton mills, of kinds which are not manufactured in Canada,
- Nitrate of soda, or cubic nitre,
- Nut galls,
- Newspapers received by mail,
- Nickle,
- Oak bark,
- Oakum,
- Oil cake,
- Oils, cocconut and palm, in their natural state,
- Oil, carbolic or heavy oil used in the manufacture of wood-block pavement, and of wood for buildings and railroad ties,
- Oranges and rinds of, in brine, for candying,
- Ores of metals of all kinds,
- Osiers,
- Oxalic acid,
- Palm leaf, unmanufactured,
- Pearl, mother of, not manufactured,
- Persis, or extract of archill and cudpear,
- Philosophical instruments and apparatus, including globes, when imported by and for the use of colleges and schools, scientific and literary societies,
- Phosphorus,
- Felts,
- Pipe clay,
- Pitch (pine),
- Plaster of Paris, not ground or calcined,
- Pumice and pumice stone,
- Plaits, Tuscan and grass,
- Precipitate of copper, crude,
- Rags, of cotton, linen, jute and hemp, paper, waste or clippings, and waste of any kind, fit only for manufacture of paper,
- Rattans and reeds unmanufactured,
- Rennet, raw or prepared,
- Resin,
- Rhubarb root,
- Salt, imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries,
- Saffron and Safflower, and extract of,
- Saffron cake,
- Sal ammonia,
- Sal soda,
- Sand,
- Sea-weed, not elsewhere specified,
- Sea-grass,
- Senna, in leaves,
- Silex of crystallised quartz,
- Silk, raw or as reeled from the cocoon, not being doubled, twisted or advanced in manufacture any way, silk cocoons and silk waste,
- Skins, undressed, dried, salted or pickled,
- Soda ash,
- Soda, caustic,
- Soda, silicate of,
- Settlers effects, viz.: Wearing apparel, household furniture, professional books, implements and tools of trade, occupation or employment, which the settler has had in actual use for at least six months before removal to Canada, not to include machinery, or live stock or other articles imported for use in any manufacturing establishment, or for sale, provided that any dutiable article entered as settlers' effects shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of without payment of duty until after two years actual use in Canada,
- Sulphur, in roll or flour,
- Tails, undressed,
- Tampico, white and black,
- Tanner's bark,
- Tar (pine),
- Terra alba, aluminous,
- Terra, Japonica,
- Teasels,
- Tobacco, unmanufactured for excise purposes, under conditions of Act 31 Vic., cap. 51,
- Tortoise and other shells, unmanufactured,
- Turmeric,
- Turpentine, raw or crude,
- Turtles,
- Treenails,
- Travellers' baggage, under regulations to be prescribed, by the Minister of Customs,
- Vitriol, blue,
- Veneers of wood and ivory, sawn only,
- Verdigris, or subacetate of copper, dry,
- Vegetable fibres, natural, not produced by any mechanical process,
- Whiting or whitening,
- Whalebone, unmanufactured,
- Whale oil, in casks from on ship board, and in the condition in which it was first landed,
- Willow for basket makers,
- Wool,
- Yellow metal, in bolts, bars, and for sheathing.
- The following articles shall be prohibited to be imported under a penalty of two hundred dollars, together with the forfeiture of the parcel or package of goods in which the same may be found, viz.:—
- Books, printed papers, drawings, paintings, prints, photographs or representations of any kind of a treasonable or seditious, or of an immoral or indecent character,
- Coin, base or counterfeit.

12. Resolved, That in lieu of all excise duties, except license fees, now or heretofore imposed on spirits, there shall be imposed, levied and collected upon every gallon, of the

strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength of spirits, the manufacture of which has not been wholly completed, or upon which the duty has not been paid before the passing of this resolution, an excise duty of one dollar.

13. *Resolved*, That in lieu of all excise duties except license fees, now or heretofore imposed on malt there shall be imposed, levied and collected on every pound of malt made and weighed as removed from the kiln, and upon which the duty had not been paid before the passing of this resolution, an excise duty of one cent.

14. *Resolved*, That upon all stocks of malt liquor held by licensed brewers at the time of passing this resolution, a drawback may be paid on the malt contained in such stocks equal to the duty paid thereon in excess of one cent per pound, and the quantity of malt contained in such stocks of malt liquor shall be determined under the existing Departmental regulations for determining the quantity of malt contained in malt liquor.

15. *Resolved*, That in lieu of all excise duties except license fees, now imposed on tobacco known as common Canadian twist, otherwise called "tabac blanc en torquette," being the impressed leaf rolled and twisted and made wholly from raw tobacco the growth of Canada, and upon raw leaf the growth of Canada, there shall be imposed, levied and collected on every pound or less quantity than a pound, an excise duty of four cents.

16. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing Resolutions, and the alterations made in the duties of Customs and Excise and on the other articles therein mentioned, shall take effect upon and after the 15th day of March, instant.

House adjourned at

Twenty-five minutes before

Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 17th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced, and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 52) Respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Act of incorporation of the Confederation Life Association.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

Orders of the Day called.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to draw the attention of the House to a report which appeared in *Le Canadien*, a leading Conservative paper in Lower Canada, of some observations I made the other night. This is the first time in my life that I have taken notice, in this House, of what appeared in a newspaper; but the report is so incorrect and mischievous, that I deem it necessary to refer to it. The report, as it professes to be, of my remarks, attributes the following expressions to me: "Speaking of Mr. Joly, he (Mr. Huntington) said that the Province of Quebec is happy in having a Protestant for First Minister." Now, Sir, I need not say that I did not make use of any such language, or of any language at all that could suggest the idea; nor need I say that, considering the *question brulante* which prevails in Lower Canada, the use of such language would be misunderstood there, and would injure those of whom it was spoken. If I were to read the editorial accompanying the report, I am sure this House would be not less amused than by the report. It contains a declaration that I never rise to my feet without insulting the French-Canadians and the Roman Catholic population of this country. I should be glad if I could honestly say that I believed the report has not been maliciously perverted; but, as I cannot positively say the latter, I will say nothing about it. But for the fact that it might be used to the detriment of the gentleman of whom I am represented to have spoken in such an absurd manner, I would not have taken notice of this report.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time :—

Bill (No. 29) To amend the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Act, and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Côteau and Province Line Railway and Bridge Act, and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 49) To repeal so much of the Act thirty-third Victoria, chapter forty-six, as relates to the collection of dues and tolls upon

logs, timber, cedar, pine and railway ties, passing down the Moira River through the Port of Belleville.—(Mr. *McCuaig*.)

Bill (No. 50) Respecting La Banque Jacques Cartier.—(Mr. *Girouard*, Jacques Cartier.)

BREECH-LOADING RIFLES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

QUESTION.

Mr. SCHULTZ enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps to prevent the introduction into the North-West Territories of Winchester and other breech-loading rifles and cartridges for the service.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: On enquiring of the Commissioner of Mounted Police, he said he has not observed that there was any large introduction of these arms into the North-West; but the matter is now under the consideration of the Government, to stop any indiscriminate introduction of those arms.

MAIL CONTRACT BETWEEN STE. GÉNEVIÈVE AND POINT CLAIR.

QUESTION.

Mr. HUNTINGTON enquired, Why was the contract for carrying the mails between St. Gèneviève and Point Clair recently cancelled; for what time it had been awarded; and for what number of years had the late contractor carried the said mails.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In the absence of the Postmaster-General, owing to the sad cause of which we were all aware, I have to state that the answer sent from the Department is this: This service has been in the hands of one J. Landry for about 24 years. Landry had ceased to be able to perform the work himself, being about 76 years of age, and it was thought desirable to submit it to a public competition. The contract has not yet been awarded.

FOG-WHISTLE AT THE ENTRANCE TO SHELburne HARBOUR.

QUESTION.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a fog-whistle on McNutt's Island, at the entrance to

Shelburne Harbour, during the present year; and if not, why not.

Mr. TUPPER: It is not the intention of the Government to do so.

BELRATH POST-OFFICE, MELBOURNE TOWNSHIP.

QUESTION.

Mr. HUNTINGTON enquired, Whether the post-office of Belrath, in the township of Melbourne, has been suspended and the postmaster dismissed; and if so, why; and whether the Government propose to indemnify the said postmaster for losses incurred in preparation for the business of the said office.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The answer from the Department is that the new post-office at Belrath was authorised in October, 1878. It was represented to the Postmaster-General on the 17th October, that it was only three-quarters of a mile from Melbourne, and instructions were given to suspend it. No claim for indemnification has been made by the postmaster.

POSTAL CAR FOR THE ALBERT RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

Mr. ROGERS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision for a postal car and postal clerk for the Albert Railway, N.B.; and if so, when.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is under the consideration of the Government.

SHIPMENT OF COAL OVER MARITIME PROVINCE GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

QUESTION.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) enquired, Whether the Minister of Public Works is aware that coal is being shipped over the Government Railways in the Province of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia by several of the coal companies to their agents along the line, nominally at the short ton, but actually by the long

ton; and, if such is the case, whether it is the intention to take any steps to prevent it.

MR. TUPPER: I am not aware that any such practice is being pursued, and, if it comes to my notice, steps shall be taken to prevent it.

BREAKWATER AT PETITE RIVIÈRE.

QUESTION.

MR. PERRAULT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to construct a breakwater in the parish of St. François Xavier or Petite Rivière; and what steps, if any, have been taken in the matter.

MR. TUPPER: At present it is not in our power to proceed with the construction of the work. The Government is obliged to defer dealing with all such work wherever possible this year.

WHARF AT ST. SIMON.

QUESTION.

MR. PERRAULT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to include in the Estimates a sum sufficient for the construction of a wharf or landing place in the parish of St. Simon; and if so, whether such work is to be proceeded with next summer, and what steps, if any, have been taken in the matter.

MR. TUPPER: I am obliged to give the same answer to this question as to the previous one.

PORT HOOD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT.

QUESTIONS.

MR. MACDONNELL enquired, Whether the Government has accepted, or intends to accept, any of the tenders received for the expenditure of the sum granted at the last Session of Parliament towards the improvement of Port Hood Harbour.

MR. TUPPER: The Government have not accepted, and do not intend to accept, any of the tenders for the work referred to.

MR. ROBERTSON.

MR. MACDONNELL enquired, What is the intention of the Government with respect to the improvement and protection of the harbour of Port Hood, for which a grant of \$10,000 was made during the last Session of Parliament.

MR. TUPPER: It would require so large a sum to deal with this important work, that the Government do not deem it desirable to proceed with it at present.

PARIS EXPOSITION MEDALS FOR NOVA SCOTIA EXHIBITORS.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) enquired, Whether the Government are aware of the time when the medals and diplomas awarded Nova Scotia exhibitors at the recent Paris Exposition will be distributed, and what has been the cause of delay.

MR. TUPPER: The Government has no knowledge of the cause of the delay.

WHARF AT BAY ST. PAUL.

QUESTION.

MR. PERRAULT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to include in the Estimates a sum of money sufficient to continue or finish the work begun at Bay St. Paul for the construction of a wharf or landing, and if so, whether such work is to be proceeded with next summer.

MR. TUPPER: The question is under the consideration of the Government.

NOVA SCOTIA AND THE FISHERY AWARD.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) enquired, Whether the delegation from the Nova Scotian Government, when at Ottawa recently, referred, at their conference with the Government or members of the Government, to the question of the appropriation of the fishery award, claiming a portion of it for Nova Scotia, and what answer was made by the Government to their request.

MR. TILLEY : The question was brought under the notice of the Government by the delegates from Nova Scotia, but no answer has been given them yet.

AVERAGE ADJUSTERS AT SHIPPING PORTS.

QUESTION.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce an Act this Session to establish the office of average adjuster at certain shipping ports in the Dominion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : It is not the intention of the Government to do so.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CARRIERS.

QUESTION.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce an Act this Session to better define and settle the duties and responsibilities of carriers by land and water.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) : It is not the intention of the Government to introduce such an Act.

CLAIM FOR EXPROPRIATED LAND AT ST. FLAVIE.

QUESTION.

MR. Fiset enquired, Whether the Government has taken steps with a view of meeting the last claim of Mr. Alexander Marquis and that of Mr. Thomas Beaulieu, both of the parish of St. Flavie, for land expropriated since the Inter-colonial Railway has been in operation.

MR. TUPPER : Those claims are now being investigated.

SPECIAL TARIFF FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA.

QUESTION.

MR. DECOSMOS enquired, Has any communication been recently received from the Government of British Columbia respecting the enactment of a special tariff for that Province, to continue until the Canadian Pacific Railway shall have

been completed ; if such has been received, what is the intention of the Government respecting it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : No communications have been received from the Government of British Columbia.

DISMISSALS AND APPOINTMENTS.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. WILLIAMS moved for a copy of all papers and correspondence that may have passed between His Excellency Lord Dufferin and the members of the late Administration on dismissal from office of those appointed in October and November, 1873 ; and also, for a copy of all such papers, etc., having reference to appointments made between 17th September and 10th October, 1873. He said that, before pressing the motion, he wished briefly to state his reasons for bringing this matter before the House. In the constituency which he had the honour of representing, there were not many offices of emolument under the control of the Dominion Government, but, in several of the most important of them, the most extraordinary shuffling took place within a few days prior to the retirement from office of the gentlemen opposite, and he might add, some weeks after the decided expression of public opinion at the polls, on the 17th September last. The gentlemen who held these offices before were permitted to transfer them, by the hon. member for Lambton, and their sons and grandsons were appointed by the hon. gentleman, in most cases only a few months before. He was sure the hon. gentleman would not claim that these changes were demanded in the public interest. His constituents, remembering the virtuous indignation with which the hon. gentleman received and cancelled the appointments made by the Administration of Sir John A. Macdonald in 1873, when it was supposed he was sustained by a majority of the members of the House, and had the confidence of the people, contrasted his action then with the manner in which he had dealt with the patronage of office since the 17th September last. He believed it was part of the political creed of hon. gentlemen on his side of the House that the Civil Service should be kept

free from the political embarrassments which so largely destroyed its usefulness in the neighbouring Republic, that it should be established on a permanent and non-political basis; but he feared that the inconsistent action of the hon. gentlemen opposite had tended to weaken the stability of the service in the public mind. He knew what the expressed views of the late Governor-General (Lord Dufferin) were on this subject, and he considered that, if any papers of a non-confidential character, written by so high an authority on constitutional law or constitutional usage could be brought down, they might be of benefit in assisting the public in forming the opinion as to which of the courses pursued by the hon. gentlemen when in office, was the correct one.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I must inform the hon. gentleman that the official correspondence between the Governor-General and his advisers for the time being cannot be brought to the House. If there was any official correspondence on record, and His Excellency allowed its production, and the public business would not be injured thereby, there could be no objection to laying it before the House—not otherwise.

Motion agreed to.

WARDEN OF ST. JOHN PENITENTIARY.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

MR. CARON, in the absence of Mr. DOMVILLE, moved for a copy of Inspector Moylan's report of the investigation of the case of Mr. Ketchum, Warden of St. John, N.B., Penitentiary.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) asked if the mover had any objection to add to his motion the following words: "Also, any correspondence from the Warden, or any person in his behalf, relating to the Inspector's report."

MR. CARON said, in the absence of Mr. Domville, he could not consent to the amendment.

Amendment, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

MR. WILLIAMS.

DISMISSAL OF CLERK OF WORKS AT DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH moved for copies of all papers, letters, and correspondence relating to the dismissal or replacement of William Robertson, Clerk of Works and Inspector under the contract for building the Penitentiary, Dorchester, N.B.

MR. TUPPER said he did not see the object of the motion, the hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith) having stated no reasons for it. He could understand a member being requested to ask information, if any public officer had been aggrieved. He did not understand the hon. member for Westmoreland to say there was any complaint in this case. He should have given some reasons for his motion. This sort of motion might be carried too far. He knew the person referred to was in the employ of the Government in a very subordinate capacity, at a certain wage per month. He was not in the Civil Service, and had no claim on the Government for the continuance of his employment. The Government of which the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland was a member had not hesitated to remove summarily much higher officers without giving any reasons. The papers showed that a higher officer had been suspended by the Minister of Public Works of the late Government; that he had applied for the reasons, which, down to the present day, had not been supplied. He (Mr. Tupper) did not, therefore, suppose that it was upon public grounds the hon. gentleman opposite took a special interest in the matter in complaining of the Minister of Public Works of the day dispensing with the services of a person employed by the month to discharge special duties. He was aware the hon. gentleman was not acting in the interest of the person removed, and that he did not thank him for his intervention; that official had written to himself disclaiming all connection with the present motion. He (Mr. Tupper) regretted this attempt to magnify a somewhat unimportant matter, than which a greater mistake could not be made in the interests of the country,

since treating a temporary employé as a public officer might give grounds for claims to a continuance of employment. He had no objection to bring down the correspondence. The Clerk of Works had been removed under a misapprehension, and, the moment he (Mr. Tupper) had reason to believe that an injustice had been done him, he promptly replaced him. No person had complained in the matter, so far as he knew, but the hon. member for Westmoreland himself; and he was very much at a loss to know why this motion had been submitted. That hon. gentleman had directed the appointment of another to perform the duties of Clerk of Works in the construction of the Penitentiary, when, as he (Mr. Tupper) had been informed, Mr. Skead called on Mr. Robertson, and told him that, at the request of the hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith), he had been appointed Clerk of Works. At a subsequent day, without any communication with that gentleman, either by the member for Westmoreland or Mr. Skead, he found he had been set aside, and another person placed in his situation. Thus, the hon. gentleman completely succeeded in obtaining the political support of a former opponent at the last election. Mr. Robertson had always opposed him before. But that was not sufficient to prevent his (Mr. Tupper's) doing justice to him the moment he found he had suffered injustice. If the hon. gentleman could gain any consolation from that fact, he was quite welcome to it. But it was a pity to create the impression in the House and country that the tenure of office of members of the Civil Service was being interfered with. It was not the practice of the late Government to treat temporary employés as possessing any claims to permanent service.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman laid down a singular doctrine, namely, that no hon. member had a right to bring down information unless stimulated by some person out of the House.

MR. TUPPER: Or who can show there is some interest to be subserved by it.

MR. MACKENZIE said that was a matter of opinion merely. Every member was entitled to information when he asked it; it was never refused by any Government. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had no right to assume a member was asking for anything improper. That doctrine would enable a Minister to use his majority, when he saw fit, on a matter of opinion, to refuse information. He (Mr. Mackenzie) knew nothing of the case further than that Mr. Skead was never authorised to offer the position to any person. He was simply an architect employed, temporarily, under the chief architect of the buildings, and was to go out, occasionally, under Mr. Robertson, the inspector; an officer who executed his duties in a most excellent manner, and he did not think that there was a building in Dorchester put up in better style than this Penitentiary; it did immense credit to the inspector and contractors. But his hon. friend had a perfect right to ask for all the information without being subjected to such a lecture.

SIR A. J. SMITH said that, though the hon. the Minister of Public Works had observed that this was a very small matter, he had expended much time in dealing with it. He was not disposed to take that hon. gentleman's opinion with regard to the action he should pursue. He was responsible, not to him, but to his constituents. He was not surprised that the Minister of Public Works did not want this information submitted. When brought down, he rather thought it would not reflect much credit on his official action. He thought it of no consequence to dismiss a man employed by the month or year.

MR. TUPPER: I did not say by the year, but by the month or day.

SIR A. J. SMITH said this man had been employed two years, but the hon. the Minister of Public Works seemed to think that, because the officer was not a member of the Civil Service, he had no right to take up the matter. He was acting on his own responsibility, uninfluenced by Mr. Robertson, but, having recommended him for this

position, and knowing he had effectively and efficiently discharged his duty, he felt grieved that such an outrage had been perpetrated in such a summary, despotic manner, without any cause. It was absolutely untrue that he (Sir A. J. Smith) had promised the position to anybody else.

MR. TUPPER: I am bringing down the evidence of it.

SIR A. J. SMITH: You cannot do it. Who is the man?

MR. TUPPER: I am bringing the matter forward on the evidence of one of the hon. gentleman's most respectable constituents, which would establish the accuracy of the statement.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Bring them forward then. I deny the assertion. The Minister of Public Works knows that Robertson is the person that I recommended to him from the first, and no other. I am not aware of his having been always opposed to me.

MR. TUPPER: I am, though.

SIR A. J. SMITH: The hon. gentleman pretends to know a great deal more than he does know, and makes statements, sometimes, for which he has no authority. Now, I repeat I do not know that Mr. Robertson has always opposed me. Had I known the fact, I do not think I would have recommended him.

MR. TUPPER: You got his vote lately.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I do not know. How does the hon. gentleman know?

MR. TUPPER: I had his own statement to that effect.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Is that the reason why you displaced him?

MR. TUPPER: I did not displace him after that statement. I replaced him.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he rather thought the hon. gentleman displaced Mr. Robertson because he had voted for him, and that a good deal of influence had been brought to bear on the hon. member. He (Sir A. J. Smith) never

spoke to Robertson on the subject of the elections, but supposed, if he had voted, it was for him. He thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) was quite mistaken in saying Robertson had been always opposed to him (Sir A. J. Smith). He wanted this information in the public interest. Surely the public had a right to know why Robertson was displaced. The hon. gentleman thought it was an unimportant matter, that it was a very small matter, with which to trouble the House. It might be a small matter in itself, but the hon. gentleman had magnified it very much by the improper speech he had made in reference to it. He thought he was entitled, as a matter of course, to the information, and he felt it his duty to move for these papers.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that his hon. friend the Minister of Public Works had stated that he had no objection to produce these papers. At the same time, he asked what object the hon. gentleman had in moving for the papers. The hon. gentleman, however, left the Minister without the information he desired. He said that there was a laudable curiosity among his constituents, that they wanted to know why this man, who was hired and paid by the month, was removed and employed again. The hon. gentleman, in making his speech, also committed a rather unparliamentary act. He was out of order, and, he would say that, without a doubt, he ought to have been told from the Chair that he was out of order. When the hon. gentleman said that the hon. the Minister of Public Works was in the habit of making statements without authority, he made an unparliamentary and unwarrantable expression, and no one knew better than the hon. gentleman that this was so. He thought that, in the matter of granting returns, they were far too lax. No matter which party sat on the Ministerial side of the House, they had been much too facile in granting motions of this kind. They had been in the habit, no matter whether the question was important or not, interesting or uninteresting, of granting these motions. They all knew that motions for papers were carefully scanned, and any member moving for papers had to give a satisfactory reason to the Gov-

SIR A. J. SMITH.

ernment of the day for occupying the time of the House, and for causing the expense of having the returns prepared. The practice in Canada had been so long in existence that, unless by arrangement made by both sides of the House for more strict supervision, they could not well resist the motion; the practice had prevailed so long that a refusal would be regarded as an attempt to stifle enquiry. Still, he thought hon. gentlemen would admit that indiscriminate motions for papers already returned constitute a crying evil. Again and again, motions were made for information that was contained in the Blue-books. In this case, the man was not a civil servant, and he had no vested interest, even by English practice. He was hired by the month, and paid by the month, and his removal was considered an outrage. They might as well say that the snow shovelers, who shovelled snow outside this House, must not be dismissed, or that there must be a great outcry if one of these gentlemen was deprived of his half dollar a day. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had said that he would not only bring down these papers, but give further information than the hon. gentleman wanted. He thought that it was obvious that the motion should be amended in order that additional information might be included in the return.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I agree to the amendment.

MR. TUPPER said he thought the motion would cover the correspondence, and he thought that the hon. gentleman would find, when the papers were laid on the table of the House, that he had jumped before he came to the stile, and he would find evidence there to sustain every statement he (Mr. Tupper) had made.

SIR A. J. SMITH: I do not think so.

MR. TUPPER said that the hon. gentleman would also find that, instead of there being any outrage on the gentleman he had named as having been subject to a great outrage, the only complaint made was in reference to the unsolicited intervention of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith).

SIR A. J. SMITH said he did not care what the hon. gentleman said. He had no doubt that this Mr. Robinson apprehended that, if he took any part in this matter the hon. gentleman would exercise the same arbitrary power he had exercised in this discussion.

Motion agreed to.

USE OF PRIVATE LETTER IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. KEELER moved for copies of the correspondence relating to the transmission during the recent Dominion Elections of a certain letter marked private and confidential then on file in the Post Office Department, Ottawa, to a voter in the East Riding of Northumberland. He said he regretted that he felt it to be his duty to the people of the riding he had the honour to represent, to bring this matter before the House; but their hon. friends opposite saw fit to go into such devious and winding ways, for the purpose of turning votes against him during the recent election, that he was compelled to notice this case. He intended to bring several others under consideration hereafter. He was sorry he did not see the hon. the ex-Postmaster-General in his place, but, as he had already allowed this motion to stand over several days, to suit his convenience, at the request of the hon. member for Centre Huron, he thought he must proceed to give the explanation to the House. While making his canvass before the last election, he called upon a friend of influence and standing in his township, who had always been one of their strongest party supporters, and upon asking him for his assistance as one of his Committee, he was very much astonished when he was told that his friend had concluded to take no part in the contest. The House might imagine that he was very much knocked down by receiving such an answer from a person whom he had counted upon as one of the very best men of their party, and, of course, he at once begged him to give him his reasons for such determination, and, after considerable persuasion, he was surprised very much indeed, when, taking a letter

out of his pocket he handed it to him (Mr. Keeler), for perusal. He found it to be a letter in his own handwriting, and addressed to Hon. Alexander Campbell, when he was Postmaster-General, headed "private and confidential," and containing some uncomplimentary reflections upon the father of his (Mr. Keeler's) friend, which it was easy to see would most probably have the effect of influencing his friend to become his enemy, and vote against him. He was happy to say, however, that he was able to satisfactorily explain to his friend the circumstances under which the letter was written, and to make such an apology to him that he returned to his support, and thus defeated the nice little scheme of hon. gentlemen opposite. He then requested his friend to allow him to keep the letter for the purpose of bringing up the subject in this House, but was informed by him that he had received the letter from Mr. Biggar, his (Mr. Keeler's) opponent, through a third person in Brighton, and that they were bound to return it to Mr. Huntington, the Postmaster-General at that time at Ottawa. This was the substance of the conversation he had with the "Voter in East Northumberland," mentioned in the motion, and he thought it a very disgraceful thing indeed, that any man holding the high and honourable position of Postmaster-General of the Dominion of Canada should so far forget, if he ever knew them, the rules observed by gentlemen respecting private and confidential correspondence, as to make use of it for electioneering or mere party purposes.

MR. MILLS said the late Postmaster-General was ill, and unable to be in his place. He trusted the hon. gentleman would not press his motion until the late Postmaster-General was able to be present and answer the hon. gentleman.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought, after the statement that had been made, his hon. friend would allow the motion to stand. The charge was a very grave one, and was simply this: Mr. Keeler wrote a private and confidential communication to Mr. Campbell when he was Postmaster-General, making a complaint of some one. That letter was taken from

MR. KEELER.

the file in the Post Office Department and sent to Mr. Keeler's opponent, Mr. Biggar, for the purpose of being used against him at the elections. It was not to be supposed that the late Postmaster-General would have been guilty of anything of the kind. It must have been done by some one in the Department, and an investigation must take place, as to the facts stated. But, in the meanwhile, the hon. gentleman should allow the matter to stand until the late Postmaster-General was in his place.

Motion *postponed*.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. BOLDUC moved for a statement showing: 1. The number of judgments rendered by the Supreme Court and the Court of Exchequer of Canada; 2. The number of employés of the said Courts, their names and several salaries; 3. A detailed statement of the amount expended for the establishment and maintenance of the said Courts from the first establishment thereof, up to the 1st January last.

Motion *agreed to*.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATIONS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) moved for copy of a return showing the names and age of all persons in the Civil Service superannuated between the 5th November, 1873, and the 10th November, 1878; the number of offices abolished through such superannuation; the salaries paid the persons holding such offices before they were abolished, and the amount afterwards paid, either as a retiring allowance or gratuity; also, a statement of the persons deceased since superannuated.

Motion *agreed to*.

ARRANGEMENT FOR SETTLEMENT IN MANITOBA.

MOTION FOR ORDER IN COUNCIL.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton), in the absence of Mr. McCARTHY, moved for a copy of the Order in Council, authorising an arrangement to be made

with Mr. R. W. Prittie, and others, relating to the introduction and settlement of settlers in the Province of Manitoba; all correspondence connected therewith, and any claims for compensation for such alleged services.

Motion agreed to.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY
EMPLOYÉS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. DESJARDINS moved for a statement showing the names of the several permanent and temporary officers and employés of the Penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul; the amount of their respective salaries, the date of their appointment or of their entering upon the discharge of their duties in the Penitentiary; by whom they were appointed, and to whom they are responsible.

Motion agreed to.

COMMISSARIAT OF NORTH-WEST
MOUNTED POLICE.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. RYAN (Marquette) moved for a copy of a return showing the names of all contractors who have, during the past four years supplied cattle and beef to the Mounted Police and Indian Department in Manitoba and the North-West Territories; the quantities bought from and the prices and amount paid each; the dates and duration of contracts, when such supplies were furnished under contract; and also, whether or not such contracts were let by tender.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD asked the hon. gentleman to state if there were any special reason for his making these enquiries.

MR. RYAN (Marquette) said he had been applied to for information by one of his constituents who had been in the habit of dealing in cattle, and who had, during the past year, tendered on two or three occasions for the supply. He (Mr. Ryan) did not know that that gentleman had any special reason, but, as he was unable to give the information asked for he had decided to ask the House for it, believing that the gentleman referred to was entitled to it.

Motion agreed to.

MARINE HOSPITAL AT MIRAMICHI.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. SNOWBALL moved for copies of correspondence, reports, and all other papers, between 1st January, 1877, and 1st January, 1879, in reference to the Marine Hospital at Miramichi, New Brunswick. He explained that he moved for these papers, in view of a controversy that had been going on for some time in reference to this station, and which had latterly been revived. He had been surprised to find, in looking over the returns, that this station stood fourth on the list in contributions to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Last year it contributed \$3,682 more than its expenses, which were something less than \$2,000. From 250 to 400 vessels stopped annually at this port, manned by about 15,000 sailors. A port of this kind required an institution well managed, such as sailors were in the habit of finding in other parts of the world. As at present conducted, the hospital was not such as the port of Miramichi required. The building itself, though small, was suitably located, and could be improved. The furniture of the institution was said to be of the rudest description. The bedsteads were old, worn-out wooden bedsteads. There was not one iron bedstead in the whole institution. He did not find fault with the management of the institution. The medical superintendent was a gentleman of high standing, who had been connected with the institution for the last forty-six years, and who, he (Mr. Snowball) believed, had done everything he could to make the institution comfortable. The keeper of the institution, though doing all he could with the material at his disposal to make the inmates comfortable, complained that they were quite inadequate. The whole institution wanted renovating. The outbuildings and the drainage needed to be repaired, and the furniture was such that it should be removed from the institution as rapidly as possible. In view of the importance of the station, he thought steps should at once be taken to remove the old and useless furniture, and replace it with that of a character more in keeping with the requirements of the port.

MR. TUPPER said he hoped the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who had been guilty of the outrage and neglect of duty indicated by the remarks of the hon. mover of this resolution, would at once offer some explanation to the House. It appeared, from the statements of the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B., (Mr. Snowball) that the seamen of the country, who had been taxed to maintain this institution, had suffered outrages at the hands of the late Government. The gentleman (Sir Albert J. Smith) who had, for the last five years, been responsible for this state of things, owed some explanation to the House. Was it possible that that hon. gentleman had allowed the sick seamen to suffer for necessary accommodation, and that he had allowed these drains to send forth their pestilential vapours to the detriment of the health of the inmates? He (Mr. Tupper) trusted that, before this motion passed, the hon. the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries would explain why he had so disregarded his duties, been deaf to the calls of humanity, and left this institution in the frightful condition depicted by the hon. gentleman from Northumberland, N.B.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) seemed to be very much moved over this matter, and he (Sir A. J. Smith) would suggest that the hon. gentleman should be sent to Miramichi to make an investigation into the affairs of the institution, as it was rather in his line, and he seemed to be a high authority on the subject. [He (Sir A. J. Smith) was not aware, however, that the institution was in the condition represented by his hon. friend (Mr. Snowball). So far as he understood, when he was at its head, the hospital was well managed. The physician of the institution had reported that it was in a very good condition, and that the sailors were well cared for. He thought his hon. friend (Mr. Snowball) was mistaken in saying there were no iron bedsteads there. Two years ago, he remembered, iron bedsteads were ordered for that institution, and he thought the papers would show this to be the case. He begged to suggest to the hon. the Prime Minister that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) was spe-

MR. SNOWBALL.

cially qualified to be sent to Miramichi to make a report on the condition of the institution.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : *Nous comprenons tout cela.* My hon. friend (Sir A. J. Smith), when he was in office, did not do his work himself; he got somebody else to do it. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries will attend to this work himself, and he will not send either the hon. the Minister of Public Works or anybody else. My hon. friend (Sir A. J. Smith) says there were iron bedsteads ordered, but he does not know whether they got there, or whether they are there now, or whether the sailors preferred the old ricketty wooden bedsteads to the iron ones. But I do not think the fact that iron bedsteads were ordered is any answer to the charge that there was bad drainage and offensive effluvia coming up, to the great injury and destruction of the people who were under the special charge of the hon. gentleman during five years, or under the charge of some of his colleagues, who did the work for him.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said the Government had no objection to the motion for the production of the papers. Representations had been made to the Department with regard to the Marine Hospital at Miramichi, and the medical officer had been asked for a further report. He hoped soon to get that report, and would send it down with the papers.

Motion agreed to.

FRAUD IN THE MANUFACTURE OF AGRICULTURAL FERTILISERS.

MOTION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE.

MR. MASSUE moved that a Select Committee, consisting of Messrs. McCallum, Wallace, Keeler, Benoit, Landry, Pope (Compton), and the mover be appointed to consider and report on the following Resolution:—

“That it is expedient to take legislative measures to prevent fraud in the manufacture and sale of agricultural fertilisers.”

He explained that his object was merely to submit to a Committee a Bill to protect the agricultural classes, by compelling manufacturers of agricultural

fertilisers to declare the real character of their goods, and subjecting them to a fine if their declaration was false.

MR. POPE (Compton) asked if the object of his hon. friend was for a Committee of enquiry.

MR. MASSUE replied that it was.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would be an extraordinary thing to appoint a Committee for such a purpose. The Department of Agriculture had power to investigate the matter, and a sum of money had been voted for the express purpose of dealing with such matters.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD advised the hon. gentleman (Mr. Massue) to withdraw his motion, since his object had already been obtained, namely, that of drawing the attention of the Department to the evil complained of. No doubt the hon. the Minister of Agriculture would immediately look into the matter, and would confer with the hon. mover thereon.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

EXPENDITURE ON CANADIAN HARBOURS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. MILLS moved for copy of a return showing the amount of money expended from all sources upon each of the harbours of Canada, before and since Confederation; the sources from which the money so expended was obtained; the harbours still held by the Government; the harbours transferred to municipalities or private persons; the harbours resumed; the amount expended since the transfer from the Public Treasury; the year in which the expenditure was made in each case; which harbours are simply harbours of refuge, and which commercial harbours. He said he did not think this return would be voluminous, and it would be very useful to have such a return from the Public Works Department.

MR. TUPPER said there was no doubt the House was entitled to every information upon every public question of interest; but there was great inconvenience, great objection, he thought, to

making motions in this House that involved a great amount of labour and expense, and were attended with great difficulty, and reached beyond the duties of this Parliament. Take, for instance, this motion, which asked for the expenditure made since the beginning of the century, or during the past hundred years, on every harbour in the Dominion. He could not see any practical benefit it could be to know that the Government of Nova Scotia a hundred years ago spent \$10, \$100, or \$10,000 on any particular work that was embraced in this motion, because it asked the Government to furnish a return showing the amount of money expended from all sources, not only by the Government, but by municipalities and by the districts, and in every other way, upon each harbour in Canada before and since Confederation. He was sure it would take at least a year to obtain this information. He had no means of furnishing the information; it was not within the jurisdiction of either the Government, or the officers of the Government of Canada, to obtain that information. Then the hon. gentleman asked them to designate those harbours which were simply harbours of refuge, and those which were commercial harbours. That was a matter of opinion.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is more than that.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman said it was more than that. It was. It had been during the last five years a matter of political opinion. He thought that, when the Government were anxious to spend money in any locality, the harbour assumed the character of a harbour of refuge, though previously it might have been considered a commercial harbour. It had been not only a matter of opinion, but a very arbitrary opinion. He had no objection to the motion passing, and to furnish all the information that could be obtained; but it would take, as the House knew, a great deal of time. It would require, not only a great deal of time and labour to give it with any exactness, but it would also cause a considerable expense.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. the Minister of Public Works was mistaken about the time it would take. He (Mr.

Tupper) would find in his Department a statement, made up some three years ago, by Mr. Kingsford, which gave considerable information on the subject.

MR. TUPPER: That applies only to Ontario.

MR. MACKENZIE: No; all the Provinces. He found some difficulty in making it, but it was done.

MR. TUPPER: Then why does the hon. gentleman want it now?

MR. MACKENZIE said it was very incomplete. The hon. gentleman would find no difficulty in getting the amounts voted by the old Province of Canada, as it was contained in the indexes to the Journals. The difficulty that Mr. Kingsford experienced was in getting the municipal grants to the harbours, and information from some places where a subscription was taken up, but they had been comparatively successful. He had, however, noticed some exceptions. At Port Elgin there was expended four or five thousand dollars by the Government, and the municipality had paid \$8,000 or \$10,000. A great deal of information of that kind could not easily be obtained. He would be sorry that, in a matter of this kind, any undue labour should be imposed upon the Department; but it would be exceedingly interesting to have a statement such as that asked for. In the annual report of the Department of Public Works for 1867, a large amount of the information had been given, and it would not be such a serious matter to get it as was thought. It was a branch of our statistics that had not been very well recorded, and it was only for the purpose of obtaining more accurate information that this motion had been made. When a similar motion had been moved by the late Hon. Malcolm Cameron, he (Mr. Mackenzie) thought it was a very good one, and he was very sorry afterwards that they had not time to bring down further information. He trusted the hon. gentleman would not oppose the motion.

MR. TUPPER said he had not the slightest idea of opposing the motion. He saw the importance of every word that the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had said on the subject.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman would see by the report of 1875 that this was not, by any means, so difficult an undertaking as he had represented it to be. He had made this motion simply in the public interest. The hon. gentleman knew the state of the statistics in regard to our expenditure on our harbours. Whatever could be done to collect and classify the information, should be done. The return brought down in 1875 did not give the information as fully as he desired to have it. What the hon. gentleman said in regard to commercial harbours and harbours of refuge he did not think was well founded. He remembered the discussion that took place on this subject when the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) was Minister of Public Works, when a certain rule was laid down by the Government at that time, in regard to the expenditure on harbours, distinguishing harbours of refuge from those used for commercial purposes. He did not know how far that distinction was a perfect or intelligible one; but he did not suppose that it would be found simply a matter of opinion of the Minister of Public Works for the time being. But, when they knew what the official classification was, they could criticise, and no doubt correct it. He could certainly say that the principle was laid down at one time that harbours of refuge were those built wholly at the expense of the Government, and commercial harbours were maintained in part at the expense of somebody else. A classification must have been adopted, or else no expenditure should be made in one place and refused in another. He made this motion, with regard to this classification, more particularly with a view to ascertain how far it had been attempted to classify harbours in accordance with the principle then announced. Taking, for instance, Rondeau Harbour, the expenditure on that harbour was made many years ago by the Government, and it was a harbour of refuge, but it was transferred to some company, and after a time allowed to get out of repair. It had been resumed by the Government and further expenditures had been made in connection with it. This was one case where a harbour had been abandoned and then resumed

by the Government. He did not know how many harbours had been resumed in this manner, or what amount of money had been expended on them. This was information which it was very desirable they should possess, and he did not think it would be difficult to get. The expenditure by municipalities could be obtained by communicating with the municipalities. He thought that information, as far as Ontario was concerned, had been obtained down to 1874.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that years ago it had been settled what were harbours of refuge and what were commercial harbours. Harbours of refuge were maintained by the Government, whilst commercial harbours were maintained by persons supposed to be sufficiently interested in them for commercial purposes. Harbours of commerce were generally left to municipal aid, and perhaps a little aid given by the Government, but principally to municipal aid. Harbours of refuge were settled as being requisite for the purpose of giving shelter to vessels. His hon. friend said truly that it was very difficult to find out which were purely harbours of refuge. He would ask his hon. friend to fix this motion so that there would be some commencement to the enquiry. He (Mr. Mills) said they could get returns from all sources upon each harbour before and since Confederation. There was the harbour of Louisburg, and there was the harbour of Quebec,—they must enquire from the French Government to get information regarding them.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is not a harbour in the ordinary sense.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is an extraordinarily good harbour. There ought to be some starting point. His hon. friend could not mean to enquire from the time of Jacques Cartier's arrival until now.

MR. MILLS: We can fairly leave that to the gentlemen of the Department.

MR. MACKENZIE said there were certain harbours that had not been specified. The harbour at Goderich had been commenced by hon. gentlemen op-

posite, and completed by the late Government as a harbour of refuge. He did not think it was altogether a harbour of refuge. The town of Goderich obtaining certain commercial advantages, the Government required them to pay \$20,000. Rondeau was not a commercial harbour, but a harbour of refuge purely. He thought, if the return were confined to piers and harbours in the St. Lawrence, built for the purpose of affording protection to vessels, and other works built purely for the purpose of affording more or less protection to harbours, no great difficulty would be experienced. The harbour at St. John, N.B., was a commercial harbour of the first class, perhaps the third harbour we had. Though the exports were not as great in value as at some other places, the number of ships entering there was greater. The late Government built a pier there purely for the protection of the harbour, about a mile from the wharves built for commercial accommodation, and it had been of great service to this harbour, which was both a commercial one, and also a harbour of refuge. That had been the only expensive work of the kind that the late Government had undertaken, he believed, wisely. Then the Administration of the hon. gentleman, before the late Government were in office, built a harbour some distance from St. John, at Dipper Harbour; the works tipped over into the sea a year or two afterwards, and had not been rebuilt since. It was no doubt a harbour of refuge; but, as it was of comparatively little use, they felt it was not necessary to expend more money there in the depressed state of the finances at the time, especially as vessels could generally get around to St. John, or get under shelter at Grand Manan. The return asked for would convey a more accurate idea of the amounts expended on harbours. Take the harbour of Port Burwell. The municipality expended, if he recollected aright, some \$79,000 on it for their own local trade, and the aid received from the Government was \$10,000. Another place, Port Stanley, was aided by railway companies, by municipalities and by the Government. When they found applications were made for certain places, and that those places had not done anything

themselves, and where it was rather a matter of affording accommodation for loading goods of some kind to some merchants, they believed that those people ought to pay a large portion of the expenditure. He tried always to discriminate between accommodation to a few private individuals and harbours for general purposes. The harbour of Meaford was such a port. There was a considerable town there, with a large population between it and Owen Sound. Meaford contributed some \$15,000 for the purpose. Owen Sound contributed about \$40,000 altogether to the Government at various times. The Minister of Public Works would find it very useful, when deputations came to him, to ask them what they had done to entitle them to the grant asked, that the people of such a place had contributed so much, what had they contributed, and what was their trade, how many ships they loaded annually, and what quantity of grain they shipped. Contrasting places in that way with one another, would enable the Minister to discriminate carefully, and maintain an equilibrium among the various grants, basing them on what was done in those places. This return would be of great service in that regard, and it would be worth while to have it as complete as possible.

MR. TUPPER said he would have it made as complete as possible, though it seemed to him to embrace a very wide ground.

MR. MCCALLUM said he thought this motion took a very wide range. In asking for a return of the money expended on all the harbours of Canada, whether by Government or private individuals, what did the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) mean by a harbour? In many places piers had been built, particularly along the lake shores, which might be called harbours. He considered a harbour to be a port of shelter to which vessels might have recourse during storms. He knew that the late Government had sold some of our harbours. They had sold Windsor harbour, after having expended a large sum of money on it. When the present Government was formerly in power, he understood, they adopted the policy not to spend any money on pri-

ate property, but the late Government had, it appeared, changed that. The leader of the Opposition had said it would be a good rule for the Minister of Public Works to base grants on what money had been expended by private parties, but he (Mr. McCallum) disagreed with the hon. gentleman; that was not the proper rule. The proper rule was to see the benefit the people were going to get for the expenditure of money, because in many instances the money expended by the late Government on piers and harbours was uselessly expended, without any adequate return. His hon. friend the leader of the Opposition insisted last year on an amount being voted in the Estimates for a place called Morpeth, a little place on the Lake Erie shore, to benefit a few individuals; which place was only 12 miles from the Rondeau, where the Government had expended a very large amount of money to build a harbour of refuge, and this little place Morpeth would be called a harbour by the hon. gentlemen, no doubt. There was another case last year, that of Pickering Harbour, the company owning which, it was said, had not paid a cent dividend, and called on the Government to come to their assistance. They should never take as a standard what a private company had expended, or were going to spend, and then supplement their expenditure by a grant of the people's money; but they should take into consideration what benefit was going to be derived, by the commerce and the shipping of this country, from these harbours, and what shelter they afforded during storms. His hon. friend from Bothwell had said, last year, that he was going to build a harbour of refuge, twelve miles from the Rondeau, with an expenditure of \$25,000, while it was a well-known fact that a harbour of refuge could not be built there for that money, so that such expenditure would not be in the interest of the public, but to benefit private property. He would be the last man to oppose expenditure of money on harbours where it would benefit shipping, but considered it his duty, when the Government proposed to spend money to improve private property, and which would be of no benefit to the people, to protest against such action.

Motion agreed to.

MR. MACKENZIE.

ONTARIO MARITIME COURT.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. RYKERT moved for return of all Orders in Council and all correspondence in connection with the rules and regulations of the Maritime Court of Ontario. He said he made this motion in order that the attention of the House, and particularly of the Minister of Justice, might be drawn to the extraordinary procedure now adopted by the Maritime Court of Ontario. It was most important that the matter should be considered at present, in view of the fact that the Government had lately established Surrogate Courts throughout the Province. It was very important that the Maritime Court, to be at all useful, should be as little expensive as possible. There were no less than 273 rules incorporating the proceedings of the Maritime Court, and all the expensive pleadings and proceedings of the Court of Chancery adopted along with it. There was no discrimination whatever made in that Court as to costs between a suit of \$10 and a suit of \$5,000. He held in his hand a bill of costs which he was going to suggest to the Minister of Justice to have photographed, and copies sent round to every Surrogate Court in the Province, in order that suitors might know what a luxury it was to gain admittance into this Court. In this case the claim was only for \$110, yet the taxed bill was no less than \$220, the greater part being for fees to the lawyers conducting it. By an Act of Parliament passed in 1877, establishing the jurisdiction of the Court in Ontario, it was required that the rules and proceedings, as well as the tariff of costs, should be laid before this Legislature for its sanction. They had been laid before the Legislature, but he could not find that anyone had taken any notice of them. He was not at all surprised that his hon. friend from Prince Edward County should make a bold attempt in this House to abolish the Court altogether, particularly in view of the proceedings of the last sitting of the Maritime Court in Toronto. In that view he brought the matter before the House, in order that measures might be taken to remedy the evils complained of.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he had no objection to bringing down

the papers. He was not aware, until a few days ago, when it was brought to his notice by the hon. members for Prince Edward and Lincoln, that, the Court was not so beneficial as it was intended to be. His hon. friend, he fancied, was mistaken when he said that the practice of the Maritime Court was founded upon that of the Court of Chancery; his impression was it was founded on the practice of the Admiralty Court, as instituted in the Maritime Provinces of the Empire. Everybody knew the costs in those Courts were always heavy. It would be the desire of the Government to make the proceedings as cheap and expeditious as was consistent with the object of the law. He had received a letter from a member of the profession complaining severely that, by an order of Judge Mackenzie, the profession were not sufficiently paid for services in that Court. On enquiry, he found the order was a reasonable one. According to it, for small claims under twenty dollars or fifty dollars, he allowed what was usually called summary costs, that was, a very small sum was taxed in the ordinary civil Courts for small claims of that kind. So far as the rules and orders in relation to costs had come before him, as made by Judge Mackenzie, he really did not think very much could be said against them. The costs did not depend on the amount of the claim; a claim of a few hundred dollars might entail as heavy costs as one of a million dollars. The papers would be brought down, and he would take care that the regulations would be so amended, and such further regulations made, as were required.

MR. RYKERT said the right hon. gentleman had not read the 38th rule, or he would not say they had the rule of the Maritime Court, as in England or the Lower Provinces.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said the effect of that was practically to state the facts on their pleading, without reference to any check from this rule in the Court of Admiralty, and the power of amendment was practically the same.

MR. RYKERT said, if the hon. gentleman had practised before Judge Mackenzie, he would see what was necessary to be done in that Court. He found it

more intricate than the Court of Chancery. The Judge had no power to reduce the tariff of costs, unless sanctioned by the House, or the Minister of Justice. He hoped that, as attention had been drawn to this Court, the Government would see that the procedure was more simple, and the costs very much reduced. In establishing a new Court it was highly desirable, in the interest of the general public, that the remedy should be speedy and the proceeding such as every person seeking redress could easily understand.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he opposed the establishment of the Court, which he was quite satisfied would be obstructive to the free navigation of our inland waters. Whenever the canals were finished, if ever they were, so as to make our lakes and the St. Lawrence a portion of the Atlantic, then there might be necessity for Admiralty jurisdiction, but, so long as it was an inland water, it should be left to the ordinary laws of the land. He had very strong doubts as to whether that measure was not *ultra vires* altogether. He knew that, in England, by Imperial enactment, the power of the Court of Admiralty extended above tide-water, but he doubted very much whether this Legislature had the power to pass that Act at all. The reason why he thought it would be obstructive to the interests of the inland shipping was that a vessel could be seized if the Captain had not money in his pockets, and might lead to a claim for demurrage, and the vessel might lose a large sum on a small claim. It was a nice way of levying black mail. There was no reason why, in inland waters, a vessel could be seized any more than a railway could. The proceedings should be against the debtor. There was no analogy between the detention requisite to creditors of sea-going ships to foreign ports, and that of our ships, which were simply ferry boats, always sure of making the return voyage.

MR. MILLS said the observations made by the hon. gentleman in regard to vessels on the lakes were in many cases equally applicable to those on the high seas. The jurisdiction over vessels on the American side of the lakes was jurisdiction in Admiralty and not in Common Law Courts. So far, pro-

ceedings in Admiralty had not developed those mischiefs to which the hon. gentleman had alluded. But he did not rise for the purpose of discussing the merits of the law now on the Statute-book, because a former Parliament considered it a meritorious or proper proceeding. He was inclined to think that they took the correct view of the matter. The right hon. gentleman had said the Act was *ultra vires*, and that they had no jurisdiction—a very extraordinary opinion to express. The hon. gentleman would admit that they had jurisdiction over the subject; that they could establish Courts to administer justice under Canadian Laws. If the Provincial Legislatures could abolish the Court of Equity, give its jurisdiction to the Courts of Common Law, or transfer the matters under the control of the Common Law Courts to the Court of Equity, they could create and could have a third Court, and call it the Court of Admiralty, or any other name. He thought it too clear to be denied that they could establish Admiralty Courts, and decide upon their proceedings, not only in regard to vessels within the jurisdiction of their law, but other matters. He thought the mistake made when the Confederation Act passed was in not standing by their rights, and asserting their jurisdiction over the Vice-Admiralty Courts of the Maritime Provinces. No doubt that jurisdiction did belong to them, and not to the Court of Admiralty in London. There was no more reason why the ownership of property in ships, and the manner in which it should be held and registered, and the liabilities of owners and shareholders should not be under the control of Canada, than the subject of their civil rights with regard to any other matter. He thought, by this Act, they had taken a step in the right direction, and hoped it would not be the only one; but that the hon. gentleman would reconsider his opinion, and apply the same principle to sea-going vessels to as full an extent as their right of property extended.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: My hon. friend (Mr. Rykert) I hope does not mean to press for this return, as all the rules are printed.

MR. RYKERT.

MR. RYKERT: I would like any correspondence on the matter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is none.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

SEIZURES OF CANADIAN TOBACCO.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

MR. TELLIER moved for a statement, showing in detail the quantity of Canadian tobacco seized by the officers of the Inland Revenue Department, Montreal, during the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878; by and on whom such seizure was made; the number of pounds seized in each case; the number of pounds on which duty was subsequently paid, and what became of the tobacco so seized.

Motion *agreed to*.

No. 1 COMPANY, 21ST BATTALION, MILITIA.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. TELLIER moved for a statement shewing the names of the officers, non-commissioned officers and men, forming No. 1 Company of the 21st Battalion of the Active Militia, in Military District No. 5; the names of those of the said officers, non-commissioned officers and men who performed the annual drill for 1873-74; the dates and number of days occupied in the performance of such drill; the sums paid for and by reason of such drill, and the persons who received these sums of money.

Motion *agreed to*.

PURCHASE OF THE SCHOONER "ELLA G. McLEAN."

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH moved for a copy of all letters, telegrams, contracts, agreements, bills of sale and correspondence in any way connected with the chartering and purchase of the schooner *Ella G. McLean*.

Motion *agreed to*.

APPOINTMENT OF THE JUDGES TASCHEREAU.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. LANDRY moved for copies of all correspondence between the late Administration and the Hon. Jean Thomas Taschereau, late Judge of the Supreme Court, respecting his superannuation, his application for a pension, the appointment of his son, Henri Thomas Taschereau, late member for the county of Montmagny, as one of the Judges of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec, and the promotion of his nephew the Hon. Henri Elzéar Taschereau, to be one of the Judges of the Supreme Court, as well as of all Orders in Council authorising these appointments; together with all reports, recommendations and documents whatsoever bearing on the subject. He said that the motion itself pointed at the explanations asked for, and that the papers, when brought down, would give them. As a matter of fact, he would state what had taken place. All this little family stir among the different persons mentioned in the motion had taken place after the 17th of September, but before the 18th of October, and, consequently, during a period when the Administration did not possess the confidence of the country. It had been claimed, at the time, that the efficiency of the public service required several appointments. But why was it, he would ask, that the Judge raised to the Supreme Court could not be sworn in until five months after his appointment. No one would be deceived by this reason, which was no reason at all, and no one would believe this preposterous vindication. The whole matter was known, and these appointments had quite a history. Public rumour had it that, if the 17th of September had been favourable to the late Administration, Mr. Letellier would have gone back to his place in the Senate, leaving an opening for Judge Taschereau; and the Hon. Mr. Laflamme was to have been offered a seat on the Bench of the Supreme Court, by Mr. Laflamme himself. But the 17th of September came and marred all the plans, and the trap-door of St. Ann's shut out Mr. Laflamme from the Supreme Court. Mr. Henri Taschereau, a former member

for the county of Montmagny, took an active part in the late contest. His zeal had been rewarded, and, under the pretence that the requirements of the public service rendered all these changes necessary, he was sent to replace his cousin, which cousin had been obliged to wait four months before he could replace his uncle, and his cousin's father. He wished it to be well understood that he had nothing to say against this privileged family. He knew that there were fortunate families of this kind that received a continuous ray of happiness; that were pursued, so to speak, by fortune, from the cradle to the grave, and who were worthy, on account of their capacities, of a prominent seat at life's banquet. And in this respect few families had been more fortunate than the one alluded to in his motion. This reminded him of a remark once made by a man of wit. It was at table, and the great families of the country were spoken of. "I know three," he said, "the family of Abraham, the family of Jacob, and the Taschereau family." Events had proved the truth of this remark with respect, at least, to the latter family. To return to the question, he maintained that all these appointments being made after the 17th September, when the popular vote had publicly repudiated the very men that were to make them a few days later, were blameworthy because they hurt public feeling, and he thought that the Administration that had made them should be condemned. Nothing could justify the late Administration for acting as they had done, and, if they could invoke as a pretext the splendours of a family, the country could urge its own interests, and the most elementary rules of the eternal fitness of things. The production of the papers asked for would throw some light on the question.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have to say that any insinuations against the late Judge Taschereau, of the Supreme Court, are wholly without foundation. That gentleman, who discharged his duties with so much acceptance to the profession and the public generally, desired to retire for more than a year. I induced him to endeavour to remain in his office, hoping his disorder would amend, and it was only when he notified me that it was

MR. LANDRY.

impossible for him to attend the Court that I found it absolutely necessary to take immediate action. I am quite satisfied that that action was the best possible in the public interest, and that a good Judge has been appointed in each Court. Judge Taschereau never intended or suggested the name of his son for the appointment he received. It appears now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landry) states the son suggested the name of his father, coupled with the changes, and not the father the son.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is a family matter.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not true.
Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

MR. MCDONALD (Pictou) introduced a Bill (No. 54) To amend an Act respecting Police of Canada.

Bill read the first time.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 18th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES PREVENTION BILL.

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions to make strict provision for preventing the introduction or spread of contagious or infectious diseases affecting animals.

(In the Committee.)

MR. MACKENZIE said he had no objection to the introduction of measures within the power of this Legislature, but it would be useless to submit any beyond

it. These resolutions provided not merely for a protective system along the frontier, for the prevention of the admission of disease, which was within their power, but for the making and enforcing of regulations for the disinfecting of infected localities in the different Provinces. Were they to undertake the general inspection of the whole country wherever disease broke out, regardless of the Local management? They had scarcely the power to do that. The language of the resolutions should plainly state their object.

MR. POPE (Compton) said they intended acting as hitherto; the regulations would be the same as those hitherto worked. The Federal authorities, as hitherto, would interfere anywhere for the suppression of cattle disease.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was a law in Ontario enabling the Local Government to establish a cordon round any infected place where an epidemic prevailed, and he would suggest the propriety of calling their attention to the necessity of a similar plan in regard to localities where cattle disease might break out. As a Dominion Government, they had no means of checking the spread of this disease in any Province, all such matters being left to the Local authorities.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought that was a very good suggestion. This Bill would give full powers to the Dominion Government to make such regulations as might be wanted for the extinction of cattle disease, and, as the Local Governments had similar measures on their Statute-books, it was but just there should be perfect accord, with a sub-division of labour and expense. The Federal Government should look after the frontier to prevent the introduction of disease, but the Provincial Governments should be called upon to use their whole powers to stamp it out in any particular locality.

MR. MILLS said that, until animals became articles of commerce, they were not under the control of this Government. So long as they remained simple articles of property, they were under the Provincial authority. The stamping out of disease in the Provinces could only be

done by the Local authorities. The Federal authorities should confine themselves to matters within their jurisdiction.

MR. POPE said he did not agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). While the Local Government should do, and be called upon to do, all they could for the stamping out of cattle disease, the Dominion had also the right of action, and important duties to perform. The power of that Government to act in such cases, could not be, and never had been, denied.

MR. MILLS said he did not think the hon. the Premier would endorse that opinion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that animals not *feræ naturæ* were articles of commerce. Matters of health and quarantine belonged to the Federal Government, as well as matters of trade. This whole subject resided with this Legislature and not with the Provinces. He thought, in the interests of commerce, agriculture, health and trade, it was better for them to deal with it still.

Resolutions agreed to and ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times and agreed to.

MR. POPE (Compton) introduced a Bill (No. 55) To provide against contagious diseases affecting animals.

Bill read the first time.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

MR. TILLEY moved the second reading of the resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th).

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this was the resolution on which hung the tariff; and, in order that they should carry out the arrangement made with hon. gentlemen opposite the other night, they had better now agree upon a certain course. The Finance Minister proposed that there should be a discussion on the whole question first, and that, after-

wards, when any hon. gentleman moved against any item, the discussion should be confined to it. They desired, however, at the outset, a full and impartial discussion of the tariff and its bearings.

MR. HOLTON said the general debate, begun the other day, should be continued on this motion to receive the report.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. HOLTON asked how the hon. gentleman proposed to proceed with the details afterwards? He thought there should be the utmost scope for discussion, as in Committee, on the general principles, and also on the details. Let them, then, proceed, as in Committee, to the consideration of each item.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, that would be rather lengthening the business and provoking a discussion on unimportant items.

MR. HOLTON: Practically, there would be no discussion excepting on such as we challenged, and it would be practically the same as in Committee; the rules of Committee must apply here.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We will meet the House in that way. When the items are discussed, they will endeavour to keep within the limits of the rule.

MR. HOLTON: I think so.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: And, afterwards, you can take them up again in concurrence.

MR. HOLTON: Is it proposed to proceed with the propositions *seriatim*?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Whenever there is any objection taken, motion can be made with regard to the item.

MR. HOLTON: The items will be read over, then?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. TUPPER said he did not rise for the purpose of answering the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, but for the purpose of drawing the hon. gen-

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

tleman's attention to a question of fact which was raised between them in that discussion, and he was sure he would admit that the charge of inaccuracy, which the hon. gentleman had brought against him (Mr. Tupper) did not lie at his door. He stated as his reason for believing that the late Government, in 1876, contemplated a change in the tariff, that they had not only a large deficit to meet, but that they had, in the then organ of the Government, the *Toronto Globe*, indicated that they, at all events, anticipated a change from 17½ per cent. to 20 per cent. He stated, further, that a telegram was sent by a member of the Cabinet to his paper in Charlottetown, indicating very clearly that the Government had under consideration an increase of the tariff, and that the efforts of the Government in that direction were being obstructed by the principal members of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in reply to his (Mr. Tupper's) statement, said that he was entirely inaccurate, and that he had sent for the paper and examined it.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, no.

MR. TUPPER: At all events, he stated that, after having examined the file of the paper for that month, he found no telegram to that effect.

MR. MACKENZIE: What I said was that I had got the paper examined. It was not examined by myself.

MR. TUPPER said he thought the hon. gentleman had hastily examined the paper himself. He, however, was quite sure the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) would not think he was wrong in taking this opportunity of reading to the House the telegram to which he had referred. The hon. gentleman would find, by referring to the *Prince Edward Island Patriot*, of the date of February 25th, 1876, the following telegram:—

“ OTTAWA, February 24th.

“ Mr. Cartwright's Budget speech, to-morrow, keeps all sections of politicians on the tip-toe of expectation. It is known that he favours an increase of the tariff to meet the deficit of over \$1,000,000, which must occur in spite of the reduction of expenditure approaching \$6,000,000. Those opposed to an increase

of the tariff propose an issue of \$1,000,000, or more, of Dominion notes, redeemable at a certain time. The majority of the Maritime members strongly oppose any change in the existing tariff. They informed the Premier of their views, through Mr. Church, to-day."

He thought the hon. member would admit that he was not inaccurate in the statement which he had made to the House in reference to this telegram.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the editor of the paper in question was in the city, and had sent him (Mr. Mackenzie) word that there was no such telegram in his paper for that month. The hon. gentleman, he thought, had spoken more precisely upon the subject than the telegram in question justified him in doing. He admitted the hon. gentleman had some grounds for making the statement, but his (Mr. Mackenzie's) information was obtained from the editor of the paper, who stated that no such telegram appeared that month.

MR. TUPPER said he did not, for one moment, wish to question the good faith in which the leader of the Opposition had made that statement.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, if the hon. the Minister of Finance would allow him to make the suggestion, he thought this would be an extremely convenient time for him to complete the financial statement which he had given them so briefly on the occasion of his Budget speech. He did not press the hon. gentleman to go further then, because, after a four hours' speech, it was natural the hon. gentleman should be suffering from considerable exhaustion. This, however, he thought, was a very favourable time, before proceeding to the consideration of this question, for receiving some detailed information in regard to the manner in which he proposed to make up the requisite \$2,000,000. All he could gather from the hon. gentleman's statement was that he expected from the increase of 2½ per cent. to get about \$750,000. How he was to obtain the remainder he was unable to see. He need not point out to him that it was of the greatest possible importance to a thorough understanding of this question, that they should know on what hypothesis the hon. gen-

tleman was proceeding, and what revenue he expected to obtain from the various articles he had removed from the free list, and the various articles he had removed from the 20 per cent. to the 35 per cent. list. No doubt he had all these figures in his desk, or, at any rate, in his office, and he desired the hon. the Finance Minister would take the first opportunity of giving them, in detail, this information.

MR. TILLEY said he thought it would be more convenient when they were discussing the various items to state the various sums he expected to realise in respect to them.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said this information should be given as early as was convenient, during the general debate. What he asked was that the hon. gentleman should tell them how much duty he expected to derive from the article of cottons, which made up about one-fourth of the present 17½ per cent. list; how much he would make out of the alterations and how much he would make on woollen articles. About sugar he had made a statement, but not sufficient to enable him to challenge it in detail, or accept it in detail, as the case might be. If the hon. gentleman was not prepared to make this statement at that time, he trusted he would do it at the earliest opportunity.

MR. TILLEY said he proposed to make these statements under the different heads. Under the heads of cotton, iron, etc., he would state what he considered would be the financial result of the new tariff. Of course there must be some speculation with reference to the matter, because the amount of revenue would be affected greatly by the amount of goods being at present imported. He had not been able to place his hand that morning on the returns showing what the imports of those different articles had been within the last two or three weeks.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would be a matter of great convenience if this statement were made as early in the debate as possible. The opinions of members would be controlled to a great extent by it, and it would enable them to enter upon the discussion more intelligently. There was another thing to which he desired to call the

attention of the hon. gentleman, and that was that there had not been a sufficient number of copies printed. He had not been able to get more than ten copies. That number was quite inadequate, because the business men of the country ought to be thoroughly informed of such a change as this, as some time must elapse before the final steps were taken. They had no means of making the precise facts known except by the distribution of these documents. The daily press supplied the information to some extent, but it was not always accurate.

MR. ANGLIN said there was another point which he thought should be referred to. He thought they should be supplied with a statement comparing the respects in which the tariff now proposed differed on various articles from the tariff which formerly existed. For instance, in cotton clothing, he desired to know what was the total duty per square yard, specific and *ad valorem*. He might divide the article into three classes; the lowest, the medium class, and the highest class, and show the total imposition per pound. He, himself, was unable to form an opinion as to the actual increased percentage. He was at a loss to know whether in woollens the rate per cent. would exceed, very much, 40 per cent., and whether, in some cases, it would not amount to 50 per cent. He thought the House and the country were entitled to all the information the Finance Minister could possibly furnish.

MR. FLYNN said that no more important question could engage the attention of the House than that now under its consideration. The question of increased taxation was, at all times, one of vital moment to the people of the Dominion, particularly at the present period, when our trade and commerce were so much depressed. So great had been the depression, and so many persons had been thrown out of employment, that the private and public charities had been insufficient to meet the wants of starving people in every village and town in the Dominion. Under these circumstances, the question of increased taxation became one of the utmost importance, and one to which they must give their careful consideration. This was a question

MR. MACKENZIE.

which would affect the Maritime Provinces more than any other part of the Dominion. In the Maritime Provinces they were essentially consumers. They possessed no manufacturing industries, and, therefore, the burdens of this increased taxation would fall very heavily on them. The imposition of a tariff of this character was foreshadowed ten or eleven years ago by the people of Nova Scotia. The anti-confederates of that period, among other objections to the scheme, prominently put forward the fact that, if confederated, our *ad valorem* duties would be raised to 25 per cent. The Hon. William Annand, who was one of the people's delegates sent from Nova Scotia in 1866 to urge their objections against a union with Canada, wrote a pamphlet addressed to Lord Carnarvon, the Secretary for the Colonies, in which, among other things, he stated that :

"Mr. Galt had, that year, reduced the *ad valorem* duties of Canada to 15 per cent. He did it with the probable design to wheedle the Maritime Provinces into Confederation, and to conciliate public opinion in this country until the measure was passed. But who does not know that the duties must come up again the moment the confederacy is formed."

How was this statement—now so prophetic—met? The Hon. Mr. McCully, who was one of the co-delegates of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to arrange the scheme of Confederation, addressed a letter to Lord Carnarvon, in which he made this statement :—

"The avowment of Mr. Annand is as unsubstantial as it is disingenuous. A protection policy once abandoned in any Legislature is not likely ever again to be re-enacted. If it be what its friends and advocates contended, it is not only the more rational, but the more prosperous policy, how does Mr. Annand expect that, under Confederation, the Legislature, with such an infusion of Free-traders as the Maritime Colonies would supply—how does he expect that the country can ever again fall back to Protection? Nothing could be more unlikely and absurd."

This was the declaration of one of the delegates of Nova Scotia, who was, at that time, in England for the purpose of arranging the scheme of Confederation. The tariff proposed in this resolution, according to those views, was a violation of the Federal compact by which Nova Scotia entered the Union.

He might be told, in reply, that Nova Scotia herself had violated it by returning a majority to this House to support the present Administration in their National Policy. But what were the facts? Nova Scotia had not pronounced, any more than the other Maritime Provinces, in favour of the tariff submitted by the hon. the Finance Minister. When those who opposed the National Policy, as foreshadowed by the speeches of hon. gentlemen here last Session, pointed out in Nova Scotia the probability that a high protective tariff would be introduced to benefit the manufactures of Ontario, they were met by the assertion that there was no idea of largely protecting the industries of the country, but merely a readjustment of the tariff. The following telegram from Mr. Boyd, of St. John's, and the reply, would carry out his statement. Mr. Boyd telegraphed to the right hon. the Premier on July 22nd: "The Government Press state you propose to raise the tariff generally to 35 per cent. Can you contradict this?" To which the right hon. gentleman replied: "It is an absurd falsehood. Neither in London or elsewhere have I gone beyond my motion in Parliament, and have never proposed an increase, but only a readjustment of the tariff." It was, therefore, evident that this majority was obtained by statements not correct. This increase of the tariff was a violation of the compact, and he felt bound to protest against it. The people had been deceived; they had not been led to believe that the tariff would have been raised, but that only such a readjustment would be made as would benefit all; foster and encourage our native industries without increasing the burdens of taxation. This tariff bore more heavily on the Maritime than on the other Provinces. In the Maritime Provinces, the manufacturing industries were mere trifles compared with Upper Canada, and, in those Provinces, the principal articles of consumption were breadstuffs, which included flour, corn, corn meal, rye, etc.; and, in addition, cotton, twills, duck, linens, earthenware, prints, hardware, etc. With regard to breadstuffs, every Legislature since Confederation was opposed to any-

thing like a duty on those articles. It was a most unfair duty, one which taxed one class of the community to build up another section. The Maritime Provinces raised no wheat, ground no flour, and therefore must pay, under this tariff, tribute to the amount of fifty cents a barrel to the Ontario producers. It was well known that, during last Session, an hon. member had corresponded on the question of Free-trade and Protection with several of the leading manufacturers of the Dominion, and their replies were on record among the papers of this House. These replies abundantly proved that wherever a man gave his business that attention which it deserved, it prospered under the 17½ per cent. tariff. It was proved by other hon. gentlemen—even from Ontario—that, where these industries had failed, it was owing to want of capacity and energy, and that, where both were given, those investing capital were amply rewarded. If under 17½ per cent. these manufacturing industries were paying, every dollar got beyond that was a tribute paid by the people to those engaged in manufactures. If 17½ per cent. was sufficient for revenue purposes, to build our public works, every extra dollar imposed was a tribute from the consumer to the producer. The present tariff ranged from 25 per cent. to 40 per cent. and bore heavily on the poorer classes. The cheaper articles, those which were manufactured in this country, were the most protected, the cheap woollens and cottons, while the more expensive articles were not so heavily taxed. He noticed a drawback of ten per cent. was given to shipbuilders on all materials used in the building of ships. He did not see why the fishermen should not net a drawback on nails and other articles used in building their boats. They were equally entitled to protection as the people who were engaged in shipping. While all these articles he had enumerated: hardware, cottons, woollens, furniture, etc., had increased nearly 100 per cent., all they had got in exchange was a slight reduction in molasses, and a reduction of perhaps not half a cent on tea, the former duty on which had never been complained of. While he most strenuously objected to the duty on flour, there was one duty,

the imposition of which, he could not help thinking, was due to some mistake; that was the duty on corn meal. As everyone knew, corn meal was about half the value of flour, and therefore should only have been charged at half the rate of duty. But there was no principle to warrant the imposition of any duty on corn meal. Ontario did not produce this article in sufficient quantity for her own consumption. With the exception of a stretch of land along Lake Erie, there was no place in Ontario where corn in any quantity worth mentioning was grown. In the Maritime Provinces, the poorer classes were forced to buy corn meal instead of flour. This tax would therefore fall heavily on them, without benefitting Ontario, as the people had to import their corn meal from the United States at an additional cost of 40 cents per barrel. He was borne out in this fact by Mr. Morrison, a commercial gentleman from Halifax, and of whose veracity no one acquainted with him could doubt. Mr. Morrison, in his evidence before the Coal Committee, in 1877, said:

"In reference to corn meal, we import it from the United States. We get it cheaper there; and, even with a duty of 50c., would still have to import it from there, because it is cheaper."

This proved the absurdity of the tax. It had been said that the duty on flour would not increase its price. True, the price in England regulated the price here, but there were some peculiarities connected with our trade, owing to which it must be paid by the consumers. If all the good time predicted to follow the advent of the hon. gentlemen opposite to office were to come; if the Maritime Provinces were also to prosper, their trade must be with the United States, which were the great purchasers of all their articles of export. Even the exports of Nova Scotia to the Upper Provinces had not increased in the slightest degree since 1866. In 1866, the exports were \$438,000, and the imports \$500,000. In 1876, the imports were about 3½ millions from Ontario and Quebec, while the exports did not exceed the amount of 1865-66, thus showing that the exports from Nova Scotia to the Upper Provinces had not increased, while the imports from those

MR. FLYNN.

Provinces had gone up to 3½ millions between 1865 and 1876. If the prosperity predicted to follow the National Policy were brought about, our natural customers were the United States. It was well-known that, while the freight on flour from Toronto to Halifax was at a fixed rate, about 80c., rarely, if ever varying, it was quite different on the sea-board. Nova Scotia had a large foreign trade with the West Indies, in the export of fish from Halifax. The vessels bringing out cargoes very often to the United States, and coming home, would take flour at a very low rate of freight, in preference to purchasing ballast, often as low as 10c. to 12c. per barrel. Taking the article of flour, presuming it was of the same quality and value in Toronto as in New York, the freight from Toronto to Halifax was 80c. per barrel, while from New York to Halifax it was from ten to twelve cents. Therefore, there was a difference of from 68c. to 70c. in favour of the flour of the United States. Under these circumstances, flour would be imported from the United States, and the people of the Lower Provinces would have to pay the duty. He was told that flour could be brought in bond, but he ventured to say that, for one barrel brought in bond, ten would come in the other way. Trading vessels, laden with Lower Province products, would go to the United States, where they could very often get return freights, and could buy their flour and other goods from the parties with whom they dealt. It had been stated, two or three years ago, at a meeting of the Millers' Association, or of the Board of Trade—he did not remember which—that they could not then compete with the Americans in the same grade of flour sent into the Maritime Provinces without the imposition of a duty. This meant that they could not send the same grade of flour, at the same prices, to the Maritime Provinces, as they sent from the United States. From this fact, it must be evident that the duty on flour would be a benefit to the Ontario producer; and, if so, who would pay it but the consumer in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. the Minister of Finance had stated that he had endeavoured to protect all the industries of the country. He (Mr. Flynn) contended that those who would

chiefly benefit by the tariff were the manufacturers of Ontario. How was the great lumber interest protected? By increasing the duty on the articles consumed by lumbermen. How were the fishermen being protected? By increasing the cost of the articles they usually consumed. How were the labourers of the Dominion protected? By having to pay higher prices for everything they consumed.

MR. FARROW: I would ask if the hon. gentleman considers that salt bears a duty?

MR. FLYNN said salt was free; it was in the same position now that it had been since Confederation. He had no doubt the hon. gentleman was not pleased because salt was not taxed in order to benefit his constituency. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had spoken of the prosperity of France under Protection. He would remind that hon. gentleman how France had protected her fishermen. She had protected them in such a manner as to convert two barren rocks in the Atlantic into prosperous towns. The fishermen of the Lower Provinces were not properly protected by the policy of the Government. Even the other day, when the Government were interrogated as to the disposition of the fishery award, no intimation was given that any portion of it was to go to the Lower Provinces, and, unless some portion of it was so applied, he should contend that the fishermen were not justly treated. The hon. the Finance Minister had also stated that, if the Ontario and Quebec manufacturers were protected, the coal interest of Nova Scotia was protected as an off-set; and it was also stated that Nova Scotia should be grateful for the privilege of having a sugar refinery at Halifax. He could see no earthly good to the people of Nova Scotia by an arrangement that would establish sugar refineries in Halifax and Montreal. These refineries might employ, perhaps, 500 or 600 people, but the whole population of the Dominion would have to pay dearer for their sugar. Since the introduction of the Budget, dealers had already raised the price of sugar 1c. per pound. In this way the entire population of the country would have to pay higher for their sugar in order to support and sustain a couple of sugar refineries

in Halifax and Montreal. We had been further told that the coal industry of Nova Scotia had been protected by the imposition of a duty of 50c. per ton on coal. He was opposed to this duty on coal, for this reason, that, even if the duty was \$1.50 or \$2.00 per ton, instead of 50c., the duty could never be placed on coal without imposing other duties. He would not be justified, representing the constituency he did, in supporting a policy of this kind. These coal mines were owned, as a rule, by wealthy capitalists, resident in England, the United States, Montreal, Halifax, and some in Toronto. It would be unfair and unjust to tax the necessaries of life, and thus increase the burdens of the people for the purpose of enriching these already wealthy capitalists, and increasing their dividends. According to the census of 1871, the population of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island was about 800,000. According to the same census, the number of miners was 2,120 in Nova Scotia, and 121 in New Brunswick. The farmers, fishermen, labourers, and seamen, without including various other occupations, numbered 140,000. Hence, we had 140,000 individuals taxed to afford employment to 2,240 miners. For these reasons he would, under no circumstances, vote for a duty on coal, when it was connected with a duty on flour, meal, or other necessaries of life, that were used by all classes. But could anyone, acquainted with the circumstances, suppose that this 50c. per ton on coal would enable the Lower Province miners to compete with American dealers? He did not think, for a moment, that this would secure the object in view. When gentlemen interested in the coal industry came before the Coal Committee, they asked for a duty of 50c. or a bounty of 75c., and they also wanted the 17½ per cent. taken off those articles which were used in their mining industries. Now the 17½ per cent. was nearly doubled, and the 50c. would not keep out American coal from the Upper Provinces, and the people would be taxed to no purpose. Then there was the matter of distance. It was stated before the Committee that, while the distance from Cape Breton to Toronto was 1,200 miles, most of the American transport lines ran very close

to the greater part of Ontario. The cost of production was also much greater in Nova Scotia than in the United States. It was stated before the Committee that, while the cost of production in Nova Scotia varied from \$1.25 to \$2.00 per ton, in the United States it was only 80c. to \$1.00. Consequently, they had these two facts confronting them: that the distance from the mine in Cape Breton was four times that from the United States, and the cost of production was nearly double that of the United States. The 50c. coal duty would simply tax the coal consumer in the Upper Provinces, without benefitting in the slightest the coal industry in Nova Scotia. It was also shown to the Committee, by Grand Trunk prices, that American coal could be laid down in Toronto \$1.45 cheaper than Nova Scotia coal. Moreover, it could be shown that the duty on coal, imposed in 1870, had had no effect in protecting that industry. Mr. Lithgow, one of the greatest advocates of coal protection in Nova Scotia, stated before the Coal Committee that, in 1869, the amount of coal sent to the Upper Provinces was 129,069 tons; in 1870, 162,977 tons; in 1871, 168,000 tons; in 1874, 338,754 tons; in 1875, 381,711 tons. Hence, they saw that, without the aid of any duty, the quantity sent to the Upper Provinces was greater in 1871 than it was in 1870, the year it was protected, and it went on steadily increasing. All these calculations that were made before the Committee, as regarded the transportation, were based on the low freights that ruled at that period. Freights were never lower than they were since 1874, but the moment times got better, as was expected to be the case before long, freights would increase with sea-going vessels, while the cost of transport by rail and the lakes, from the American mines, was not likely to increase. This would be an additional advantage to American coal in its competition with Nova Scotia coal. There was another aspect in which this question presented itself to him, and he desired, before concluding his remarks, to refer to it. A memorial had been sent to the Dominion Government by the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia on the financial condition of the Province. This memorial showed that, while the expenditure amounted to

\$600,000, the revenue amounted to only \$455,000, making a deficiency of \$145,000. The people of Nova Scotia had been told, at the time of Confederation, that \$400,000 would be sufficient for their annual expenditure, and that, under no circumstances, would they require more. This statement was made by the Minister of Justice, who was then the Finance Minister of that Province. But now they had the statement before them—and it came from a political friend of the Minister of Justice—that \$400,000 was not sufficient; that they would require \$600,000. No matter what economy might be practised, he believed that very little reduction could be made in the sum. There could be no reduction of any consequence made in this expenditure without interfering with their educational grants or road and bridge service. The people of Nova Scotia would, therefore, have to submit to direct taxation annually to make up this deficiency of \$145,000, or have the grants to which he had referred materially curtailed. And, in addition to this, the people of that Province would have to contribute largely to the Dominion revenue, and submit to the additional burdens this tariff imposed on them. The people of that Province had good reason to complain of the injustice of this tariff. Previous to Confederation, Nova Scotia prospered under a 10 per cent. tariff; made ample provision for all public purposes, and, for ten years before Confederation, her annual receipts exceeded her expenditure. Now they had a local deficit of \$145,000, which must be met by direct taxation, and also bear the burden that this tariff, ranging from 25 to 40 per cent., imposed in order to protect Ontario manufacturers. He did not intend to further occupy the attention of the House. He had endeavoured briefly to give his views on this important question. Representing, as he did, a constituency who, as consumers, contributed largely to the revenue, and belonging to a Province who were essentially a trading and commercial people, nine-tenths of whom, if not more, were in favour of Free-trade, he considered it his duty to protest against the adoption of a tariff so oppressive and burdensome to the people. He opposed the resolutions submitted by the hon. the Finance

Minister, because he believed the imposition of those high duties was a violation of the compact by which Nova Scotia was induced to go into Confederation, and because he thought it would endanger the Federal system. He opposed it because he believed the policy to be a retrograde one, and in opposition to the enlightened views and Free-trade policy of Great Britain. He opposed the resolutions, because he believed that the tariff would bear heavily on the poor people and labouring classes of the Maritime Provinces; because he believed the fishermen, the lumbermen, and every class would feel the burdens imposed by the proposed tariff. He opposed it, also, because he did not believe that a few manufacturing industries of this country should be bolstered up at the expense of the people. He did not believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of this Dominion should be over-taxed and made poor to make a few manufacturers rich.

MR. DOULL said he felt he was called upon to reply to some remarks made by the hon. gentleman who had just sat down. He (Mr. Flynn) would make it appear to the House that at Confederation the people of Nova Scotia had entered into a compact with the other Provinces against Protection; that, by the Confederation Treaty, Nova Scotia was to be exempt from Protection. He thought that was a fallacy, and that the result of the general election in that Province was a sufficient answer to that statement. He thought that the question of Protection had been discussed in all the constituencies of Nova Scotia; and he knew, so far as the county he represented was concerned, it had been discussed freely and fully, and they had unmistakably declared in favour of Protection; and every other county in Nova Scotia, with the exception of five, had also declared in favour of Protection. Therefore, that statement of the hon. gentleman amounted to very little. He (Mr. Flynn) had talked about increased taxation. He (Mr. Doull) had no fear of increased taxation, if the tariff would only give the industries of the Province to which he belonged that Protection that was necessary to give them a market. They had

one great industry that the hon. gentleman had alluded to. It was not only one of the greatest industries of the county he (Mr. Doull) represented, but of the Province of Nova Scotia, and for that great industry he thought that a sufficient Protection would give them the markets necessary to develop it. He referred to coal. He would not care how much duty they put in order to protect the other industries, if the industries of his Province were protected; but he feared that the Protection that was given under the present tariff was not sufficient to give the people of Nova Scotia a market for their coal in Quebec and Ontario, because he had taken the trouble to enquire from men engaged in the business. He might say he had seen to-day, in Ottawa, a gentleman who was engaged in the coal trade in Toronto, who handled one hundred and fifty thousand tons of coal yearly, and that that gentleman was prepared to go down to Nova Scotia to make his contract for the ensuing year, for the coal that he required for the markets of Ontario, if a duty of 75c. were imposed on coal. That was an answer to another statement made by the hon. gentleman, that he did not think a duty of 75c. would give them the market of Ontario. He believed, further, with respect to coal, that, if the Government or the Finance Minister would only agree to put 75c. upon all bituminous coal coming into this country from the United States, the United States, in order to retain the markets of Ontario, would take the 75c. duty per ton off our coal going to their country, and thus restore to Nova Scotia its natural market, and, if it had its natural markets, they would not want the markets of Ontario, because the latter was, at the present time, the more natural market of the United States than it was of Nova Scotia, on account of the distance they had to transport their coal from Nova Scotia to Ontario. He believed that, if the Minister of Finance had placed a duty of 75c. a ton on all imported bituminous coal, they would have restored to them, in the course of a year, their natural markets in the United States, and it would not have been necessary to continue a duty on coal coming into Ontario. He wanted to show, before he left coal, that a duty of 50c. on coal

was not really going to benefit the Dominion. It was going to be a tax on Ontario and Quebec, whilst it was not going to give the Province of Nova Scotia a market for its coal. It was his opinion that 75c. would not only give Nova Scotia a market, but would, in the course of a short time, reduce the price of coal for Quebec and Ontario. And why? Everyone knew that with an increased demand they could afford to sell their coal at a lower price than at present. They were able to put out four times the quantity of coal at very little additional cost per ton, and that additional cost would be merely in cutting in the mines, and, if they had a market for four times the quantity sold now, they would be able to sell at a less price. Freight, also, would be cheaper, because having the Ontario markets their coal and ship owners would, in the course of a very short time, put on a class of vessels suited to the trade to take coal from the Nova Scotia markets to the Ontario ports at a much lower rate of freight than it could be carried for now. He dared say that they would get a portion of the Quebec market, with a duty of 50c. ; but he feared very much that the present duty was not going to give them the Ontario market. That it would be a benefit to a small extent, he believed ; but he must confess that, when he heard the rate put at 50c., he was disposed to kick a little, with respect to the tariff. However, he would not object to 50c. if he could not get 75c. He thought, however, the Government should reconsider the matter, and give the 75c. duty, and thus some guarantee to the coal-owners of the Province of Nova Scotia that they would obtain the home markets of the Dominion of Canada. There was no speculation with respect to this matter. They had Mr. Rogers here, who was ready to go into Nova Scotia and make his contract for the coal from there, if given a protection of 75c. per ton, on coal imported from the United States. If they did not obtain this Protection, Mr. Rogers meant to make his contract in the United States. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) said that the people of Nova Scotia were Free-traders to-day. As he (Mr. Doull) had already said, he thought the result of the election proved

the incorrectness of that statement. He found that the people of Nova Scotia, with the rest of the Dominion, were strongly in favour of the National Policy. He would say, if it were not for the duty on coal, he would congratulate the Minister of Finance and the Government for the National Policy which they had submitted to this House. With the exception, also, of a duty on two or three other items, he did not think there was anything in that policy they could find fault with. He thought it reflected great credit on the Finance Minister and the Government who prepared it ; but that they could get a perfect measure at first he thought was impossible. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) had alluded to the increased taxation upon the Province of Nova Scotia. Well, if they had a market for their coal, he thought that the increased remuneration that their people would get for their labour and for every article they had to dispose of would be more than equal to counter-balance any increased taxation that might ensue from the present tariff. With regard to the increased price of flour, he would say that, if he mistook not, the hon. member for Lambton had proved conclusively that the duty on flour was not going to increase its cost in this Dominion. They produced more flour than they consumed, and, consequently, any advance that was put on flour was not going to increase the price of it, because the price of flour was regulated by the prices in European markets. With respect to corn meal, he rather agreed with the hon. gentleman who had just sat down, that corn meal was not produced in this country to any great quantity. It was not produced in sufficient quantity to supply the whole market ; and, therefore, he thought that the tax, 2c. per bushel, was much larger than it should be, because that article was consumed more by the poorer than the wealthy classes. Therefore, he agreed with his hon. friend that the duty was objectionable. So far as the price of flour and the carriage of that article from the Ontario markets to Nova Scotia was concerned, he thought the hon. gentleman was wrong. The time when they had a coal trade with the New England States, their vessels carrying coal from the ports of Nova Scotia to those States got flour as return freight

at a very low rate of freight—10c. or 12c. But since they had been shut out from these markets the cost of carrying flour from the United States to Nova Scotia was about the same as from Ontario to Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) had said that the fishermen and labourers were not protected. He (Mr. Doull) thought, from his reading of the tariff, that the fishermen had received very fair consideration at the hands of the Minister of Finance, and that their labourers were very well protected. He thought whatever gave labour to the country gave protection to the labourer, and that every increase put upon articles imported into the country was protection to the labourer, because it gave labour to our country, that was on imported articles paid for abroad. Therefore, he contended that this National Policy gave protection to the labourer and the fisherman, as well as all other industries, except it might be lumbering. He would admit that the lumber industry was one that could not very well be protected. All the industries except lumber and coal, he thought, were fairly protected. When he went before his constituents, he had pledged himself to obtain, as far as he was able, that protection that would secure home markets for native industries. He thought that with this exception in the tariff that they did not get on coal the duty necessary to secure a home market, the tariff was a very fair one. He contended, therefore, they had not received at the hands of the Finance Minister that consideration they ought to have obtained. The coal industry was one of the great industries of the country, and should receive equal consideration at the hands of the Government with the other industries. The Committee appointed to report on this important question in the last House, a majority of whom were opposed to giving coal protection, in their report said that it was not to be regarded as an isolated branch of commerce, but as a great and important factor in relation to the national progress and prosperity. He thought that, as regarded an industry of such great importance, the Government should have given it that protection necessary to secure for it the home market, considering that it was shut out of their natural market, the New England

States, by the duty of 75c. imposed upon it by the United States.

MR. MACKENZIE said he desired to correct the hon. gentleman who had last spoken, in quoting his remarks respecting the flour trade. He said that he (Mr. Mackenzie) proved conclusively that no duty would increase the price of flour. What he had said was that no duty would be of any benefit to the producers of that flour in Ontario; but that the price or duty put on the flour imported into the Maritime Provinces would be a serious hardship to their people, inasmuch as their trade was not with Ontario, but with the Atlantic States. He (Mr. Mackenzie) took this opportunity to correct a mis-statement that hon. gentlemen opposite had repeated from time to time.

MR. McLENNAN said he thought the situation of the country was one of very great gravity, and that the responsibility that rested on this House was very great indeed. The change in this House was suggestive of the change of feeling and opinion that had certainly taken place in the country; it was an indication of the change, of the progress men were making in this whole question of finance, of duties and industries. The change they were making in this respect was in the same direction, and in accord with that going on in all the civilised world around; and he must heartily congratulate the Minister of Finance upon his good fortune in having to deal with this whole question, from the foundation, at a time when the country and the world at large was so ready to deal with it; at a time when the faith and hope of the Dominion were with and behind him, when he could deal, with a strong hand, with all the important questions that related to the use of capital, labour and trade, and all the questions affecting the wealth and resources of the nation. He would quote, on this subject, a few of the statements of men considered the doctors of political economy, and, more particularly, practical men, to show the direction opinion had been travelling in with regard to this question. Prof. Bonamy Price, a good authority, said:

“To construct a strict science of political economy is what no writer has yet performed.”

Prof. Cairns, of London University, gave, in a few sentences, his own opinion and the correlative opinion of another high authority on this subject, as follows:—

“It is now a quarter of a century since Col. Torrens wrote as follows: ‘In the progress of the human mind, a period of controversy among the cultivators of any branch of science must necessarily precede the period of unanimity. With respect to Political Economy, the period of controversy is passing away, and that of unanimity rapidly approaching. Twenty years hence there will scarcely exist a doubt with respect to any of its fundamental principles.’ Five and thirty years have now passed since this unlucky prophecy was uttered, and yet such questions as those respecting the laws of population, of rent, of foreign trade, the effects of different kinds of expenditure upon distribution, the theory of prices—all fundamental in the science—are still unsettled, and must still be considered as ‘open questions,’ if that expression may be applied to propositions that are vehemently debated, not merely by sciolists and smatterers, who may be always expected to wrangle, but by the professed cultivators and recognised exponents of the science. So far from the period of controversy having passed, it seems hardly yet to have begun.”

He (Mr. McLennan) would commend to the reading of the House an article only two years’ old by another authority of a different kind—a gentleman who had spent his life in the diplomatic service and colonial governorships—from the *Contemporary Review*, a portion of which he would read, as follows:—

“In attempting some explanation of this question, I would premise that, so far as my own opinions are concerned, I am neither Protectionist nor Free-trader. I am disposed to regard the controversy as, in many respects, not more scientific than would be a discussion of the comparative merits of speed and of slowness, regardless of the laws of correlation of forces and conservation of energy, and the fact that, what is gained in speed, is paid for by some form of force.

“In all discussions of commercial principles or policy during the last thirty or forty years, there is an obvious tendency, which may be seen in many other fields of enquiry, to imagine that it is not possible to have too much of a good thing, as we express the idea in colloquial language. Because commercial restrictions are often burdensome to particular interests or certain classes, it is assumed that it must always be for the good of the whole of any community to enjoy untrammelled freedom of trade. I think that, in accordance with this general tendency to push the application of abstract principles to extremes, the admirers of commercial liberty have over-

looked the fact that there are limits and circumstances within which alone healthy growth and beneficial action may be expected from perfectly free and unprotected trade. * * * * The whole of the confusion in this matter arises from a sophism as old as Adam Smith, but not venerable, except for its age—the doctrine that nations can get rich and accumulate capital by interchanging perishable articles with one another—that England can become wealthy by exchanging hardware with France for wine; as if a cutler who should make a penknife and scissors every day, and exchange them with a publican and a butcher for a bottle of wine and a beefsteak, which he drinks and eats, could by this process make provision for his family. According to the Free-trade theory pushed to its logical extent, each country should only do that thing, produce that article of commerce in respect of which it is most favoured—gold countries should produce nothing else but gold; countries with specially good copper mines nothing but copper; wine countries nothing but wine; China nothing but tea; Australia nothing but wool; South America nothing but hides. But the inhabitants of these places say naturally: ‘It is quite true, this is by far the most favoured industry in this country, but this is not sufficient to employ all of us. We want employment—work to do, that we may live. We cannot remove to other countries, for in each the favoured industry is oversupplied with labour. That the few engaged in the favoured industry enjoy exceptional advantages, in competition with all the rest of the world, is no reason why we should starve. On the contrary, that is an excellent argument why they should pay us rather more for all the supplies which they want, and which we can supply, if we are protected, than they could get them for in the open markets of the world. We can then obtain the capital necessary to prosecute the industry under disadvantageous circumstances, if we know that sufficiently high prices will be ensured to enable us to recover the capital expended, and give us a profit to live upon. And, then, remember that the capital will not be destroyed, nor sent out of the country, but remain within our borders and circulate among ourselves. If you spend a little more money upon us than you otherwise would, we also shall spend more upon those whom we employ.”

We would have, in the application of this theory, the additional disadvantage, in exchanging our pen-knives for their bottle of wine, of travelling 3,000 miles of sea for the purpose. He did not think that anything could more clearly illustrate the whole theory of the Canadian National Policy now in hand. Further, he would read from the same authority:

“According to Mr. Cairns, because with vast extents of free land, the United States en-

joyed unparalleled advantages in producing the food of man, and the special article, cotton, they are to make no efforts to supply their own wants in other respects. A great and populous nation, possessing every requisite for human happiness is not to strive to develop these for herself, but should be satisfied to remain the hewer of wood and drawer of water for others of mankind."

He believed that the United States had determined that question for themselves. To-day they, in Canada, were trying to get out of the rut of being hewers of wood and drawers of water to other people. Again, Professor Cairns said, with respect to the money question :

"Taxation, in whatever shape, which is gathered from the several members of the whole body, and then redistributed among the same body, though in different proportions, and to different members, is not a reduction from the earnings of the body as a whole."

Another writer in a late number of the same Review, said :

"Political economy cannot assume the uniformity of nature in the same way that astronomy does, and hence it has no scientific position from which to slight the doctrines of those who maintain that a new and wholly different régime might supersede that which Ricardo and his school have so clearly described."

In fact, they found, in dealing with this question, that everything was new and nothing old, and that the world about them was discrediting theories that it had cultivated for many years; that they were, not only themselves taking a lesson from the experience of the last five years, which had been so disastrous, but were travelling in the same direction as the people of England, who had for many years, been gradually crystallising the theories of Free-trade, after the instructions of Bright and Cobden, and men of that school. But they found that they were not only making progress in discrediting those theories, but others, also, on the other side of the ocean. He would have been a bold man, ten years ago, who should have said that Free-trade was not a sound and incontrovertible principle. To-day the majority of thoughtful men were coming to the conclusion that those theories were not of the nature of law, but were based merely upon a series of fortunate circumstances that grew out of different relations of things from those now existing. There had been a host of manufactures in England produced by

Protection, till England reached the position of excellence attained in them. While that state of things continued, which was called Free-trade, but was not, after all, Free-trade, England had the advantage. The only Free-trade he knew of was what Canada had been subjected to, under which every freebooter of trade had the real command of it, with access to every dollar of their earnings. On this subject he would add a statement which he saw in an English newspaper, in the London *Daily News* of February 11th. It gave an account of a meeting held in the city of London, with a list of names well known in commercial centres. The following resolution was adopted at that meeting :—

"That this meeting, deploring that the confident predictions of the promoters of Free-trade—first, that if England set the example, other nations would be sure to extend to her reciprocal advantages; and, secondly, that the cheapness arising from Free-trade would enable England to defy the competition of foreign countries in her own and neutral markets—have not been fulfilled, but that, on the contrary, after thirty years' experience, foreign nations are less inclined to Free-trade than ever; and that not only is England excluded by prohibition from many foreign markets, but she is threatened by Protectionist countries in neutral markets, and her staple manufactures are undersold on her own counters."

In *Macmillan's Magazine* there was a view of the position taken by an eminent Liverpool merchant, Mr. McIver, the member for Birkenhead. He was a man who had discussed this question from all its standpoints, and the discussions now going on in England amongst practical men, he thought, were far more instructive than the lessons and doctrines they read in works of political economists. He must ask the pardon of the House for reading another statement, made in one of the reviews. It was as follows :—

"The first duty of Government is to afford the freest possible field for labour. The second is to put the least possible hindrance on the process by which wealth is naturally distributed. The third is to impose its necessary charges with a constant eye towards effecting, as far as those who contribute the tax are concerned, an equality of sacrifice."

This equality of sacrifice was brought about by what, for want of a better name, they might call the National Policy. The National Policy dealt with this whole

question, with a view of equality of sacrifice. Whilst a loaf of bread might be dear at sixpence to a man who had not a penny in his pocket, it would be cheap at a shilling if he happened to have a pocket-full of money. This was simply the theory upon which the National Policy was based. To say a country should be a producer without being a consumer was simply to indicate a state of things that would impoverish any country. They saw the result of cheap living on the banks of the Nile and the Tiber; the traveller and the railway whistle disturbed the herds of cattle that fed there. Those countries were once populous with men who devoted themselves to agriculture, they maintained large bodies of agriculturists who were known as helots and serfs. Then men were held until they actually eat up everything upon their own soil, like locusts, and those countries had fallen into decay. One of the most striking features of the trade of this country was that, whilst they imported a large quantity of produce for consumption from the United States, they had been exporting to Great Britain. This process in itself was a very great disadvantage. They were importing from men at their own doors, and paying for their imports in gold. And they were exporting to a country 3,000 miles away, with the disadvantage of going so far for a market. In 1874, our imports from Great Britain were \$63,076,000. In 1878, they had fallen to \$37,431,000, a decline of \$25,654,000. On the other hand, our imports from the United States in 1874 were \$54,283,000. At the end of the last fiscal year they were \$48,631,000. In the one case there was a decrease of \$25,645,000, and in the other there was a decrease of only \$5,652,000. Our exports to Great Britain in 1874 were \$45,300,000. Last year they were \$45,491,000, showing an increase of \$190,000. Our exports to the United States in 1874 amounted to \$36,244,000. Last year they were \$25,244,000. Whilst in the one case there was a difference of less than a million dollars, in the other case there was a difference of \$11,000,000 against us. One of our great sources of income and wealth had been our lumber trade. In former years our exports to

the United States were very large, but they had fallen off as all our exports had. He did not look upon the lumber resources of the country as a permanent resource, as he looked upon the productions of the soil and other productions which could be a permanent resource. Our exports of lumber in 1874, to Great Britain, were \$14,944,000. In 1878 they amounted to \$13,536,000, showing a difference of \$1,408,000. The exports of lumber to the United States in 1874 were \$9,871,000, while our exports in 1878 were only \$4,739,000. Our exports from the mines had fallen off in the same way. In 1874, Canada exported to the United States, from the mines, produce to the value of \$3,611,000, which fell off in 1878 to \$2,510,000. It was obvious, therefore, that they had been losing by this trade with the United States in every direction. In discussing this question of trade with the United States, he thought it behoved them to put the whole question on its proper footing at the outset. They should understand that they were not making a crusade against the United States, and he thought it would be a subject of regret if they were to indulge in any expressions that would convey the idea that they were adopting a measure of repulsion towards the United States. When the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated in 1865, they were told by the people of the United States, that the heavy taxation to which they were subjected was the result of their great war, and that it was necessary that they should retain their own markets for their own people. They, in Canada, had to accept that proposition, and they accepted it because they thought it was reasonable. He thought that the situation of Canada to-day was precisely the same, and that the same argument would apply. Independently of the depression that had gone all around the world, they had assumed a great undertaking for the extension of the Dominion. For the great burthens they had assumed, in their effort to reach across the continent, they found themselves in a position in which they must do something to preserve the interests of the country. He agreed with the hon. the Minister of Finance on the policy he had brought down. He believed there were some anomalies in

the tariff. It would be very extraordinary if an undertaking of this kind, comprehending the whole fiscal system of the country, could be completed by one effort. It had been stated on both sides of the House, and throughout the country, that a reciprocity of tariff would have served us better than the system now adopted as the National Policy. He believed there was a fallacy about this. He was sure reciprocity would never bring any revenue to the country. It might be possible, if our entire fiscal system was successful, that we should become large manufacturers; that we should manufacture to a degree that would render us self-sustaining, and drive us to some other method of raising a revenue than the method of raising revenue from Customs. A great deal had been said in deprecation of the system of direct taxation. He thought there might be worse things for the country than direct taxation. If they were to produce everything they required and roll in wealth, instead of being in the state they were in at present, he did not know that direct taxation would be a serious drawback. In taking up this National Policy they were not merely adopting an expedient for the purpose of bridging over a doubtful condition of affairs, but they were adopting a system that would be the best possible system for all time that they could adopt under the circumstances. And he congratulated his hon. friend upon the successful policy which he had initiated.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. McLENNAN said an hon. gentleman opposite, some two or three nights ago, suggested that, if we lived on an island in the sea, instead of forming as we did a long line of country divided by wastes of barren land, we might adopt such a system as the one proposed for the protection and development of our industries. He ventured to suggest that it was because this Dominion covered a country of very great extent, of very diverse character and quality and geographical line, of climate and resources, that we were well adapted for development under our present system of

Government, and under the policy now inaugurated. Everybody knew that our country had not prospered during the past five years. This great child of the Empire,—this Dominion,—had not prospered under the sage nurses to whom it had been entrusted during that period. He believed the time would come when that great North-West would be developed; when, under the influence of our present financial system, we should be able and happy to go on with the railway across the continent; when the proof would be manifest to all men that our country was well adapted for the system of government we had taken up, and for the protective, and all the system proposed by the present Administration. But we should require, if we had not reciprocity with the United States, which, as he had already said, he did not look forward to as a great desideratum, to have reciprocity within ourselves. The men of the East and of the West would have to learn that they had some interest in this Union, that they had something as a nation worth preserving, and that, in the interchange of their products, in the arrangement of their measures of finance, and in all their fiscal economies, they must practice a system of reciprocity within themselves; that they must give and take from one end to the other of this great Dominion, and that the coal of Nova Scotia and the wheat of Ontario and the great North-West would be exchanged upon this principle of reciprocity and of self-protection. There were some items in our manufacturing industry that illustrated in themselves, in a very concise and clear manner, the methods we were adopting. The manufacture of cloth, the use of the wool that was grown in this country, was one of these examples, of the method by which the Government proposed to benefit the country by keeping our industries in our own hands. There were woollen manufactories within a few miles of his own residence, and from his personal observation the process followed in the home manufacture was as follows: The wool produced was sold to the manufactory at 20c. per pound. That pound was sufficient for the manufacture of a yard of cloth, which was worth 50c. This yard of cloth was manufactured in his neighbourhood

out of wool grown there, and every incident of outlay connected with the manufacture was expended on the spot. By the contrary course pursued to so large an extent for years past, that wool would be sold to the American buyer, subject to a duty of about 12c. and would be manufactured into a yard of cloth in the United States, and whether it were there worth 50c. or 60c. or more, all that the Canadian producer could get out of it was 20c., and this country could not possibly receive further benefit from it. There was an industry of very great magnitude just now, the refining of sugar. It seemed extraordinary that this interest should be invested with so much difficulty, that it should be surrounded, apparently, by problems so difficult of solution. He did not believe they were very difficult, and would endeavour to make it plain to the House that there was no great difficulty, in fact, if the proper measures were taken. A great deal of argument of a very technical and scientific kind had been used about this question, but he thought it was one which, in its application to the interests of the whole country, could be appreciated by common minds. They had been told by scientists, by men who had used a great deal of analysis in the discussion, that the manufacture of sugar was an occult science, which common minds could not understand. In fact, from what he had read of the discussions in this House, an attempt had been made to persuade the House that over 100lb. of sugar could be refined from 100lb. of raw material; but this was something of so legendary a nature, that it could hardly be believed. To deal with this sugar question on its simple merits, as it appeared to the common understanding, this was the state of things. We had consumed, in this country, for the last four or five years, quantities varying from 109 to 114 million pounds. Up to April, 1876, sugar was refined in this country. Of course, a very large proportion of our consumption, up to that time, was imported, as raw material, from the countries of production. In 1876, we imported the largest quantity, something over 114 millions, value, \$5,073,000. In that year we imported from Great Britain to the value of \$1,476,000; from

the United States, \$2,229,000; from the West Indies and Brazil, and all other countries, about \$1,300,000 worth. In 1878, these quantities were very much changed. There was an increase in the aggregate. In 1878, we imported from Great Britain to the value of \$2,763,000; from the United States, \$3,026,000; whilst our importations from other countries, the countries of production, were diminished to the small matter of \$396,000. There was an equal discrepancy in the variation of duties. On an aggregate, the average of the rate of duty upon the whole quantity was smaller from the United States than from any of the other countries, although the importation from the West Indies had been of the raw material. This showed that we had been at some disadvantage in our importations from the United States; but the disadvantage, financially, did not rest here. In the manufacture in the United States and in Glasgow, very serious adulteration took place in sugar. He had it upon very good authority, that American sugar was adulterated with glucose in proportions varying from eleven to 30 per cent., and that glucose was worth about two cents. We paid about six cents for that sugar to the refiner, who, before he sent it from the United States, obtained a drawback of something over three cents per pound on the glucose, as well as on the sugar. In our importations from Demerara, Cuba and the West India Islands, we were under a disadvantage of a different kind. Sugars were exported from these countries in all their native strength, but were subject to a process by which the colour defeated all the standards established, upon which duty was exacted. The result of a certain process in the raw, he believed it was, gave the sugar a colour no better than seven or nine Dutch standard, though, in reality, it possessed all the qualities of refined sugar, and, upon undergoing a very simple process in the hands of the importer, it became restored to the quality it really represented. By this, and all the methods adopted, we had been subjected during the past few years to buying the refuse of everybody's manufacture, under every disadvantage in money and quality. They had been told that glucose was not poisonous, but

wholesome food. If we were to mix our sugar with bran, it would be more economical to have it done at home. The sugar refiners of Canada, they had been told, had the matter in their own hands, that they could adopt the same process. It was much better to keep the sugar refiners in Canada honest. He had the pleasure of knowing personally some of the sugar refiners, and men of higher character were not to be found in this country. He did not believe one of them would, for any consideration, attempt to poison the people, or rob them of their money by selling them bran instead of sugar. If we could refine sugar ourselves as economically as it could be done in foreign countries, then, by prosecuting this industry, we would be paying out among our own people about two million dollars, which sum represented the result to the American sugar refiners in carrying on this industry. In refining our own sugar, we should consume our own coal. In refining the 67,000 tons of sugar we used, we should consume an equal quantity of coal from our own mines; we should employ, to bring the raw sugar from the West Indies, or elsewhere, a number of vessels, representing 168 cargoes of about 400 tons each, a description of vessels that had almost disappeared from the St. Lawrence since this industry was driven from the country. This class of vessels was very much needed. They were needed to bring this sugar from the countries of production; they were needed to carry on the coal trade between the Maritime and Upper Provinces, and they were needed to take away cargoes of grain to ports of call, and places where the large steamers of the regular lines did not go. The sugar, in the process of manufacture, would employ about 2,000 families directly, and it was impossible to compute how many families would be employed indirectly as the result of this enterprise. If we could earn these two millions at home in refining the sugar we consumed, he believed we could earn the whole five millions, and that the consumption of five or six millions of sugar would not take a dollar out of the country. This was a bold thing to say, but he thought he could prove it. It was well known that the West Indies took a million barrels

of flour a year, produced from a description of wheat grown in Ontario. These islands now took this flour from the United States, along with fish, lumber, and other things, in exchange for their products. We could pay for all this sugar ourselves in the regular exchange of our productions, and at the same time contribute to the development of our own industries. It was also necessary, in the development of the country, to improve and cultivate that great factor in our national importance, the St. Lawrence, and he was sorry to say that the experience of the last five years suggested a fear that it might become a wilderness. He hoped the Government would do something to foster the use of the St. Lawrence as a channel of trade. There had already been expended upon the St. Lawrence and Welland canals something like \$28,000,000, and it was estimated that to complete the works now in progress \$5,000,000 more would be needed. We had obviously gone too far in this direction to draw back, and it was now a question of whether we should adopt the routes of the United States, or any other routes in preference. He did not think this country was prepared to give up the St. Lawrence; on the contrary, every possible method should be adopted to bring back trade to this highway. The restoration of the sugar trade, with the coincident return of trade with the West India Islands, would do a great deal in this direction. The encouragement that could be given to direct importations from the countries of the far east, by the adoption of the differential duty which the Government had wisely decided to restore, would do a great deal in the same direction. Having expended \$33,000,000 on the canals, he thought the Government should assume the improvement of the St. Lawrence, so that the port of Montreal might become more accessible and cheaper of access to the ships of all nations. Perhaps some gentlemen in this House were not sufficiently informed of the importance of this point, and of the difficulties that were thrown up in the way of carrying on the export trade by the St. Lawrence. He had a letter from a gentleman of great experience in that trade, who had just been across

the Atlantic, and who had been seeking some means of restoring the large trade of a few years ago—he meant the export trade of the west. About fifteen years ago, our shipments of breadstuffs, by the St. Lawrence from the west, reached its greatest point. We had then a great advantage in the route of the St. Lawrence, an advantage of seven or eight cents over other routes in bringing grain from Lake Michigan to Montreal. But the competition of American railways, and the influence of capitalists and railway corporations interested in the development of American ports, had created such a tendency in that trade towards New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore that, to-day, grain was exported from those ports, or was laid down at these ports as cheaply as it could be by way of Montreal. Unless the port of Montreal was made more accessible, it was obvious that the current of trade would continue to follow its present course to the American ports. This correspondent to whom he had referred said:

“ I find, both in Great Britain and in Antwerp, Amsterdam and Rotterdam, an impression against the St. Lawrence route, not only for sailing vessels, for which I was in a measure prepared, but against the route for steamers as well. It is stated, in a general way, that our charges are too high, and that, in some cases, our port regulations are not reasonable. I think the whole subject should be fully investigated, and at all points a comparative statement with Atlantic ports, arrived at, with a view to modification where our charges are too high, and to explanation where they are not. I am made to feel that we are at great disadvantage. New York has facilities of communication all the year round, besides the greater choice of tonnage. We have lost any advantage we had in inland ports. It now requires our best efforts to place grain in Montreal as cheaply as in New York. We are therefore without a margin to pay additional charges over those that are paid in and from that port.”

Another thing he hoped the Government would do, was to give every facility to the business of carrying in bond, so that the process of bonding and transshipment might be made as easy as possible and present no obstacle to the ordinary progress of trade. Another question which the Government should take up, in order to get the benefit of the National Policy, was that of immigration. Doubtless, there were a great

many idle and useless people in the country, but that did not show that we did not want a great many more. We wanted them, however, of a different calibre, and capable of helping themselves in various pursuits. It required no great prescience to understand that we could not go on and develop this country with only four millions of people. How were four millions going to people this vast country, and build a Pacific Railway across the continent? This railway must be built as that in the United States was built—by settlers going into the country and carrying on the work, and improving the country as they went. Our great North-West, in its present state, was of no value to us, and would only become of value when the settler produced something from it. We should make no appreciable progress in that country until we saw a multitude of people going there—not the refuse of our poor-houses and streets, but those hardy men from northern Europe, such as those who flowed into the United States while the Union Pacific Railway was building. Such men as these were the only kind of importation for which we could not pay too high. He did not advocate sending immigration agents all over Europe, and thought the object might be attained in a much simpler way, namely, by the agency of the immigrants themselves sending back accounts of the country to their friends. He also highly approved the plan which, as he had been informed by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, had been adopted in the case of the Menonites, that was, selecting some of themselves to act as immigration agents among their fellow-countrymen. Then Lord Dufferin had done a great deal to advertise the country of the North-West throughout Europe, by his fine description and eloquent language, which could not fail to attract attention everywhere. They were just in the position of a farmer who had brought into the farm more land. They could not afford to sit down and look at their acquisition. A gentleman on the other side of the House, two or three days ago, who appeared to be hungering and thirsting for a foeman worthy of his steel, seemed to have a great horror of towns and cities. He (Mr. McLennan) had read something like that, when a neighbour of his came

up two years ago from Glengarry. He was not much surprised. He attributed it to the fact that, although a fellow-countryman of his, he did not know better. But, when he heard a gentleman who had occupied the position of Minister of Finance in this country delivering himself of a tirade against methods of congregating people together in towns and cities, and describing it as something that might endanger the peace of the country, as Socialism, and he did not know what besides, he should have supposed that that gentleman had read a little history; that he knew the methods by which civilised countries became great and populous; that he would know what development was, and the cause why cities did not grow. If he had read history, he would have known the process by which they had come from being rustics of the soil, living in huts, in a state of serfage; he would have read descriptions of the growth of Manchester, Glasgow, Liverpool, and other large cities. He thought, if the hon. gentleman had consulted his colleague, the leader of the late Government, he would have learned something about the city of Dundee, in which that hon. gentleman had some years ago expatiated upon the uses of cities in a very different sense from that of the hon. the late Finance Minister. It was because he (Mr. Cartwright) did not wish to see differently. He did not think it was purely an agricultural case, because he did not think they made their profits simply by producing wheat, any more than the people in the Southern States made their profits by growing cotton, which they once thought was king, but proved a king that fell to be ground in the dust. He thought, in this country, they might take example from those influences in modern Europe, where the development of manufactures had produced the growth of great cities, and small villages, and hamlets, such as he hoped to see dotting every hill-side in this country, and developed until our population was five times what it was at present, when they would consume, instead of five millions worth of sugar, ten or twenty million dollars worth; when all their industries would grow and sustain one another. They were almost beginning a new era. It was true they had been ten years in Con-

ederation; but they had had a change of nurses in that time, and they had not developed as rapidly as they ought. They were, however, starting with a new policy, with all the influences and experiences that could be derived from a forecast of the opinion that was developing all over the world; they found that it was an opinion that prevailed, not only in the United States, but in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy and other countries. They were beginning a new régime with the representative of royalty amongst them, and it was to be hoped that the Empire would take more interest in them from this time forward, and that they would have that additional agency to make them better known in Europe, and make their influence greater. If these hopes were true the question before them in the resolution under discussion was not merely a question of ways and means; the question was the manner in which the country would be developed for all time to come, that would enable them to reach across the continent, from sea to sea, and extend their influence through that vast country of which so little was known, but which was known to be capable of almost indefinite development. Much depended in this development upon the present Government. They were starting on a new plane; they had adopted a new policy; everything had been changed, and the Government started with important lessons of the last five years before them. The Government would have to see that there was no inward corruption. They would have to avoid those speculators, purveyors and parasites that were the sappers and miners of all Governments. There was no royal road to finance. The hon. the Minister of Finance had, no doubt, found his task one of toil and labour, but the work would have its reward. It was being talked about very freely that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tilley)—and he (Mr. McLennan) hoped he was betraying no confidence, for the matter had been widely discussed—was going to retire to make room for somebody else,—some more heaven-born Minister. He did not believe it, nor did the House believe it. He believed that the policy proposed by the hon. the Minister of Finance was the right one, and that he would remain to

conclude the work he had so well commenced. The work, no doubt, was tiresome, and the reward for such work was not always obvious. Though the Minister of Finance, and the Government who acted in this independent manner fearlessly and nobly to do their duty, might not see the immediate fulfilment of their labours, they would have before them the reward of the appreciation of the country. Everything was possible to men of determination and endurance. He thought this subject was of vast importance, and he was glad to see around him a great number of new men from the Province of Ontario, representing the intelligence of its country gentlemen, an element that was very much required. He was glad to see so many young men entering public life, and he asked them to take the example of the hon. the Minister of Finance, and to remember the reward was for the patient toiler, and that that was the direction in which they would have to achieve greatness, success, and satisfaction.

MR. DOULL said he rose for a word of explanation. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had denied the statement he (Mr. Doull) had made, respecting what he (Mr. Mackenzie) said in reference to flour. He wanted to read his own words from a speech delivered when he was on a missionary tour down to the Lower Provinces. He was going to read from a paper which he (Mr. Doull) supposed the hon. member for Lambton would acknowledge as the organ of his party in the Province of Nova Scotia. He (Mr. Doull) had made the statement that the duty on flour would not increase the cost of it to the consumer, if there was a surplus of flour produced in the country. Here was the statement the hon. gentleman made in Halifax, when the hon. gentleman had visited that city for the purpose, no doubt, of influencing the election, to secure the return of a friend of his own; but it appeared that the county of Halifax, no more than the county which he (Mr. Doull) represented, paid much attention to the hon. gentleman or his colleagues. It was as follows:—

"Now, when your leaders came down here, they declared, as Dr. Tupper did the other

MR. McLENNAN.

day, that a tax on flour would not raise the price one cent, and Dr. Tupper quotes me as an authority for that statement. Well, I do believe in it. I believe that no tax will affect the price of a commodity of which we produce a surplus."

He wanted to know whether the hon. gentleman was justified in making the contradiction to the statement he (Mr. Doull) had made. The hon. gentleman, when in Opposition, had a reputation for honesty, because they had not an opportunity of testing his honesty; but, no sooner had he come into power, than his promises in Opposition were forgotten and falsified, and his want of honesty was to-day the principal cause of his return to the Opposition benches.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought that he avowed he had said it, and he avowed it now. It was a principle which no one could dispute, that where there was a surplus of any articles produced, it was impossible to raise the price by imposing duty upon some articles coming from the producers. He had pointed out, over and over again, that vessels trading to those ports took back flour as ballast, often at ten cents per barrel, rather than nothing, and that to put 50c. per barrel on it would practically destroy the trade. As to the hon. gentleman's remarks about his want of honesty, it was a matter of very little importance to him (Mr. Mackenzie) what his opinions were; they had very little weight in the House or country.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): Will the hon. gentleman tell us in what speech, in the Lower Provinces, he ever referred to the fact that flour would be raised in price, by virtue of the change?

MR. MACKENZIE: I have no doubt I did it, in almost every speech.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): Then the hon. gentleman's reporters and friends did him more than injustice, because in no speech ever reported, below, that I have seen, was that change so described.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman need not trouble himself about my treatment; I can take care of myself.

MR. CHARLTON: Unfortunately the remarks of the hon. member for Gleggarry (Mr. McLennan) were almost inaudible on this (the Opposition) side of the House. I was only able to hear a sentence here and there; but one point I noticed he made with reference to the importation of sugar from Cuba, and the exportation of flour from Canada to that island. He represented that we should secure in Cuba a market for one million barrels of flour per annum, in exchange for sugar purchased there for Canada. I presume the hon. gentleman was not aware of the fact that Canadian flour is not suited to the market of Cuba, as it does not keep well in a tropical climate, and for that reason we are debarred from the business of exporting flour to that island. Again, one million barrels would be more than we have to spare; our supplies of wheat last year fell one million bushels short of the amount required to make one million barrels of flour. Then it would be larger than the amount needed to purchase all our sugar, and would leave no room for the trade in fish, lumber, shooks, etc., which we desire to export also. The average value of the sugar annually consumed in Canada is, at the place of its production, in the neighbourhood of \$5,000,000, and one million barrels of flour in the West Indies would be more than sufficient to secure the amount of sugar we consume, leaving no room for the sale of the products of our fisheries and forests. The hon. member for Gleggarry undertook to be somewhat facetious with regard to the statement of the hon. ex-Minister of Finance, as to the evils that gentleman depicted in the aggregation of great masses of the population in the towns and cities, and the consequent depression and misery from the loss of employment, leading to socialism, and to almost every form of vice. Every close observer of events has noticed in the United States, for the last four or five years, confirmation of this view; so it is not necessary for me to defend the statement of that hon. gentleman, who is able to take care of himself. We shall have an opportunity, in the progress of this debate, to discuss the National Policy in its details, so I shall confine myself to a consideration of some of the general principles in relation to this sys-

tem—to this fiscal revolution inaugurated by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. I must compliment them on having kept their pledges in the main, though Mr. Boyd is somewhat deceived by the non-fulfilment of the pledges made him by the First Minister. The pledges of Ministers have been kept better than we expected, and better, I fear, than the country will wish they had been two or three years hence. I have no doubt that the hon. the Minister of Finance was glad when his labours were completed. I can picture to myself the difficulties he has had to encounter in the incubation of his policy. He has been visited by deputations; a great many patriotic men have come to Ottawa—patriotic, in the sense of Artemus Ward, who was willing to sacrifice his first wife's relations for the benefit of the country. They have come to secure such provisions in the tariff as will enable them to rob their neighbours, and secure unjust advantages, and, in the main, have succeeded admirably. The Minister of Finance has unquestionably been the victim of bores innumerable of every description. They have waylaid him by night, taken up his time by day, and at last he has got rid of their importunities, satisfied those gentlemen, and succeeded in laying his policy before the House weeks later than he anticipated, when Parliament was called. I hope he has succeeded in reconciling the conflicting and diverse interests; that the day of deputations to Ottawa is past; that all their members are satisfied, and that the Finance Minister's couch is a bed of roses. I do not believe that his difficulties are ended, however; if so, his experience is different from that of all Finance Ministers of other lands, who have before this day been charged with the duty of arranging the details of a Protective tariff. This policy is a fiscal revolution, and it is somewhat surprising to see, opposite me, gentlemen who, a few short years ago, denounced it as the sum of all political villainies. The Minister of Public Works condemned the slight increase to 17½ per cent., as the thin entering wedge of the hateful policy of Protection, and yet he looks placidly on these changes, which advance the duties to such an extent as to revolutionise the

commercial system of this country. Ministers have been lavish in their promises, and are somewhat in the position of an Indian medicine-man, or an African rain-maker, who must succeed in inducing his dupes to believe in his boasted miraculous powers. The country is looking to Ministers for the redemption of their promises. I very much fear that some of them they will be unable to redeem, and that their fate will be that of the rain-maker, who, after patience has been exhausted in waiting for the rain, is denounced as a humbug, and killed by his dupes. I fear the present tariff will be the death of these Ministers, not more than five years hence.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will not be sorry, however.

MR. CHARLTON. This celebrated National Policy is what? Where shall we look for its source? It is a servile imitation of the American system, and the Finance Minister has imported into this country, for the purpose of aiding him in developing and fixing this policy, an assistant from Washington, a gentleman connected with the Washington Bureau of Statistics; a man of fine abilities, no doubt, whose aid has been, no doubt, invaluable. He has assisted the Finance Minister in constructing a tariff on American principles; and we have to-day, for the first time in the history of Canada, tariffs introduced into politics, and made a political issue. If we look over the history of the United States, we shall find that the introduction of tariff discussions and laws into the politics of the Republic was attended with infinite mischief, and I fear our experience will not be dissimilar to that of our neighbours. In introducing the tariff into politics, we give it to the public, who are necessarily, to a great extent, ignorant of those subjects, and not capable of treating complex questions like those affecting the commercial policy of the country with the necessary degree of discrimination, and what is the result? If anything is desirable, it is the permanency of the tariff, and yet you propose to expose all interests to sweeping changes with each election, as in the United States. There is every reason to think the same results will follow here five years hence, should this Government

MR. CHARLTON.

remain in power so long, which God forbid. The hon. gentleman said they had been deceived, and the probable consequence is, there will be a reversal of the commercial policy, and, although it would be in the public interest, yet I maintain it is a great misfortune to this country, as of any country, to introduce tariffs into politics. I have frequently met with arguments in favour of the beneficial results of this policy in the United States. The Finance Minister, himself, cited the United States as an example of the beneficial effects of Protection. I wish, Sir, to show that such arguments, founded on the experience of the United States, are fallacious. The Morrill tariff, adopted in 1861, levied enormous duties, and aggravated the evils of the civil war by adding to its waste the robbery of the people by duties that filched from them hundreds of millions. The effect was to foster manufactures, and wring from the people enormous revenues, and, while taking from the taxpayer \$1 for the Government, the policy took \$3 for the monopolists; the tariff also unduly stimulated industries, and manufactories sprang up at every point, so that, to-day, hundreds of millions are invested in unproductive enterprises, and silent factories are standing in all parts of the country. Then came, as the natural result, the commercial collapse in 1873, after which came the desperate and long continued depression, lasting over five years, and which still sits, like a nightmare, on the industries and energies of that people. We are told that business in the United States is reviving. I hope it is, and that the depression is passing away. If so, what is the cause? Is it that hundreds of millions have been invested in unpatriotic enterprises—that hundreds of thousands of operatives were thrown out of employment in the Eastern and Middle States when the crisis came? No, Sir; if there is a revival, as I believe and hope, it is attributable to the fact that, in the last five years, 2,400,000 persons have emigrated from the New England and Middle States, and the older Western States, to the North-West prairie region, the newer Western States and the prairies of Texas. That vast movement, last year, reached the figure of 600,000. They have gone from the

Eastern States, where they were aggregated in towns and cities by Protection, to the West, and become producers themselves, and have left a multitude of idle factories as monuments of the failure of Protection. They have gone where Nature and Nature's God intended, to the vast prairies of the West, to become independent and happy, owners and cultivators of the soil. They would have been cultivators, but for Protection, during the years that they were doomed to idleness and want, by a false and pernicious system. The American people have had ample trial of Protection, and we are about to adopt a policy they are about to cast off. The Finance Minister has the honour of taking up the cast-off clothes of American Protectionists in appropriating the tariff of the Republic. The American people have expressed their opinion as to the propriety of abandoning Protection in the most unmistakable terms, a matter that we are bound, in consideration of this question, to pay some attention to. The question of a Revenue versus a Protective tariff, was made an issue in the last Presidential election. The position taken by the Democratic party in that election was squarely in favour of a revenue tariff. Their convention met in St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, in the month of July, 1876. They adopted the following deliverance on the question of a Revenue versus a Protective tariff, and I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will give attention to this:—

"Reform is necessary in the sum and modes of Federal taxation, to the end that capital may be set free from distrust, and labour lightly burdened.

"We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 3,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, irregularity and false pretence. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries, to subsidise a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labour. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufactures at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half of our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labour. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all Custom House taxation shall be for revenue purposes only."

That, Sir, was the deliverance of the Democratic party in the year 1876. That was the issue upon which the party went to the people. That issue was discussed from July to the first Monday in November. It was discussed from every rostrum and stump in the United States, and that was the verdict of the people. Did the people of the United States, in their verdict, say that Protection was good and ought to be maintained?

MR. TILLEY : Yes.

MR. CHARLTON : No, Sir. The people of the United States, by a majority of 266,765 votes, endorsed and affirmed the truth of that arraignment, that indictment that was preferred against this iniquitous policy in July, 1876. I will venture to affirm, Sir, that if that question were submitted to the people of the United States to-day, that verdict would be re-affirmed by a million of a majority. Of course, Sir, we will be told that the Wood tariff was introduced into Congress, and that the Wood tariff failed.

MR. TILLEY : Hear, hear.

MR. CHARLTON : We will be told that this verdict of the people has borne no fruits. I venture to say my hon. friend the Finance Minister, who is pleased to say "hear, hear," will learn, if he lives many years, that these monopolies that he is aiding now to build up in this country will not be easily removed, and that it will, perhaps, take more than one verdict of the people of this country to unloosen that grip which will fasten on them with a death-like tenacity. When the Wood tariff was introduced into the United States Congress, it was defeated by the lavish use of money by combinations opposed to it. The consummation of the wishes of the people is postponed. But the change is sure to come speedily, and the effect of postponement will only be to make it more radical and more sweeping than were the changes proposed in the Tariff Bill introduced by Mr. Wood in the Session of Congress following the General Elections of 1876. So much, Sir, for the question of Protection in the United States. So much for the position that the great majority of the people of the United States

occupy upon that question, after sixteen years of sad experience. Well, Sir, we have had a depression in Canada, and that circumstance was adroitly taken advantage of by our friends who now occupy the Treasury benches. The people of this country were induced to believe that the depression existed to a greater extent in Canada than elsewhere. They were induced to believe that the Government which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) led, were responsible for that depression. They were led to believe that the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches could by mere legislation remove that depression. Believing these deceptive promises, the people committed the greatest act of folly that the people of this country ever did commit, by driving from power men who had honestly conducted the affairs of the country, and by returning to power men whose record was, to say the least, scarcely as clean. Well, Sir, it is unnecessary to go at any great length into an enquiry into the causes of the depression that existed in this country. That depression originated in the United States, that country blessed with a Protective tariff—the Paradise of the Protectionist. That depression spread to this country, and to every commercial country in the civilised world. I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Finance whether, while that depression continued, our manufactures were in a languishing condition, as compared with the manufactures of the United States, or of other countries, and whether the condition of our manufactures was worse than that of the United States or of England, or of any commercial and manufacturing nation on the face of the globe? I affirm that it was not. I affirm that our manufacturing industries were more prosperous, during these years of depression, than the manufacturing industries of the United States or any commercial nation of Europe. Why, Sir, our exports of manufactures have gone on steadily increasing from \$2,530,000 in 1874 to \$4,715,000 in 1878. Our domestic production of manufactures, I venture to say, is not less than \$275,000,000 a year. Our import of manufactures, susceptible of being manufactured in this country, last year, did not exceed \$42,000,000. Our manufactures had always complete control of

the market. Under the operation of a revenue tariff of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., they were steadily gaining ground on their foreign competitors, and steadily acquiring a more complete mastery of the situation. They required no further Protection. They had Protection enough. The demand for Protection was simply a demand that the people should be made to pay tribute to the prosperity of manufacturers to a greater extent than formerly. I have a list here of some of these poor distressed industries, whose representatives interviewed my hon. friend the Finance Minister. Here are Messrs. J. & R. Molson, who, on the Commercial Register are rated as worth \$1,000,000, and credit very high. Here is Mr. J. G. Worts, worth \$1,000,000, credit very high. Here are Messrs. E. & C. Gurney, their business is very much depressed, and they are rated as worth \$500,000; credit very high. They commenced a few years ago as common moulders, and the operation of a $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. tariff has been very disastrous to them. E. K. Greene is worth \$500,000; credit very high. A. F. Gault is worth \$500,000; credit very high. Andrew Robertson is worth \$500,000; credit very high. William Darling is worth \$500,000; credit very high. Mr. Hay is worth \$500,000; credit very high. He is a distressed manufacturer who requires double the Protection he formerly had, and we may now reasonably expect to see that gentleman worth \$2,500,000 in a few years from now. So I could go on through the entire list. I assert that no business in Canada has been as prosperous in the main as the manufacturing business. I assert that the country is full of evidences of the prosperity on the part of manufacturers. You may go to the principal towns in the west, and you will find that many of these gentlemen have amassed fortunes; that they are, as a rule, in prosperous circumstances; that there are fewer failures amongst them than amongst any other class of business men, and that there is no class of business men who stood in less need of aid from the Government. They were capable of taking care of themselves; but now a law is introduced, designed to enable many of them to extract money from the pockets of the people, and put it in their own pockets,

through the operation of an unjust and iniquitous tariff. It is manifest that a revenue tariff was ample for the protection of our industries. As a revenue measure, indeed, the last tariff was too high. I believe the result of a tariff of fifteen per cent. would have been more favourable to the Government than the operation of a $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. tariff for revenue. Well, Sir, we have got Protection. These poor distressed individuals have got their distresses relieved. We have got the duties raised from $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to I do not know how much—to 50 per cent. in some instances. Now, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to call attention to one feature with regard to this matter of imposing duties, that the people who pay these duties do not generally understand. I wish to call attention to the fact that the loss the people sustain is not measured precisely by the amount of duty; that, in fact, it far exceeds that. If a duty of 20 per cent. is imposed on an article, the wholesale merchant who purchases the article places a profit of, say, 10 per cent. on the original cost, and on the duty as well. The retail merchant, who purchases from the wholesale merchant, proceeds to impose his profit, which is, say, 25 per cent. on the original cost and on the duty and profit of the wholesale merchant. I have compiled a table, hurriedly, which will be found, I think, substantially accurate. An article that pays 20 per cent. duty costs the consumer, supposing that the wholesale profit is 10 per cent. and the retail profit 25 per cent., which is the basis on which these calculations are made, $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. advance on the original cost. If the duty is 25 per cent., it costs the consumer $34\frac{3}{8}$ per cent. advance upon its original cost. If the duty is 30 per cent., it costs the consumer $41\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. in advance of its original cost. If the duty is 35 per cent., it costs the consumer $48\frac{1}{8}$ per cent. in advance of its original cost. If the duty is 40 per cent., it costs the consumer 55 per cent. in advance of its original cost. If the duty is 45 per cent., it costs the consumer $61\frac{7}{8}$ per cent. in advance of its original cost. If the duty is 50 per cent., it costs the consumer $68\frac{3}{4}$ in advance of its original cost. Here, Sir, then is a fact which

shows you that the imposition of a duty for the purpose of collecting revenue is the most costly mode of collecting revenue. And when, Sir, you add to that fact that the object of Protection is to compel the consumers of the country to pay these largely-enhanced prices, not for the benefit of the Government, but for the benefit of the monopolists, who secure the enacting of the law for their own profit and advantage, you see, at a glance, the iniquitous nature of this measure, which my hon. friend stands sponsor for, and which he should know will be condemned and repudiated by the people of the Province from which he comes. Well, Sir, who pays this advance I am speaking of? There is an old adage that the farmer is the ass that carries the most of the burthen and eats the least of the hay. The farmer pays the bulk of it. The lumberman pays his proportion. The labourer pays his proportion. Whoever receives a fixed salary pays his proportion. Now, Sir, what advantage or return does Protection confer upon these industries which I have enumerated, that pay their several proportions to this swindle. As regards the lumberman, what does he get? What does my hon. friend, the Finance Minister propose to give the lumberman for the tax upon his supplies and upon his tools? That is an industry already much depressed. Will he be kind enough to put the lumberman on the same footing with the shipbuilder, and grant him a drawback on all the lumber he exports, commensurate with this tax that is wrung from him. I think it would be well if he would take the lumberman's case into consideration, and afford him some manner of relief. As regards the labourer, who is to pay an increased price for coal, and is to bear increased burdens on all the necessaries of life; how is he to be protected? Is he to be protected from competition on the part of other labourers, who may flock in and snatch from him employment he seeks? If labourers can come in from all parts of the world and compete with him for the employment he seeks, there is no protection for his labour. He must pay the duties on all he consumes, and go without the protection which, under this scheme, he might justly claim. I would like the hon. gen-

tleman to point out any advantage to the labourer from this celebrated National Policy. Then, Sir, as regards the recipient of a salary, it is proposed to increase the cost of living to him. What compensating advantage is he to secure? Perhaps the hon. the Finance Minister will point out the advantage he will receive under the National Policy. As regards the fisherman, it is proposed to increase the cost of his food and the cost of his clothing. What advantage are you going to confer upon him? I am afraid, Sir, that my hon. friend has rendered himself liable to that denunciation made by Solomon of old, who pronounced a woe against the oppressor of the poor, and against the man who took from the poor and gave to the rich. And in reference to the shipowner. How is the shipowner to profit by this National Policy, which strikes at the very roots of a prosperous commerce. It will decrease our carrying trade on our lakes and canals. It will send our vessels to Europe with cargoes of grain, and compel them to return in ballast. This policy must be disastrous to the shipping interests. As regards the farmer, I will show, further on, that he has received protection, and we will consider what it is worth. We will try to strike a balance between the receipts and expenditure of the farmer, and, I am afraid, the balance will not be satisfactory to him, though it will, I presume, be satisfactory to those whose interests my hon. friend the Finance Minister seems to have specially in charge. Now, Sir, we will be told that one of the advantages that the farmer has to secure from the adoption of this policy is the establishment of a home market for the products of the soil. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Finance Minister is an adept or not in the garden-sass theory of political economy, that theory which professed to be able to provide for all the market gardeners in the country a market for all the potatoes, cabbages, and beets that can be raised in the country; but, Sir, this assumption that Protection can create a home market that will absorb the products of the soil of this, or of any other, agricultural country, is an utter fallacy. We can only deal with this question in Canada

MR. CHARLTON,

in the light of probabilities; but we have the results in the United States tangible before us. The very arguments which, during the last election contest, were advanced by the advocates of the National Policy, were the original arguments used in the United States eighteen years ago, and the same promise was there made as was made in this country, to those who would bear the burden of that policy, that a home market would be created for their agricultural products. How was that promise carried out in the United States? Were these expectations ever realised? Never. Factories were created, and manufacturing capacity developed, not only sufficient to supply the wants of the people of the United States, but sufficient to supply the wants of eighty millions of people. They carried Protection as far as it could be carried, while enormous over-production brought disaster and ruin, and yet there never was a year when the United States did not export the products of the soil; and to-day, under the operation of that system for eighteen years, their exportation of the products of the soil is vastly in excess of what it ever was. Protection did not create a home market for agricultural produce in that country, nor can it here. What quantity of the goods now imported into the Dominion could be manufactured here? The amount, calculating on the basis of last year's importations, would not exceed forty million dollars' worth. How many operatives would it take to produce that amount of goods? I went carefully into that calculation a year ago. I found that the production of that amount of goods would give employment to operatives, and those depending on them, to the extent of, perhaps, 75,000 souls in all, and the augmentation to the population of Canada required to produce those goods now imported would not consume one quarter of the present agricultural surplus of this country. The people of Canada, after having paid enormous taxes to increase that home market, would still be very far from the realisation of that promise, and the promise could never be redeemed. There is another feature of this protective question that I invite the attention of my hon. friend the Finance Minister to; that is, not only does Protection increase the price of

goods, but it also diminishes the prices received by the farmer for all the staple productions of the soil. I state that proposition broadly. I reiterate it. That has been the experience of the United States. It seems like a paradox.

MR. TILLEY: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARLTON: I will explain it to the Finance Minister to the best of my humble ability. How is commerce carried on? It is an exchange of productions. The nation that has a production to export must seek some country that wants to buy that production. If commerce is to be carried on successfully and permanently, the exporting nation must take in exchange something that its consumer has to sell. If a nation adopts a policy that shuts out all that its natural customers have to sell, it has to force a sale of its own goods at a disadvantage. Take the history of the United States during the three separate and distinct periods during which protective tariffs have been in force in that country, and in each of these periods the price of what farmers have had to sell has been lower, as a rule, than in the periods in which revenue tariffs prevailed there. I will call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that a protective tariff, with its crushing burdens and its cumbrous and complicated machinery, produces scarcely more revenue than the simple tariff of the Mother Country, under which ninety-six per cent. of the revenue was derived from duty on seven articles. The tariff of the United States has, for the last sixteen years, yielded an average annual revenue of one hundred and forty-eight million dollars, or \$3.70 per head. That tariff was imposed on something over two thousand three hundred articles. The tariff of England, during that same period, imposed, as I have stated, on very few articles, realised a revenue of only 35c. per head less than the enormous tariff of the United States. And, while the tariff of England took from the people only what entered the coffers of the Government, the tariff of the United States took from the people five times the amount that entered the coffers of the Government. For every dollar the Government got from it, four dollars went into the pockets of rapacious

monopolies. We are often treated to homilies about pauper labour abroad as a reason for imposing protective duties. Who more justly deserves the name of pauper than those sturdy mendicants, worth, many of them, \$500,000, who came here to ask the Government to impose taxes on the people for their unearned benefit? The world is full of lessons by which we may profit if we will but examine the pages of history. In 1849, England abandoned the system of Protection, and immediately entered upon a career of commercial prosperity. In 1877, England had 6,115,000 tons of shipping; in 1877, her export and import trade amounted to £646,765,000. In the United States, in 1877, the total of their shipping, including canal boats, mud scows, river steamers, and all the inland craft of the country, was but 4,212,000 tons, and, in 1878, her export and import trade was £210,800,000 sterling, or one-third that of Great Britain, although with one-third greater population. In 1826, the Americans carried over 70 per cent. of their commerce in their own ships; in 1878, less than 30 per cent. We are often treated here to theories and speculations about balances of trade. The Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, referred to the fact that the United States, last year, had a very heavy balance of trade in their favour, while England had a very heavy balance of trade against her, inferring, therefore, that the condition of the United States was highly prosperous, and that the condition of England was the exact reverse. If there is any one feature of political economy upon which people are liable to form false conclusions, it is upon this matter of the balance of trade, and I propose, briefly, to discuss the question. England, during the last seventeen years, from 1861 to 1877 inclusive, has had balances of trade against her, amounting on an average to £115,354,000 per year, or, in round numbers, to \$575,000,000, annually. If that amount were yearly drawn from the resources of the country, as the Finance Minister evidently believes, how is it that England is not at the present moment ruined? A sum of \$575,000,000 per year for seventeen years, drawn from the resources of a country, is enough to ruin any nation on the face of the globe. I assert

that this annual balance of trade represents the profits and increase to England's wealth. As to the Finance Minister's reference to the fact that the United States, last year, had a very heavy balance of trade in their favour, I find that, during seventeen years of the last twenty-three years, the United States have had balances of trade against them, and these seventeen years were those during which the country was in a state of prosperity, while the six years of this period of twenty-three years, when balances of trade were in their favour, were years of disaster. Those six years were: 1858, the year following the panic of 1857, when the balance of trade in their favour was \$8,672,000; 1862, the first year after the commencement of the slaveholders' rebellion, when their industries were prostrate, it was \$1,318,000; in 1874, after the crisis of 1873, \$18,876,000; in 1876, \$79,623,000; in 1877, \$152,152,000, and in 1878, \$257,796,000. Does any hon. gentleman profess to believe that those balances of trade in favour of the United States, occurring invariably in years of depression and commercial distress, were indications of great commercial prosperity? The fact that the balance of trade exists in favour of the United States simply proves that the nation is in commercial distress; that it is exporting more than it imports for the purpose of paying its debts, and of getting out of the difficulties in which it is involved through reckless borrowing and trading. Take the case of England's exports, the amount entered upon the Custom-house books is fixed by the value at the port of export. The value of imports are estimated at the value at the port of import, which covers profits upon exports and freight on outward and return cargo. Suppose a British merchant ships a cargo to Chili, and receives, as usual, in exchange, wool, hides, or copper ore. The cargo is entered on the Custom-house books, when on board the vessel for Valparaiso, as worth £100,000 sterling. The profit of sale at Valparaiso is, say 25 per cent., or £25,000 sterling, besides £12,500 freight earned by the vessel. The vessel brings on her return trip wool and hides, purchased with the proceeds of her outward cargo. The value of her return cargo is increased

say £12,500 by charge for freight upon it, so that in Liverpool the return cargo is worth £150,000, at which figure it is entered upon the Custom-house books, which represents simply the original cost, the freights saved by the merchant's ship, and the profit accruing from the transaction. The entry shows a balance of trade against England of £50,000, but, so far from being poorer by that sum, the entry indicates the measure of England's gain. The whole world is indebted to England. The United States and India are called on to buy annually £30,000,000 sterling as interest on their indebtedness. This vast sum is transmitted to England in bullion or in merchandise. It helps to make up the vast annual balance of trade against England, but it is £30,000,000 added to her accumulations. The reason that there is a balance of trade against England, is that she carries her goods in her own ships, and adds scores of millions earned in freights to her profits, that she is the creditor of the world, and that all the accumulation added yearly to the vast amount of wealth she has amassed is represented in the Custom-house books as a balance of trade against her. What is the case in the United States? They owe England for money borrowed upon real estate, for money borrowed to build factories and open mines. England holds their railway bonds, their Government bonds, their city bonds and their State bonds. They are called upon to pay England the interest on their indebtedness, and in so doing are piling up the balance of trade in their favour. They are exporting more than they import in order to discharge the debts that are pressing against them, indicating, according to the hon. the Finance Minister, a position of extraordinary prosperity. Whenever the affairs of the country prosper, and trade is good, down goes what hon. gentlemen opposite would call the favourable balances. At this moment, under the influence of improving business and more hopeful views as to the future, importations are increasing, and the favourable trade balance is diminishing, and, when that country reaches a prosperous condition, it will return to the normal condition of affairs existing in seventeen

out of the last twenty-three years, when there was a balance of trade against the country. I represent an agricultural constituency, and am indignant that the Finance Minister should have so basely sacrificed their interests, while professing to be their friend. He professes to have given them Protection. He did not put a duty on wool. He has charged 7½c. per pound on cloth, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. I respectfully submit to that hon. gentleman the claim of my constituents to a duty of 3½c. per pound, at least, on wool, and an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. I hope he will take that into consideration and do the farmers justice. Then, I do not notice that he gives them any protection in broom corn, that can be largely raised in my constituency. I notice a duty of 25 per cent on brooms, and I submit to the Finance Minister whether he is not, in common justice, called upon also to impose a duty of 25 per cent. upon broom corn for the protection of the poor, struggling agriculturists in that portion of Canada where broom corn can be grown. Then, I notice that, although the tanners are protected, hides come in free. Farmers in my constituency are somewhat interested in that matter, and they demand of the Finance Minister the same *ad valorem* protection upon hides that he has given the tanner upon leather. And then they want protection upon pelts. I think these must be matters the hon. the Finance Minister has overlooked. I can scarcely believe he will come so far short of fulfilling the promises made by himself and his colleagues that the farmers of Canada should have Protection in all cases where it could be afforded them. My hon. friend says no deputation came to him to ask Protection in these respects. If the hon. the Finance Minister will consider me a deputation in behalf of my constituents, I am here, and make the request. We have got a duty on meat, and it will probably do us a little good. I think very likely we shall gain one cent there where we are robbed of one dollar in the distribution of the stealings in this policy of plunder. It is an old adage that there ought to be honour among thieves, but I think there is very little justice in the manner in which this tariff has been ad-

justed. There is a duty on meat, a duty on wheat, a duty on pease, a duty on oats, a duty on barley—all these things are mockeries. The duty on corn is the only duty in the whole list of duties on breadstuffs that will benefit the farmers of any portion of Ontario; that is the only duty that will benefit my constituents. And how has my hon. friend the Finance Minister arranged that? He has put a duty of ten cents on oats, and on corn, which is twice the value of oats for feeding purposes, he has put 17½c. a bushel, which will be considered as little short of a swindle in the arrangement of this policy, by the farmers whom I represent. I suppose I shall be told that a benefit will accrue to the farmers in that duty upon their productions. I will ask will a duty upon any production of which we raise a surplus for export advance its prices? I answer that it will not. Mr. Speaker, this morning there was flashed from the Liverpool Corn Exchange, by telegraph, to the Corn Exchanges of every grain mart upon this continent, to the Corn Exchange of Alexandria in Egypt, to the Corn Exchange of Calcutta, to Odessa in Russia, the current quotation of grain in Liverpool. Why was this done? When these quotations were posted upon the bulletin board, traders ceased their transactions and flocked to that board. Why? Because those quotations govern their transactions except in exceptional cases. There may be cases, as there sometimes are in Chicago, where rings get up a corner, and where gambling in options, shorts, and calls goes on; there might be a period when common quotation would not rule the market; but the normal condition of things is that these quotations rule the market day by day in every part of the globe, where there is a surplus of breadstuffs to export. The duty upon these articles, of which we have a surplus in Ontario, can have, and will have, no influence on the prices; and, if these gentlemen are not convinced of that fact, let them examine the current quotations for the six days preceding and the six days succeeding the introduction of the National Policy. If I am right in this view of the case, allow me to call your attention to the surpluses exported from the Dominion of

Canada, of the various cereals last year. I have reduced, in this table, flour to wheat, at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels to the barrel. Last year we exported 10,905,468 and imported 7,208,011 bushels of wheat, making a surplus of exports over imports of 3,697,457 bushels. Last year we exported 4,350,462 bushels of oats, and we imported 2,194,730, making a surplus that year, in the exportation of oats, of 2,155,731 bushels. Last year we exported 2,491,308 bushels of pease, and we imported 9,589 bushels. Last year we exported 7,543,342 bushels of barley, and imported 302,147 bushels, leaving the excess of our exports over imports, 7,241,195 bushels. Our export of rye last year was 452,420 bushels, our import 146,803; balance of exports over imports 305,597 bushels. The only article upon the list we imported in excess of our exports, was Indian corn, of which we imported 3,299,000 bushels more than we exported; consequently that is the only grain grown in the Province of Ontario upon which a duty will advance the price in that Province, if, indeed, the doctrine of our friends on the other side is correct, when they assert that the American duty on barley came out of the American producer. In that case, of course, they might put a higher duty upon corn, as the American producer would pay it. What is to be the effect? I think I have shown conclusively that these duties can confer no benefit upon the agriculturist. What will be the effect upon the carrying trade of this Dominion? Do hon. gentlemen opposite suppose that they can, by means of the bonding system, obviate the difficulties and the mischievous result of this imposition of duty upon grain? If they do, they are greatly mistaken. Competition between rival routes to the Atlantic for the carrying trade of the West is keen, margins between them are small, and the imposition of any restrictions in the shape of a bonding system will be most vexatious, and will turn that trade to the rival routes. We are expending millions of dollars upon our system of canals. The Welland Canal is being deepened to a depth of 14 feet. We hope that, when that work is completed, we can defy competition for the carrying trade of the West. But, if the Gov-

ernment persist in retaining duty upon grain, we may bid good-bye to our expectations of securing the carrying trade of those vast and fertile States. It will greatly impair our carrying trade, it will have a depressing effect on our shipping interests; it can work no good to the farmer, and will work disaster to some of our more important interests. To sum up, with regard to this remarkable National Policy, let me present, Mr. Speaker, briefly, a few of the salient points in regard to it. In the first place, it will rob the farmer; in the second place, it will rob the lumberman; in the third place, it will rob the fisherman; in the fourth place, it will rob the labourer; in the fifth place, it will rob the shipowners; in the sixth place, it will rob every man who receives a salary; in the seventh place, it will enable the manufacturer to rob all classes, and, for diversion, to prey upon each other. These, Sir, are the features of this celebrated policy. One or two words in regard to retaliation. I always listen to talk about retaliation with a certain degree of nervousness. I always have a feeling of fear when that matter is referred to, just as I do when I see children handling dangerous edge tools. Retaliation. Forcing the United States to come to our terms. Why, that is sheer madness. The idea of compelling that great nation to accede to the terms that we are to dictate. Retaliatory tariff. My hon. friend the First Minister talked in a very threatening manner upon that subject last summer. I hope he will excuse me for saying that it is the greatest nonsense that he has given utterance to. The idea he sought to convey was that the United States had treated us, in their fiscal arrangements, with great unfairness. That is not quite correct. The articles we buy of that people, for consumption, we have hitherto taxed $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the main; the articles they have bought from us they have taxed but very little more. They do not buy of us cottons, woollens, and sugar; but the principal articles they buy of us, for consumption, are barley and lumber. The duties we imposed were very nearly equal to the duties imposed by them. Now, we propose greatly to increase those duties; we are on the line of retaliation. I am afraid

it may have a bad effect. Suppose that our friends on the other side, smarting as they are just now under a sense of imagined wrong in the matter of the the Fishery Award, and considering this tariff as discriminating against them, should take it into their heads to consider that we had thrown down the gauntlet, that we had entered upon this policy of retaliation with the design of forcing them to our terms; suppose they should take it into their heads to show us the thing could not be done, what course might they possibly pursue? What might be the effect of imposing a duty of 40c. a bushel upon barley? What might be the effect of imposing a duty of \$5 a thousand upon lumber? What might be the effect of renewing that order which Secretary Seward issued fifteen years or so ago, demanding passports of all persons entering the United States, or departing from the United States to Canada, which in one day shut off all the through travel over the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways, and compel these roads to cancel all but their local trains? We are playing with dangerous edge tools. This policy of retaliation is a piece of madness, and men of sense ought to know better than to talk about it, or to make the threats that they have freely indulged in. And, lastly, we have a very loyal party in this country, led by my hon. friend the First Minister. They have done a few things that might lead one to question their claim to the title, but they profess to be excessively loyal. They have great regard for the interests of the Mother Country—great reverence for her institutions; they cherish very highly that bond of union between these colonies and Great Britain. Sound these professions, and they are hollow. What are they now about to do? England receives every article we have to sell to her free of duty, not one dollar of duty is levied upon any article that this Dominion wishes to export to the British Islands, but we are discriminating against her industries. We will inevitably injure ourselves by the course we are taking. This course has already provoked comment in the British House of Commons; we have all seen, by the newspapers, that Sir George Campbell has given notice that he will

ask the Government if they are aware that Canada is about to adopt a policy of commercial hostility to England.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Hear, hear.

MR. CHARLTON: I can assure my hon. friends, although they may laugh at this, that it indicates a state of feeling that is no laughing matter. I can assure them that the position the Government has taken in the fiscal policy of this country is revolutionary, and that it is a position of enmity to England, and is so considered in England. I believe it will produce disasters. It threatens the Imperial connection; it threatens our national prosperity. It is a policy that the people of this country ought to, and, unquestionably, will, repudiate after they have had a chance to examine it in its practical operations, and to pronounce their opinion upon it at the polls.

MR. BOULTBEE said that, a few years since, he had formed his views on this subject from the hon. gentleman who had just sat down. At that time, young in politics, he (Mr. Boulton) was carried away by the specious term of Free-trade, just as men were misled by the name of Reform, and he adopted doctrines which he was now satisfied were very pernicious. He had taken a considerable part in discussing this question during the last election, and was satisfied that the position he then took, and the position so largely taken in Ontario at that time, was a correct one. The member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had just as much talent now as he ever had; consequently, if the speech he had just made was so infinitely inferior in its matter to its manner to the one in favour of Protection, it must be because his cause was bad. That gentleman had failed to convince anyone by his speech; he had not convinced the benighted farmers who had returned him to this House; he had not even convinced himself; he said that the people of this country were the dupes of the Government, and that the course the Government was now taking was such as to betray the confidence reposed in them by the people. He (Mr. Boulton) apprehended that a totally opposite state of things was the case.

The Government were acting now as men who acted in carrying into effect the duty of government, under our system of responsible government. The hon. gentleman went on to say that it was a servile imitation of the American system. He did not know what he meant by that. I took it, at any rate, it seemed to be a very feeble argument to resort to. There was no servile imitation of the States in the adoption of a policy which was different to our own, but which was eminently successful. The people of this country had the question before them, and had to deliberate upon it; they had got to determine what was suitable for them, and when they had done this, they caused legislation, through their representatives, to give an expression of their views. This was what the hon. gentleman called servile imitation of opinion. The hon. gentleman said the tariff was made a direct political issue. How could it be otherwise? The people were then represented in the Government by a set of men who obstinately closed their eyes to what the views of the people were, and who were so bound up in their own selfishness, and in ignorance of every principle of responsible government, that they overlooked and disregarded the opinion of the people who had sent them to be their representatives, allowed the country to sink from bad to worse, and then admitted they could take no step for its redemption. Therefore, the question was made a direct political issue, as it ought, and these men were beaten ignominiously at the polls. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) then went on to say that the United States gave us an example of the working of Protection. Well, he denied that it was a bad example, considering the difficulties under which the States laboured, difficulties which were vastly greater than ours. Notwithstanding the great debt imposed on them by their war, they had not suffered to anything like the same proportion that we had, which was the result of a careful system of Protection. He did not exactly understand what the hon. gentleman meant by saying that the people had emigrated from the Eastern to the Western States, leaving the factories empty, as he understood that every factory in the Eastern States

was well employed in manufacturing for those very men. Under their system they were always manufacturing goods, and, whether the people went north, south, east or west, factories were required. Then the hon. gentleman read a resolution passed at some meeting in the United States. Well, he believed it was well understood that, above all others, the American people were a great people for what they called "resoluting," they were very fond of holding large meetings and passing very fine resolutions. After they had done "resoluting" they then practised exactly the opposite. They resolved in favour of Free-trade and they practised rather close Protection, and they had practised it very successfully. Now, the next remark of the hon. gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Charlton) was very important in this way, as it sought to lead the people away from the real issues that influenced them in the last election. He made some eloquent remarks about the people being lured away and duped by the specious pledges and promises of the gentlemen who now formed the Government, and that they were led to commit the great sin of turning out honest gentlemen such as those who recently occupied the Treasury benches on this Protection question alone. As these words fell from the hon. gentleman's lips, he almost fancied he could see a tear trickling down his cheek, because his friends had been forced out into the cold by Protection. The truth was, that the result of the election hinged on the fact that the people of the country felt that the Government and the men who helped them were unable and unwilling to look after the true interests of the country, or to act up to the people's behests. He did not say that these gentlemen leading the Government and their supporters were dishonest, because that would be not only unparliamentary, but unbecoming any gentleman; but he did say that the people of the country felt they were not only incapable, but dishonest, and passed their verdict at the polls to that effect. There was another factor in consideration equally important in influencing the people at the polls. They had had a trial of gentlemen who were now in Opposition, and of the gentlemen

who were now at the head of the Government, and in that trial the late Government had been found wanting, while the present Administration had gained their trust and confidence, and in them the people believed they had men capable of framing financial measures which would tend to foster the industries of the country and redeem it from its trouble. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) next gave them a short dissertation on the fact that goods passing from one dealer to another, from the wholesale merchant in England to the wholesale merchant here, and then to another dealer, were accompanied by a charge, as each transaction took place. Any child knew, and he could show the hon. gentleman that any poor working-man struggling for a livelihood comprehended that question a great deal better than he did. He thought that the farmers derived great benefit from their vicinity to cities and towns, and there was not the slightest doubt but that it was in them the farmers obtained their principal markets. He could not admit the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk that protection to manufactures increased the price to the consumer. On the contrary, it would be seen that, in the United States for instance, under a close system of Protection, the price of articles had been falling from the natural competition induced. He (Mr. Boulton) did not understand what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) meant by his illustration of the ass bowed down between two burdens, unless he meant the great trouble and difficulty the hon. gentleman had experienced on having his speech on both sides of the question; perhaps he did feel like the animal in question. He (Mr. Boulton) was unable to come to any other conclusion. The hon. gentleman in his peroration said that, under this policy, the principles of Confederation were interfered with, and the people wronged. He (Mr. Boulton) did not think that was the feeling of the people of Ontario during the last election; that was not his reading of the verdict. The hon. member for North Norfolk began his speech by saying that he only intended to touch upon some general principles affecting this question of Free-trade and Protection, and he sat

down as far as he (Mr. Boulton) recollected without having laid down one single principle. He gave them statements of what had been done in various lands, and quoted statistics relating thereto, more or less correctly, but he had not given them one general principle, or made a single deduction from any principle. The question had been discussed at considerable length, and there were great principles involved in it. As he (Mr. Boulton) understood the question, and as he believed the large portion of the people of this country understood it, because it had been thoroughly debated, Protection would be of immeasurable value to this country. It was firmly believed that, under a close system of Protection, any country would become wealthy and prosperous, and its people comfortable. The wealth that arose from the conversion of the raw material of little value into articles of great value in the country, would increase and remain among us. For example, if a piece of unworked iron, worth one dollar, were sent to the United States, and it came back worked up into material worth \$20, would not the increase of wealth be there? Would it not be better if that piece of iron were worked up in this country, and thereby gave to the workmen and factories of the Dominion the benefit of the \$19 increase of wealth, which otherwise would accrue to the American manufacturer? He did not believe that they should remain idle, and merely look around them for markets for their wheat whilst their manufacturing industries were languishing; but how then would their workmen and factories have full employment as possible, and increased remuneration for the workmen's labour—a result which had been obtained in the United States under a close system of Protection. They had a surplus of wheat in this country. If they took a million dollars' worth of it into the United States, and they bought a million dollars' worth of goods with it, what would be the result? In say twelve months, the wheat was gone, the money gone, and the goods they bought with it were gone, in the natural progress of wear and decay, but, if they had used that million in buying a

million's worth of goods manufactured in their own country, the million of dollars would remain there, increasing their own circulation and remaining as wealth. He had heard this argument which was, no doubt, a favourite catch-cry about the hardship of the poor man who would have to pay more for everything. He happened to represent a suburb of Toronto, or district adjoining it, where hundreds of working men, who were employed in the various workshops in Toronto, lived. Many of them were idle for lack of work, suffering much hardship. He found no difficulty in discussing the matter with these men, for they were very intelligent, to whom he had said that, if they carried out the National Policy, it might, at first, raise the prices of a few things, but would it not be better for the artisan to have at, say, Don Mount, where he addressed the working men, a large cotton factory erected, affording hundreds of men employment? He said to them, "You may have to give 9c. a yard for your cotton, instead of 8c. or 7c., but you will get full wages; if you are fully employed in a wealthy country, what will a difference of 1c. or 2c. a yard make to you?" Those men all seemed to see the matter in that way. Whenever they talked about a cheap country to live in, he and the people thought it was not desirable at such a cost. They preferred a dear country where there was plenty of money, men were fully employed and wages were good. Of course, if people wanted a cheap country, they could go to the banks of the Nile, where a man could live for 5c. a week, and a yard of calico would do him for a great-coat, but we wanted no such a country as this. They wanted a country where men were wholly employed, got high wages, plenty of the necessaries of life and some luxuries, too. No country could become rich, strong and healthy, with its people comfortable, unless there was a constant circulation of wealth through the medium of the hard hands of the working men. Hoarded up, it did little good, but, broken up in small sums for circulation among working men, it made a country prosperous, wealthy, happy, the people satisfied and content. They could not bring about that result so long as Canada was simply a grain-growing

MR. BOULTBEE.

country. The land, under such a system, would become more exhausted every year, sending away its grain and wealth to other countries to pay for articles which might be produced here. That was neither wise nor prudent, he thought. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made some remarks about the loyalty of the Ministerial party. He (Mr. Boulton) dared say they were quite as loyal as the other side of the House. He had yet to learn that it was disloyal to legislate in a way to keep their people in their own land. If, by any process, they could increase the wealth and comfort of the people, so that their purchasing power might be doubled and trebled, they would be a better customer and connection of England than at present. They would be able to deal with her to a greater extent as had the United States since their wealth increased. He did not think that there would be any feeling against them in the old Mother Land, because they were struggling to better themselves and increase their means as her customers. He believed that, if the Protective system was wisely carried out, they might do away with those expensive emigration agencies, as their best agents and attractions to the working men of England and Europe, generally, would be found in the joyous hum of toil arising from their prosperous factories; and, when they learned that this country was growing more wealthy and prosperous, offering plenty of employment, they would throw into it, the very best men, without emigration agents, whose labours had only resulted in sending here inferior men, and not the sort wanted. There was a point to consider, fully as important as the taxation per yard of textiles imported: unless they could, in some way, create their own wealth, and keep it in their midst, creating gradually the wealth that would seek investment in our own securities, they would go on year by year adding to their indebtedness in England, till the whole country would become mortgaged. That was the case now to a great extent. What with debts to loan societies, debts of railways and building societies, the people were already mortgaged to an almost unbearable point. But, if they could manufacture within the country, create their own wealth, have their own

profits invested in their own bonds, and the interest paid here, it would not be of much importance whether their debt was large or small. At present, all their energies were taxed to pay the interest of debts due in England. It had been charged against the present Ministers that, in the election campaign, they declared there was not going to be an increase, but only a readjustment, of taxation by the new tariff. He (Mr. Boulton) believed that was true to the letter. There was, in fact, only a readjustment of the tariff, but no imposition of any taxation, beyond what was requisite to meet the expenses of the country. But, however the people felt early in the campaign, his own experience showed him that towards its end, their feelings broadened out into a determination to have thorough Protection, so far as they could get it, and to make Canada a country for the Canadians. He was satisfied that the true course would be—and he believed public opinion would work up to it—to encourage the manufacture of everything capable of production in this country. The hon. member for North Norfolk said that the Finance Minister, in the formation and formulation of this tariff, was surrounded by bores and designing men of various kinds, misguiding and misleading him, and that, some five years hence, he and all his friends would pay for it. He would like to reply that the Opposition were not a very large circle, and, after their not very flattering experience, of late, it did not become them to shake their fists in the face of a country that had just marked them with the stamp of severe condemnation. It was an insolent assumption, on their part, of superior knowledge that did not become them. They had expressed pity for the Minister of Finance under his supposed difficulties; but he (Mr. Boulton) thought he might return the compliment by considering the unfortunate situation of the leader of the late Government. No man who had any sympathy but would pity that hon. gentleman, whom they all knew as a man of plain, broad common sense, able to look facts in the face. He knew the result of his colleagues' conduct. He was not able to robe himself in the mantle of measureless self-conceit, or

wind round him the tough buffalo-hide of conscienceless indifference to everything, or fritter away his time in muddled, metaphysical disquisitions, but was capable of looking things squarely in the face, and he found himself, through the influence of those around him, led away from the course agreeable to his sense of right, and stranded on the barren shore of a people's disapprobation. He must feel that he had got into a bad position by yielding to those under him, and that, if he had trusted more to his own common sense, and not been misled by them, he would have fared a vast deal better.

MR. BUNSTER said he thought that, when they considered the amount of nonsense talked that night on the tariff, every member should want to go home. With regard to the remarks of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) threatening serious consequences to Ministers, on account of the tariff, he believed that, considering the popular verdict in their favour, such remarks showed unwarrantable assumption on his part. The Government had initiated the National Policy which the people believed in, wanted and had called for unmistakably. It had been called the National Policy, but it would draw a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They could not build such a railway, of course, without adequate means and taxes. British Columbia, also, pronounced unanimously for this policy, in carrying out which the Government should not be sneered at. The Pacific Railway, with regard to which the late Government rode into power, would have been completed, but for the unpatriotic spirit they showed, and which induced them to oppose the National Policy, and the men who were keeping their promises in respect to it. The people of Canada and of British Columbia were well satisfied with the tariff. A telegram from one of his constituents proved how much was thought of it in that Province. The farmers wanted the home market, and not to be crowded out by foreigners. The tariff suited British Columbia very well, although not *in toto*. The member for North Norfolk said he did not know how high the Government had raised the tariff—that was the most candid statement he made. He said

it was probably 50 per cent; but they all knew the highest item was furniture, 35 per cent., about which there was such a hurrah and ado made. It was improper to bring men's credit and circumstances into this question. They had nothing to do with the means of any manufacturer. A man, knowing he had protection, might invest more money in his business. The keeping of the furniture and other businesses to themselves would help to retain their young men in the country. The question was, not how prices should be kept low, but how employment and wages could be provided for the people. That was fair reasoning, and, if they could not give employment to their own men, their own men would be forced to emigrate. The Protectionist policy of the present Government would give employment to those men. The time might come, when a misunderstanding with the United States was pending, that the United States would prohibit the exportation of clothing to Canada. What was Canada then to do? Would it not be better for Canada to have her own factories? An hon. member had referred to the balance of trade against England. He would ask, could there be a stronger argument in favour of their having a tariff of their own, than those figures? He was surprised that the National Policy would be of material assistance to the Government in their efforts to construct the great national highway of the Pacific Railway. They, in their Province, lost 316 good citizens, owing to the inability of the late Government to carry out the terms of the Union. This was a serious matter for them. If they had not entered this Confederacy they would have had a railroad of their own by this time, for the American people would have been only too glad to have constructed a railway through the country and round it, if required, in order to obtain possession of British Columbia. But British Columbians were too loyal to the old flag, and all they wanted was that the Dominion of Canada should carry out the terms of Union. The people of British Columbia had shown their confidence in the Government by electing the Premier as a member for Victoria, and placing him at the head of the poll. It was hoped that he would do justice to

MR. BUNSTER.

the confidence that had been reposed in him. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had said that they were robbing the farmer. He would ask him were they robbing the farmer? He very much questioned whether the farmer would have to pay more for what he purchased than he had paid in the past. If he had to pay a little more to the manufacturer for the time being, he would, as the country got richer, receive a higher price for his produce. Competition would always regulate itself so that the manufacturers would only get a fair profit. During the past five years our manufactories had been shut up for the want of protection. The hon. member for North Norfolk had also referred to the Welland Canal. He held that, before the Welland Canal was completed, the Government should fulfil its undertaking with British Columbia. He claimed it was not just to mortgage British Columbia and raise money upon her real estate, and then spend that money in building canals before the Pacific Railway was completed. The hon. gentleman had also spoken about the Government robbing the poor clerks. He maintained that the National Policy would benefit that class by increasing the prosperity of the country, increasing the rate of wages, and affording employment to the unemployed. He was quite satisfied that the result of the operation of this tariff would be that they would be relieved of the importunities of the juvenile mendicants who pestered hon. members without the Parliament Buildings. He was sure that they on his side of the House would be able to pass this tariff without seeking the assistance of their colleagues on the other side. Hon. gentlemen on that side dared not vote against it, because they had to go back to their constituencies, and their constituents would say "You have not acted faithfully; you have not done as we wanted you to do." Therefore, he was satisfied that the tariff had proved so satisfactory to the country that even the members of the Opposition dared not arouse the indignation of their constituents by voting against it.

MR. MCCALLUM said he congratulated the Finance Minister on the financial policy he had submitted to the

House. He knew it was a question that was surrounded with many difficulties. There were many in this country who thought it impossible to reconcile every interest, but the hon. gentleman had succeeded, to a great extent, in reconciling these conflicting interests. When the present Government were in Opposition, they were of opinion that the revenue required in order to pay the interest on an indebtedness, in order to pay for the expenses of Legislation and public improvement, should be collected on those articles coming into this country in competition with our industries. He believed the tariff brought down would accomplish this object. He doubly congratulated the Finance Minister and the Government upon this tariff, because they had carried out the pledges they had made to the people of this country, and which had been a factor in carrying the elections on the 17th of last September. It had been complained that the late Government had deceived the people, and had not carried out the pledges they had made. What were their pledges? When in opposition, on a former occasion, their pledges were these: purity and economy and Parliamentary control over the people's money, and independence of Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite, as soon as they obtained power, forgot their pledges and cast these principles to the four winds of heaven, and that was the principal factor of the defeat on the 17th of September last. In reference to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition in regard to the agricultural interest, he would ask, what had the late Government ever done to assist that interest? What had the hon. gentlemen done for the North-West? What had the hon. gentlemen done to reach the fertile lands of the North-West? They had done nothing; but they had the satisfaction of knowing, that, under the existing régime, the North-West would be opened up, and our young men would have a chance of making their homes there. It was complained that this tariff would not assist the country, and the depressed condition of the United States was attributed to their Protective tariff. Why should this country ever be in the position of the United States, he could not understand. We had not had any civil war, nor had

we spent millions upon millions of money in destroying our country, and each other, as the Americans had done. But still, under Protection, the United States were prosperous—and more so than any other country in the world to-day—considering the amount of life and treasure they expended in putting down the civil war. He was amused at the manner in which some of these gentlemen talked of the balance of trade against England. Why, England was the banker of the world, and the balance of trade against her came back in the shape of interest on the money which she had loaned. He could easily illustrate the positions of England and Canada. England's position might be compared to that of a farmer who, while he did not raise enough in the year on his farm within a hundred dollars, to keep his family, had an income of \$1,000 interest coming to him, so that at the end of each year, nine-hundred dollars was added to his wealth. Canada stood in the position of a farmer who did not raise enough in a year to keep his family, by \$100, and had \$200 to pay. That was the way the balance of trade worked as far as England and Canada were concerned. Hon. gentlemen said the balance of trade meant nothing. It was just as sure as that the sun would rise in the morning, that the man who spent more than he earned was on the road to ruin. The old adage was true, that, with an income of 19s. 9d. per week and an expenditure of 20s., a man would be perfectly miserable, while with an income of 20s. and an expenditure of 19s. 9d. he would be perfectly happy. The odd three pence had in it the elements of misery or happiness according as it was over-expended or held to the good. The same principle applied to a community or nation as to the individual, only it took longer to reach the nation than the individual. The leader of the Opposition had stated that Protection destroyed the shipping of the United States. Why, everyone knew that it was owing to the destruction of American shipping during the civil war by privateers, by the *Alabama*, the *Georgia*, and the *Florida*, that the decline in American shipping was caused. What ships these privateers did not destroy, were transferred under the

British flag for safety. They also knew that England gave the right to register, under her flag, to the world, while the Americans refused that right to foreign ships, and even to-day many ships sailing under the British flag were owned by Americans. If they looked at the American commerce on the inland waters of this country, they would find it was largely increasing. Look at the inland navigation on the inland waters. Was Protection destroying shipping of the United States there? No; it had largely increased. How was it Protection had not destroyed our shipping? From 1867 to 1872, all the articles used in shipbuilding were allowed to enter free, or nearly so, and that was Protection to our shipping, and our shipbuilding prospered. He held in his hand some remarks that the hon. member for North Norfolk had previously made, and which placed him now in the position of the ass he had referred to as being loaded down beneath two burdens. Every young member ought to know what the former opinions of this hon. member on Canadian political economy were. To-night the hon. gentleman had praised the laudable object of the Democratic party in the United States to secure Free-trade, although he was what in that country was called a black Republican. He was there not long ago, and when there was proud of that name. The following was what he said:—

“I believe that the interests of the nation at large would be promoted by judicious Protection. I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by Protection, and that the manufacturer, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away. With a home market of this kind, established by Protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops. The purchasing power of money is not a correct measure of the purchasing power of labour. A farmer raises a bushel of corn, which he sells for 50c. in a foreign market, and with the proceeds he can buy three yards of cotton; but, supposing the manufactures are brought to his door, and the better market which it creates increases the price to 60c. or 70c. per bushel, and, although import duties are levied on cottons from Manchester, so as to add largely to its price, still he may be enabled to buy four yards of cotton with his bushel of corn, instead of the three yards it

was able to purchase before, as the purchasing power of his labour is increased.”

He might read a good deal more, but he thought he had read quite sufficient to prove the inconsistency of the hon. member. The late Finance Minister wanted to have us all farmers. He wanted neither towns, villages nor cities in this country, which he considered had too much power, and, on a former occasion in this House, had said that cities were a source of danger to the country, and that they should not be entrusted with their own municipal government. The following were the words used by the late Finance Minister:—

“I have called attention to this point, because I know there is a strong danger lest we ourselves should suffer from this particular evil. No one can have looked into the vast increase which has taken place in the amount of our municipal taxation, particularly in towns and cities, without being aware that there is some considerable risk—a very considerable risk. I may say that the almost unlimited power for the purpose of direct taxation that has been granted to those bodies, will be grievously abused. Sir, I trust it will be no offence to the governments of the various cities of the Dominion, if I say that there is some reason to believe that the city populations are especially unfitted to be entrusted with such very large powers. The country population, as far as I know, do generally manage their affairs with great economy and discretion. But I am sorry to say that neither the experience of the people of the United States, nor our own experience in this country, would warrant me in bestowing any such powers in the management of municipal affairs of the various towns and cities of Canada. If I might be permitted, on a point which is very closely connected with the question under discussion, to express my own individual opinion on that subject, I would say there is no urgent need that the power granted to those municipalities should be rigidly restricted, and that I believe it will be found a far truer principle, and far more conducive to their real interest, if they were confined to a certain list of subjects, strictly selected, instead of, as at present, permitting them to tax everything with, simply, a list of exceptions.”

The hon. gentleman would have them believe there was a lack of intelligence among the members of this House, and the people of this country; that, with the exception of himself and his party, the whole country was wrong, they alone being right. To-night the hon. gentleman spoke in the same terms. He said it was dangerous that we should have an accumulation of population in the cities, and the

leader of the Opposition said, the other night, that this policy would degrade the working man. He (Mr. McCallum) contended that this policy would have decidedly the opposite effect; that it would elevate the working man, by giving him plenty of employment, by making him a factor, in creating that wealth in this country which was now sent out of the country every year to buy manufactured articles. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to tell them that they must beware how they offended the people of the United States. Were they here on sufferance? Were they afraid to legislate for the people of this country, to impose a tariff that would be beneficial to our country? If so it was high time they knew it. The greatest compliment they could pay the United States would be to copy after them. He did not wish to say anything to offend the United States in any way; but he would say it here, distinctly, that, as long as he had a vote and a voice, that voice would be cast, and that voice would be raised, in favour of the people of Canada, on every occasion, no matter what the United States might think of it. He would say, further, when they told us that the tariff might not be well received in England, that it might have the effect of causing difference between both countries; he knew and believed that the loyalty of the Canadian people was greater, and that our connection with England was far stronger than mere £ s. d., and that this very tariff would be the means of raising our credit in England by showing to the world that we were determined to pay the debts we had contracted; besides it would tend to increase our population and make our country prosperous, and, when the time came, we could be of much more benefit to the Mother Country than if we were weak and poor. There might be something in the tariff of which he might not approve himself. Of course, the organ of the hon. gentleman opposite had said that he was dissatisfied with it, and that he was a miller. He was neither dissatisfied with it, nor was he a miller. Taken altogether, it was as good a tariff as could be expected, and the people of this country were satisfied with it. Of course, there might be some mistakes. The Finance Minister was only human and might make mis-

takes, and he stated he would be ready to remedy any defects in this tariff. He (Mr. McCallum) had, on a former occasion, expressed a wish to see tea free of tax, as we did not raise an ounce in the Dominion, and they had received the announcement of the Finance Minister that he was sorry he could not take off this tax, but would do so as soon as the finances of the country would permit it. That tax he looked upon as direct taxation to the country, because the article could not possibly be produced here; but still it might be necessary for the revenue. The hon. gentleman opposite, however, had collected a specific duty on tea, when in power, so that the poor man paid while the rich man was let off easy. There was a change under this tariff in that mode of collecting it, which was a decided improvement in favour of the poor man and consumers of cheap tea. As far as the duty on coal stood, it might bear on the manufacturer, but he was protected otherwise. Some people said the lumbermen ought to be assisted. He did not look so much at lumbermen as at other individuals, because lumbermen were only spending the wealth of this country, which had been growing for thousands of years. If they did not take it out this year, it would be standing next.

An Hon. MEMBER: It might be burnt.

MR. MCCALLUM said there was a good deal of truth in that, and he was sorry to say that the policy of this country had not sufficiently considered the protection of our woods and forests from destruction. As long as they collected the stumpage, as they now did, at so much per thousand, lumbermen would only take what it would pay them to take, and leave the balance in the bush to burn. He would have liked to have seen a little duty on wool. He thought the fine wools coming in from the Cape would be more used than formerly, and a small duty on foreign wool would give more room for our own coarse wool, than by allowing the Cape wool in free. Some hon. members of this House differed from him in this respect, and held that in the large protection afforded to coarse woollen goods, our

wool-growers had sufficient protection ; but, if this was not so, it could be remedied hereafter. He saw by the tariff that the hon. Minister gave a protection of 10 per cent. on ships, and he was glad to see this ; but he would like to see it 20 per cent., in place of 10. Formerly, they could go to the United States, and build or buy a vessel, and take her into this country free of duty ; and, if they built the vessel here, in part, such as the hull, and got their engine from the United States, they paid 17½ per cent. on the part got from the United States, which was a great injustice to our own ship-builders, and an encouragement to get vessels built in a foreign country, instead of encouraging our own ship-builders here ; but, under the present tariff, and taking in part of the ship, they paid 20 per cent. duty, and, if they took in the whole ship, they paid only 10 per cent. on the whole ship. Of course, this was better than formerly ; but still there was a premium of 10 per cent. against our ship-builders by this arrangement, and he hoped that the Finance Minister would see his way clear to do justice in this matter ; and he ventured, further, to add that this tariff would be beneficial to the country at large.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Fifteen minutes before
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 19th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE TARIFF RESOLUTIONS.

REMARKS.

MR. HOLTON called attention to the fact that the corrected tariff had been circulated after the House had been engaged in dealing with the list as origin-

ally printed, and suggested that the changes made, or errata which occurred, in the original list should be printed in the Votes and Proceedings, in order that members might see the differences without having to wade through such a quantity of figures, and compare them item by item.

ally printed, and suggested that the changes made, or errata which occurred, in the original list should be printed in the Votes and Proceedings, in order that members might see the differences without having to wade through such a quantity of figures, and compare them item by item.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was no objection to that being done.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

NAMES ADDED.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Messrs. White (East Hastings), Orton and Cameron (South Huron) be added to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canal and Telegraph Lines ; Messrs. Orton and Cameron (South Huron) to that on Banking and Commerce ; Messrs. Killam and Rykert to that on Public Accounts ; Mr. White (East Hastings) to that on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and also to that on Immigration and Colonisation ; and Mr. Boulbee to the Select Committee on the subject of the Insolvency Laws.

PIER IN ROCHER BAY.

QUESTION.

MR. ROGERS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant an amount in the Supplementary Estimates to further aid in the erection of a pier in Rocher Bay, at Anderson's Hollow.

MR. TUPPER : The attention of the Government has already been called to this matter, and they are engaged in carrying out the expenditure involved by the contract that has already been made for the work. But they do not expect to be able to proceed with it at present. They will be very glad to do so on a future day if it is found necessary.

REBUILDING SHEDS ON GROSSE ISLE.

QUESTION.

MR. LANDRY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to rebuild the sheds on Grosse Isle, in the county of Montmagny, these sheds having been destroyed by fire in August last.

MR. TUPPER : In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I would say that it has already been stated to the House that it is not the intention of the Government, at present, to proceed with the erection of these sheds.

CONTRACT FOR SECTION "B," PACIFIC RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. TROW enquired, Whether the contract for section "B," Pacific Railway, has been formally entered into between the Government and the contractors, and when the tenders and contracts will be brought down.

MR. TUPPER : I expect the contract for section No. 2 will be signed to-day, and no time will be lost in laying on the table of the House the contracts for both sections.

ABOLITION OF NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

QUESTION.

MR. TROW enquired, Whether the Government, during this Session, intend abolishing the postage on newspapers in the county or city of publication.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The Government do not intend to make any change in the rate of postage in reference to newspapers in the city or county of publication during the present Session.

CLAIM OF NEW BRUNSWICK FOR EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. BURPEE (Sunbury) enquired, Whether the Government have decided to pay to the Government of New Brunswick the sum of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, claimed by that Province as due for that part of the Intercolonial Railway, known as Eastern Extension, and purchased by the Dominion Government from the Province of New Brunswick.

MR. TILLEY : Application was made to the late Government on this subject, and no reply was given, and no answer has yet been given by the present Government on this subject.

MAIL ROUTE FROM BRIGHTON TO PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY.

QUESTION.

MR. KEELER enquired, Why was the mail route between Brighton and the county of Prince Edward removed to Trenton, previous to the late general election.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, in the absence of his hon. friend, the Postmaster-General, he had obtained from the Post Office Department the information that the old mail route was discontinued in 1877, and the new one substituted for it, on the report of the Post Office Inspector.

USE OF PRIVATE LETTER IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. KEELER renewed his motion for a return of the correspondence relating to the transmission, during the recent Dominion elections, of a certain letter marked private and confidential, then on file in the Post Office Department, Ottawa, to a voter in the East Riding of Northumberland.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he understood, from the newspapers, that the hon. gentleman had brought a charge against him personally. As he was not present, he did not know whether the newspapers had reported the matter correctly or not; therefore, he would like to know what the charge against him was, in which case he would endeavour to give the hon. gentleman a satisfactory reply.

MR. KEELER said that the reports that appeared in the newspapers were substantially correct. The charge was simply this: In his recent canvass in his riding, he called upon one of the residents of the township, who had always been a strong supporter of his, and he was surprised to be told by him that he intended to remain neutral, as he could not give him (Mr. Keeler) his support or his vote. After a good deal of persuasion, he induced the gentleman to give him his reasons for refusing his support. The gentleman stated that a letter had been sent to him, written by himself (Mr. Keeler), addressed to the late Postmaster-

General, the Hon. Alexander Campbell, containing some uncomplimentary reflections upon the father of the gentleman whose vote he was soliciting. The gentleman handed him a letter in his (Mr. Keeler's) own handwriting, which he had addressed to the Hon. Alexander Campbell, marked "private and confidential." After he had explained to the gentleman the causes he had for writing the letter, the gentleman gave him his support as usual. That gentleman told him that the letter had been sent by his (Mr. Keeler's) opponent, the late member for that riding, who had received it from a third party. He desired to take possession of the letter, but he was told he had to return it to Mr. Biggar, who had received it from a third party, who, he understood, had received it from the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington). Of course, he could not help feeling that there had been committed a great act of impropriety, on the part of the hon. gentleman, or some one in his Department. He hoped the hon. gentleman would be able to give them some information on the subject.

MR. HUNTINGTON said that, if he had been present when this question was put, on the first occasion, he would have contented himself by saying that he knew nothing about it. When he was first apprised of this motion, he did not imagine that he had ever heard anything in relation to the matter. And, had he been in his place, he would have said that he knew nothing about it whatever, and would have recommended him to get the papers. But, being anxious to give all the information he could in regard to the matter, he went to the secretary of the Department, who told him that a member of Parliament, during last Session, had had access to the papers relating to the Codrington post-office case, and he presumed that, one of the papers, which was not marked "private and confidential," was the one referred to, and that these papers were returned during the Session of Parliament, and that they were not out of the custody of the Department after the termination of the Session. He (Mr. Huntington) remembered nothing personally of the matter. He had no knowledge of what the secretary said. It was not an

MR. KEELER.

unusual thing to give a member of Parliament access to papers. The secretary stated Mr. Biggar had had access to the papers, and that was all he knew in regard to the matter. However, none of the papers in that case were marked "private and confidential." He hoped a full enquiry would be made into the matter, in order that no one might think that he had not given all the information in his power upon the subject.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that a memorandum had been sent to him from the Post Office Department on the subject, from which it appeared that Mr. Biggar, the then member for East Northumberland, called at the Post Office Department, and asked to see the papers relating to the appointment of one Mr. Lay, postmaster at Codrington, and that Mr. Biggar had the papers. Amongst these papers there was none marked "private and confidential," but there was a letter of a private nature complaining of this appointment. When Mr. Biggar, in the first place, asked for leave to have this letter, the hon. member for Shefford declined, but he afterwards allowed him to have it, and it was no doubt very improperly used by Mr. Biggar, in order to deprive his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) hon. friend, who now represented the county, of a vote. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) had also obtained this information from the secretary of the Post Office Department.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was most anxious that this matter should be investigated, because there was a direct discrepancy between the information the hon. the leader of the Government had obtained and that which he himself had obtained. The hon. member for East Northumberland said this letter was in the possession, during the canvass, of a certain party in his county. He (Mr. Huntington) was certain that letter could not have been there if the information given him by the Secretary of the Department was correct. The letter was not obtained from him for any such purpose. He had no recollection of the letter being returned, but he was assured the letter was returned during the Session, and it was impossible that the letter could have been in the hon. gentle-

man's county during the election. He supposed the letter referred to by the hon. gentleman, must have been some other letter, as the hon. gentleman had stated that he saw it, and read it, and that it was in his own handwriting.

SIR. JOHN A. MACDONALD said his information was from the same informant as that of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), namely, the Secretary of the Post Office Department. He was told that the letter was purely of a personal character; that Mr. Huntington at first declined and afterwards permitted Mr. Biggar to have access to the letter, and that it was subsequently returned in an envelope.

MR. HUNTINGTON: And during the Session; so he told me himself.

MR. KEELER said this letter was addressed by him to Mr. Campbell, and was headed "private and confidential." Of this he was positive. The gentleman whose vote he was canvassing took it out of his pocket. He (Mr. Keeler) recognised his own letter and read it. When he desired to retain it, the gentleman said he was bound to return it to Mr. Biggar.

MR. HUNTINGTON said it was not at all necessary to discuss the matter at length. When the papers came down they might bring some further information on the subject. He desired, however, to add that, if Mr. Biggar applied for those papers, and he (Mr. Huntington) objected to give them, he undoubtedly told Mr. Biggar to move for them in the usual way. It was not his fault if a private and confidential letter had been amongst the papers, but he had already stated that there was no private and confidential letter amongst those papers. It was a customary thing to allow members of Parliament to have access to papers in this way. He was inclined to think, if the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Keeler) was not mistaken, that they were talking about one paper and he of another, of which the Department knew nothing. He was not surprised that the hon. gentleman felt wronged upon seeing a private communication of his own used in that way. He (Mr. Huntington) considered such a use of a letter as highly

improper, and he would not have allowed it. But, as far as the Department was concerned, they utterly denied the existence of any such letter at all. Somebody might have done wrong, but he (Mr. Huntington) was clear of any wrong doing in the matter. There was no knowledge in the Department of a letter marked "private and confidential." He had never heard, to his knowledge, of the paper to which the Department had reference, and he certainly never heard of the paper, in regard to which the hon. gentleman moved.

MR. McCALLUM said that Mr. Biggar would not be guilty of any impropriety in this matter. If he got the letter at all, it was sent to him either by the then Postmaster-General or some of his clerks.

Motion agreed to.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTOR FOR DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. BOURBEAU moved for copies of all correspondence, returns and statements which have passed between the Inspector of Weights and Measures for the united counties of Drummond and Arthabaska and the Government.

Motion agreed to.

LOSS OF THE "LADY HEAD."

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. VALLÉE moved for copies of the minutes of the enquiry held as to the loss of the steamer *Lady Head* last autumn; 2nd, a statement of the number of vessels the Government has at its disposal for the protection of our fisheries. He said he had observed by the Estimates that it was not the intention of the Government to replace the *Lady Head*, and he regretted this, since it was highly desirable for the protection of the fisheries that she should be replaced. He understood that the Government intended to employ the *Napoleon III* for the service formerly rendered by the *Lady Head*. It was well known that the former vessel had proved already to be wholly inadequate for the proper performance of the service proposed. A lighter vessel was required for this purpose, which would

not only protect the fisheries, but perform a variety of other services, for which a vessel under Federal authority was very much needed in that region.

Motion agreed to.

MR. RYLAND'S CLAIM.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. COURSOL moved for all papers, correspondence, etc., relative to the claim of Mr. Ryland for interest due him on the Canadian moiety of Chief Justice Carter's award, together with the report of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake), in January or February, 1877, suggesting that the Local Governments of Quebec and Ontario should be called upon conjointly to pay the amount claimed.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the Government should take care that no reports of the Minister of Justice to the Council were brought down, unless it was quite clear it was a subject which ought to be made clear to the whole world. This motion, if passed, would be a direct order for the production of these papers.

Mr. TUPPER said all such motions were necessarily subject to the documents asked for being public documents.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he had always taken the precaution to state to the gentlemen moving for such papers, that he would not agree to any order of the House, without some qualification. Speaking as a member of the late Government, he was not willing that a confidential report should be brought to the House, in a matter of this kind.

Mr. TUPPER said he would like, in the absence of the First Minister, that the hon. member for Montreal East would allow the motion to stand.

Mr. COURSOL said he had no objection to that. He knew nothing about the merits of the matter, but he knew that Mr. Ryland, feeling himself aggrieved, intended to appeal to England, and, in order to do so, wished to transmit those papers to England asked for in the motion.

Motion postponed.

MR. VALLÉE.

DISMISSAL OF RÉGIS CARDINAL.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. HUNTINGTON moved for a copy of all papers, reports, correspondence and documents, relating to the recent dismissal of Régis Cardinal, heretofore an employé of the Inland Revenue Department. He said that Cardinal was an excellent officer, and had certificates of his ability to fill the office from which he had been dismissed. The country felt interested in knowing the reason for his dismissal.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) said he was surprised that this question should have been raised, especially by the hon. member for Shefford, who, for a long time, was the law partner of the late Minister of Justice, and who ought to be familiar with all the facts which led to the dismissal of Mr. Cardinal. Everybody knew the extraordinary means and ingenious devices used in Jacques Cartier in the election of the late Minister of Justice, and every member of this House, whether he represented British Columbia or one of the Lower Provinces, had read the details of a certain criminal prosecution, showing that, in that county, some leading Liberals had even tampered with the ballot-box, and it was not surprising, in view of those facts, that an army of public officers, not only of Jacques Cartier, but also of the city of Montreal, holding positions in the Customhouse, the post-office, and the Inland Revenue office and others holding office in Ottawa, had canvassed the county for three or four weeks from door to door, in favour of the late Minister of Justice. This dismissal of Mr. Cardinal was the only one which had been asked by the electors of Jacques Cartier, although a dozen other dismissals might have been made with perfect justice. It was thought proper that an example should be made by striking at the head of the party of corruption. The proof upon which Mr. Cardinal was dismissed was not doubtful; it was reduced to writing and confirmed under oath. It was based on the deposition of Mr. Richard B. Cook, forming part of the case filed in the Supreme Court in 1876, in connection with the Jacques Cartier election of that year. Mr. Cook de-

posed that Cardinal had asked his help, saying that Mr. Laflamme would be willing to help him in return in his contract if he wanted assistance. There was no necessity for an investigation in the matter, as the evidence clearly proved a case of gross abuse of official position. For these reasons, Cardinal's dismissal was asked for and granted. If the hon. member for Shefford had been Minister of Public Works, he would certainly have granted such a petition. At all events, they all knew that, in 1874, the late Minister of Public Works, now leader of the Opposition, dismissed the predecessor of Cardinal, one Mr. Clark, without any reason whatever, and merely to make room for one of the friends of Mr. Laflamme.

Mr. HUNTINGTON said he was obliged for the explanation of the hon. gentleman, upon whose recommendation the dismissal took place. Every Canadian deplored, whether a party man or not, the sad events which occurred in Jacques Cartier, relating to the stuffing of the ballot-box, to which the hon. gentleman had referred. How far the fact that he (Mr. Huntington) was, some years ago, a partner of Mr. Laflamme connected him with this affair, he left it to the hon. gentleman to explain. If it were true that a public officer interfered unfairly in an election, he was not disposed to protect him. But the Government allowed Mr. Cardinal no defence, and simply cut off his head without parley. We would owe to the Conservative party the introduction into the country of the American system, "to the victors belong the spoil." For five years his hon. friend from Lambton led the Government, embarrassed in every way by the hostility of many members of the Civil Service, who were partisans of hon. gentlemen opposite, without resorting to dismissals; but the moment this Government got into power they proclaimed the doctrine that every civil servant who was friendly to the late Ministers was to be beheaded, though the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Girouard) said that, although there was an army of offenders, they would exact only vicarious punishment by means of one individual. The present official had been spoken of with an extraordinary bitterness; but, if he

(Mr. Huntington) believed him guilty, he would not lift a hand to save him. There could be no greater disgrace than to allow it to be seen that a Minister had not taken the trouble to investigate a charge against a man, or allow him an opportunity of defence before discharging him. It seemed enough to know that a member had made complaints against an official to order his decapitation in this vicarious way.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman who had just sat down would do well to inform himself a little better in relation to the cases he dealt with, before indulging in such very high-sounding phrases of censure. He did not seem to know that, at the time of the Jacques Cartier election, in 1876, Régis Cardinal was an officer of the Government, nor, though he was a member of the late Government, the particular Department to which Cardinal belonged. He had asked for the correspondence regarding Cardinal's dismissal from a Department to which he did not belong. He was a paymaster for the works on the Lachine Canal, and was not in the Inland Revenue Department. Every remark of the hon. gentleman indicated an entire ignorance of the facts of this case. He had stated that the present Government's course in regard to dismissals was calculated to bring about a general system of dismissals from office, and yet he admitted that, whenever it could be shown that a public officer, instead of attending to his duties, gave his time and attention to political work, he should be dismissed. Now, it was notorious that Cardinal was a most active and energetic canvasser in all the elections in the interest of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. HUNTINGTON: How do you know?

MR. TUPPER said he had the undoubted evidence of a gentleman on the spot, whose character and standing had induced the people to elect him their representative in this Parliament. But Cardinal was not dismissed for that. Thousands of public officers all over the country, who had devoted their attention enthusiastically and energetically to the work of the elections, still held their

offices. Years ago, when a charge of dismissals for political reasons was brought against the Government of the right hon. gentleman, now Premier, he (Mr. Tupper) had challenged proof of a single instance, and he was happy to say they stood on the same ground to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite would seek in vain for the case of a dismissal in consequence of the political opinions of any officer or any ordinary exercise of his political rights. Cardinal not only interfered energetically in the election in Jacques Cartier, but, as had been proved, used his official position to bribe and intimidate the electors instead of attending to his duties. Mr. Cook was a contractor, and Cardinal a paymaster in the public service. Cardinal introduced himself to Mr. Cook, according to his sworn testimony, saying he carried a letter of introduction to him from Mr. Laflamme, then a Minister, at the time of an exciting political contest between him and the present hon. member (Mr. Girouard). Mr. Cook's evidence proved that Cardinal was conscious of the corrupt character of the communication he carried from Mr. Laflamme to a contractor under the Government of which he was a member. That contractor's very business life was in the hands of that Government at the moment, and he had the best reasons for believing that his life would not be tenderly cared for if he did not pursue a particular course. Cardinal was conscious of the corrupt nature of the letter, for, after Mr. Cook read it, he asked its return. Why ask it back unless for the reason he gave, that it was a critical time? Mr. Cook returned one part and kept another. Cardinal made an appointment, saying Mr. Laflamme would see Mr. Cook and himself, asking him for his support to Mr. Laflamme. Mr. Cook, who had always been a staunch Conservative, excused himself, saying he could not do much; he could not speak French, the language of nearly all his employés. He was not, however, let off. Cardinal, in making the appointment, said: "If you will assist Mr. Laflamme in the election, he will assist you in relation to your contract." He (Mr. Tupper) would ask the hon. member for Shefford whether he thought any Government ought to retain in the public

service, as a charge upon the revenue, an official who could act in this way? The Government believed this testimony, it being that of a disinterested person, and any Government would fail in its duty, and destroy the whole character of the Civil Service, if it did not promptly dismiss such a public officer.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he had stated, at the outset, that he had no personal knowledge of the case, but knew it only by representations. The hon. the Minister of Public Works said that Mr. Cook gave some damaging testimony in 1876, but he knew that the Courts had attached no importance to it. Had they believed the story, they would not only have unseated, but disqualified Mr. Laflamme. He knew it was said, last year, by the hon. gentleman opposite, that the Courts, in not doing so, were partisan; but, with the responsibilities of office upon him, he would hardly repeat that charge. What he (Mr. Huntington) would say, as to Cardinal, was this: That the hon. gentleman had dismissed a man who, according to the evidence of his own employés in the Department, was one of its best men. He gave Cardinal no opportunity to defend himself, but stated that he took his advice from an excellent gentleman, now one of the people's representatives, the member for Jacques Cartier; but he was known to be a sworn enemy of Cardinal, who had not, contrary to British ideas of justice, been permitted an opportunity of responding to the charges against him. Besides, the hon. the Minister of Public Works acted on evidence given two years ago, which the Courts discredited, but which was now brought up to rattle the dry bones of an old controversy. They had dismissed this able officer on no better evidence than Mr. Cook's statement, discredited by the Court, that he had tried to bribe him, and without allowing that officer an opportunity for self-defence.

MR. ROULEAU said the hon. member for Shefford ought to have been better informed of the facts before making the charge that the Conservative party in this Dominion had inaugurated the American system in dismissing public officials who did not entertain the same political views as the members of their

party. This charge came with particularly bad grace from him, seeing that his friends, the Joly Government in Quebec, had dismissed entire classes of officials who entertained contrary political opinions—he referred to the forest rangers who were officials of great utility in that Province; moreover, their creation had been approved by many members of the opposite party.

MR. CASGRAIN: I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to introduce into our debates what took place in the Government of Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member for Dorchester should confine himself to the general question raised by the hon. member for Shefford.

MR. ROULEAU said he was speaking to the question, as the hon. member for Shefford had accused the Conservative party of inaugurating the American system of dismissal. He believed he had the right of quoting instances of the doings of the Liberal party, on the same matter, in the Province of Quebec. He would repeat that an entire class of employés had been dismissed in the Province of Quebec. They were dismissed without any investigation as to whether they were useful or not; in fact it was well known that they were useful, and had collected a revenue sufficient to pay their salaries for many years to come.

MR. CASGRAIN said the hon. gentleman persisted in ignoring the ruling of Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think this House has anything to do with the policy of the Local Governments.

MR. ROULEAU said he was speaking of the policy of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, and the Province of Quebec formed part of this Dominion. It was not the Conservatives who had introduced the system of dismissing employés of opposite political opinions, but it was certainly the Liberal party who had introduced it.

MR. LANDRY said he wished to deny the assertion of the hon. gentleman from Shefford (Mr. Huntington) that the Conservative party had introduced the

system of dismissing employés of opposite political opinions. That hon. gentleman ought to know that, when he was Postmaster-General, he had, in numerous instances, dismissed postmasters without any preliminary investigation, and the dismissed officers never knew the reason therefor. One instance of this was the dismissal of Isaïe Caouette, in the county of Montmagny.

MR. BRECKEN said that he did not profess to be very well acquainted with the details of the case before the House, except what he remembered having read of it in the newspapers, some months ago; but he had no doubt, from the explanation just given by the Minister of Public Works, that the dismissal of Mr. Cardinal, whose conduct had been complained of, was quite justifiable. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had charged the Government with endeavouring to introduce the American system that "to the victors belong the spoils;" he wished that the charge, so far as it would affect the Province that he represented, was true. All that he (Mr. Brecken) could say was, that he had been endeavouring to have certain political opponents dismissed from office, but had not as yet succeeded. He did not, however, despair, but intended to try again. He admitted that in the Province he came from the practice in accordance with the idea that "to the victors belong the spoils," had very generally prevailed. He had to attend to a very large correspondence from his constituents on this very subject. He also admitted that it was more conducive to the public interest that the Civil Service should be permanent than that the staff of public servants should be dismissed upon every change of Administration. The principle laid down by Lord Dufferin, in his speech made at Toronto, was, no doubt, the correct one, that there was nothing about which a country should be so particular as to secure, in such a service (alluding to the Civil Service) independence, business capacity, and faithfulness; but, while Lord Dufferin inculcated the necessity of preserving the Civil Service free from political changes, he also laid it down that such immunity from dismissal imposed upon that service the obligation

that the members of it should serve their successive chiefs or heads of Departments, no matter to what party they belonged, loyally and impartially. If men in the Civil Service were allowed to vote, let them vote, and let them not be punished for the free exercise of their franchise; but when, as had happened in the Province he came from, their most violent, indefatigable, and he might say, most unscrupulous opponents, were officers of the Dominion Government, he did think that such a state of things called for a remedy. These men should not be allowed to retain office, and, while he subscribed to the doctrine laid down by Lord Dufferin in relation to the Civil Service, he contended that, if such service was to be permanent, it should only be on the condition that the members of that service should refrain from taking an active part in elections, so that they might be in a position to act faithfully and cordially with the head of the Department under whom, for the time being, they were serving, even though that head should be opposed to them in politics. In his little Province, among their most bitter and abusive opponents, were men who held Dominion offices, and he contended and would contend that the American system should be applied in such cases. They had joined in the cry of the opponents of the present Governments, in many cases hurling the most outrageous charges against the Liberal-Conservative party, and yet he regretted to say he had not yet been able to get one of these men removed. He again repeated that, so far as these men were concerned, he regretted that the charge made by the hon. member for Shefford was not true; he wished, and still hoped, that the Government would see to this matter, and that the men who had so abused their position would be dismissed, and replaced by others who were qualified to fill these offices, and who had fair claims upon the party now in power. He (Mr. Brecken) thought the Government were much too lenient, and were not doing their duty towards their supporters. He thought that, where cause was shown, and it was satisfactorily established that civil servants had been stumping the country, retailing violent charges against political

MR. BECKEN.

opponents, or aiding others in doing so, such men should be dismissed. The existence of the party required it. As they made their bed so let them lie on it.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was surprised to hear the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) charge the Liberal-Conservative party with the cry that "to the victors belong the spoils." He was curious to see whether the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, from the city and county of St. John, N.B., would allow such a charge to be made, and remain uncontradicted. He was present on one occasion, at a political meeting in New Brunswick, during the last election, where there were on the platform two gentlemen now in opposition, holding seats in this House, and an hon. Senator, and the chairman of the meeting gave out the watchword: "To the victor belongs the spoil," and they all cheered and clapped their hands at the sentiment. When the hon. member for Lambton, and the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright), were at St. John, speaking on the platform to help their candidates, the same chairman who had laid down on the previous occasion the doctrine that "to the victor belong the spoils," got up and said to some persons present that he was surprised they should dare to make a noise when they owed their bread and butter to the Government. The whole election was run on the question that "to the victors belong the spoils." The late Minister of Customs, on a previous election, sent a public officer up to his county, who worked three days in one place canvassing against him (Mr. Domville). The watchword that "to the victor belong the spoils" was not the watchword of the Liberal-Conservative party, but it had been the watchword of the Liberal party all through the late elections, particularly in New Brunswick. No persons had been dismissed in New Brunswick for their political views, and he trusted that the Civil Service might become a permanent institution, not affected by changes of Ministry, and that no dismissal should be made except for adequate cause.

MR. CASEY said it was a fortunate thing for gentlemen on the Treasury

benches that they had thus early had warning whither the course of political appointments and dismissals in this country was leading them. He was glad that it had come from the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite that the present system tended inevitably to the introduction of the American system. He was hardly prepared for the statement of the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville) that this election had been run on the issue that "to the victors belong the spoils."

MR. DOMVILLE: I did not say that the election had been run on that cry by both parties, but that it had been adopted as the motto of the Reform party in New Brunswick.

MR. CASEY said that was what he understood his hon. friend to say, and if on that issue the Reformers were defeated, he supposed it must have been because the electors hoped more from the side that was coming in than from the other side. He knew that had not been the war cry of the Reform party throughout the Dominion; but if, as his hon. friend had just stated, it was the war cry in one Province, it was high time the system was changed which rendered such an election cry possible. His hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Brecken) had complained of being troubled with a large amount of correspondence, asking for appointments. His was not going to be the only case. The Government would find that from all quarters their supporters, after being excluded several years from power, would come up with complaints that those miserable Grits were retained in office, which they, the Government supporters, thought belonged to themselves. He believed the present Government would, in many cases, yield to this pressure and dismiss Reformers for the purpose of placing their own friends. After every change of Government, the party that was left out in the cold would become more and more eager to provide for their friends, and the result would be that, in the near future, some Government would adopt the American system *in toto*, and make a clean sweep of the board in respect to offices. His hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Brecken) had stated that he desired to see such a result. No doubt

many other members would have urged the same view on the Government if they had the courage. He was afraid the time was not far distant when this, or some other Government would adopt this policy. Political appointment led logically to dismissal on the same grounds. He quite agreed with that hon. gentleman that, when a man was in the Civil Service he should leave politics behind, and he would find no fault with this or any other Government for dismissing a man who had made himself unduly busy in elections. Of course officials should not be debarred from the privilege of voting, but it was not becoming in a man who took pay from the nation, as a whole, to make himself the servant of a particular party. His services belonged to the people and not to party. He was glad to hear reference made to the speech of Lord Dufferin, who had told them, "Above all things, do not make your Civil Service a political machine." This was a point which he (Mr. Casey) had urged, in his humble way, for a long time,—first, on his own friends and now on this Government. He thought this was an appropriate time to urge it again—to urge that Ministers should agree to a measure, which, by making the service non-political, would prevent, forever, such discussions as the present.

MR. DOULL said he was astonished to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Shefford, that the present Government were introducing the American system with respect to the Civil Service. If that hon. gentleman had made a visit down to the Province to which he (Mr. Doull) belonged, along with the late Minister of Public Works and the late Finance Minister, he (Mr. Huntington) would have seen that the American system had been already pretty generally introduced by the late Government. So far as his county was concerned, there were many individuals occupying official positions who had been dismissed without any intimation beforehand, and without having the British justice extended to them of being tried before they were condemned. He could give numerous instances of this. There was the Collector of Customs at Glasgow, a most worthy and upright gentleman, who had been filling the position creditably to himself and

with satisfaction to the whole community, and who was dismissed for no other reason than a political one, so far as he knew, and that without any previous intimation whatever. At the time he occupied the position of collector, he was receiving a salary of \$200. An active partisan of the other side was appointed in his place, and the salary increased to \$600. This was the way the late Government carried out the British system, or the American system. The late Government might not have considered Customs officers as connected with the Civil Service, but there was the case of the Harbour Commissioners in his own county, whom they might consider as officers of the Civil Service. No charge whatever could be brought against these gentlemen, yet they were dismissed and others appointed in their place, because they did not belong to the same side in politics as the gentlemen composing the late Government. Then there were the Pilot Commissioners, dismissed for no other reason whatever. Then there was the Collector of Customs at the port of Pictou, one of the best officers in the Dominion, a gentleman who discharged his duties most faithfully, and this gentleman was forced, against his will, to go on the superannuation list. He (Mr. Doull) intended to ask for the papers in the case, and they had appointed in his place an active partisan, a man who had written leading articles for the Opposition press in his (Mr. Doull's) county, a man who had no qualification at the time, though he might have qualified himself since for the position. He had been appointed because he was a supporter of that party. They had another gentleman who was lighthouse-keeper, who was just as able to discharge his duties to-day as when he was put on the superannuation list. And why? Because he had a son whom he wished to have put in his place. No doubt he had received that consideration for services rendered at elections.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: What is the name of the lighthouse-keeper?

MR. DOULL: Lowden. That was the way those gentlemen had carried out the British principle; and he thought, if they went to Nova Scotia, it could be shown conclusively that, if the American

system existed in this country, it had been introduced by the late Government. He agreed with his hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Brecken) in the wish that this Government would dismiss every man who took an active part in politics, and he trusted this discussion would lead to that result.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he was glad that this discussion had arisen, as it enabled him to bring to the notice of the House what had taken place in his constituency during the late election. But, before doing so, he would say he did not agree with those gentlemen who thought it desirable that the American system should be introduced in this country—he entirely deprecated such an idea; but he did believe that, when it was found that an employé of the Government took an active part in elections, he should be dismissed from office. In fact, he thought a civil servant ought not to exercise the franchise. He knew gentlemen in the city of Hamilton, who had been appointed to office by the hon. gentlemen opposite, who took a most active part in the late election there. They had been warned, and told that they held their situations in their hands, but they snapped their fingers in the faces of the gentlemen who put them on their guard, and said: "We know what we are about. It may be that you will be successful in the city of Hamilton, although we do not believe you will; but, whether you are or not, we are satisfied that the Mackenzie Government will be retained in power, and we will be justified in all we do." He did not know why the Election Act should make it incompetent for a member of the Inland Revenue service to vote, and not operate similarly respecting other public officers. He thought it should be the same in regard to the whole Government service. He thought that, when a gentleman was appointed to a public office, it was understood, generally, to be the reward for the services of himself or his friends, on behalf of the party that put him in the position. When he had obtained his reward, he (Mr. Robertson) thought he should be encouraged, and, in fact, compelled to remain forever out of the political arena. He would be able to show, when the papers

MR. DOULL.

were brought down, that men who were actually prohibited by law from voting had voted at the late election, although a formal protest was entered at the time. He would not recommend the dismissal of a supporter of the late Government, merely because he had been a supporter of that Government, and was not in sympathy with the party to which he (Mr. Robertson) was proud to belong; but he thought that, when a man so far forgot himself as to act as a strong partisan, when he was receiving his bread and butter, so to speak, from the Dominion at large, he should be dismissed. He hoped the discussion would have the desired effect of preventing the interference of civil servants in politics in the future.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) had referred to his Department and to a Mr. Lowden. He might say, preliminarily, that throughout the whole of his public life he had been opposed to the establishment of the American system in Canada; but he was not prepared to say that any public official who used his influence in elections, and became an active partisan, ought not to be dismissed. But the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) was, he thought, entirely mistaken, and lacked information on the subject to which he referred, namely, the dismissal of Mr. Lowden. He (Mr. Doull) had anticipated his motion, and he would be glad if the Government would lay the papers on the subject before them. Mr. Lowden was appointed by the Government of Nova Scotia in 1839 as lighthouse-keeper at Pictou, where he continued until 1864. He was then dismissed for interference in an election; because he thought at that time the American system was to some extent in force in Nova Scotia. In 1868, Mr. Lowden was restored to his place by the then Government of the Dominion, and he was continued from 1868 to 1876. In 1873, however, in August he thought, there was a great storm during which he received very serious injuries, and an application was made to superannuate him. His application was referred to Mr. Johnson, the agent in Nova Scotia, who strongly recommended that Mr. Lowden should be superannuated. Mr. Johnson, speaking of his own

personal knowledge, said that this man was unfit for the position, and that he ran great risk if he was allowed to remain. The Superintendent of Lights also recommended that this gentleman should be superannuated, and he was superannuated accordingly. His term of actual service was thirty-two years, and for that period his pension was calculated. That was the whole story with regard to Mr. Lowden. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Doull) also referred to the pilotage authorities at Pictou. If he (Sir A. J. Smith) recollected aright, there was no pilotage authority established there under the Act of 1873. He thought the pilotage authority was in existence before Confederation, and continued thereafter under the Nova Scotia law. It was his impression that they organised pilotage authority under the Act of 1873. Of course they took the recommendation of the representatives in appointments to that commission. There was no remuneration for the services of the Commissioners. As regarded the Harbour Commission he had not the facts in his memory at the moment. He dared say that on enquiry there would be found some reason for the action adopted by his Department.

MR. DOULL said he wished to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman who had just sat down had given reasons for the superannuation of Mr. Lowden. He (Mr. Doull) had no doubt those reasons had been given to the Department, but all he could say from practical knowledge was that Mr. Lowden was to-day as able to discharge his duties as he was ten years ago. He had now moved on to the main land and was working a farm, which he (Mr. Doull) thought required just as much ability as to attend a lighthouse. Therefore, he thought that whatever reasons might have been given, they were not well founded. With respect to the Pilotage Commissioners, he would say that there were two of the three Commissioners, because they were political friends of his (Mr. Doull's), dismissed, and friends of the hon. gentleman (Sir A. J. Smith) appointed in their place.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I think it was under the old law.

MR. DOULL: No. So far as the Harbour Commissioners were concerned, two of them were dismissed, of course partisans of his (Mr. Doull's). His colleague and himself, when they were in Parliament before, had the commission appointed. Two of them were appointed from their side, and one from the other.

MR. CARRIER said he hoped that the doctrine, "To the victor belong the spoils," would prevail in this country just as long as Government officials interfered actively in elections. For his part he had suffered from such interference, and he could point to Government officials who had interfered actively in elections, and he was strongly of opinion those officials ought to be dismissed. These officials followed them around at their meetings, hooted and yelled in their faces, using insulting language, and still they were employed by the Government. He did not care to what party they belonged, it made no difference to him, but people who conducted themselves that way ought certainly to be dismissed summarily from the public service, and measures ought to be taken to prevent public officials acting in this obnoxious manner at elections.

MR. RYAN (Montreal West) said he did not desire to say anything regarding Mr. Régis Cardinal's efficiency as a public officer; he had nothing to say against him in that regard. It was, however, a notorious fact that Mr. Cardinal had not merely voted and used his political influence in the Jacques Cartier election, but he had been an active partisan in every election which had taken place, not only in the city of Montreal, but in every election which had taken place within two or three days' journey of that city. He was invariably employed by his particular friend the late Minister of Justice, for his special purposes. As regarded this particular charge, it had been established on evidence before the Montreal Courts. Mr. Cardinal never denied that he was the bearer of these documents. Mr. Cardinal went to interview Mr. Cook in reference to that, and the following day, knowing Mr. Cook was in the city of Montreal, he interviewed him in reference to exercising his influence and to employing him in the county of Jacques Cartier. Notwithstanding

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Carrier), he could not advocate that doctrine that to the "victor belong the spoils," and he would deeply regret if any such system were introduced in this country. But, while admitting that much, and he knew that there was great pressure brought to bear upon the Government, he was glad to see that the Government, one and all, were of the same opinion, unless an extraordinary case occurred, such as the case of the paymaster on the Lachine Canal. That the case had been proved was beyond all doubt. If it had not been sufficiently proved for his hon. friend the member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), if that gentleman had placed himself in communication with him (Mr. Ryan), he thought he had sufficient information in his possession to induce him (Mr. Huntington) to admit, in a moment, that the dismissal of Mr. Régis Cardinal from the position he held was perfectly justifiable under the circumstances. With reference to the general principle of the interference of civil servants in elections, he did not blame so much the officials. He blamed the gentlemen who lately occupied the Treasury benches here, and who were now on the Opposition side of this House. It was the natural result of the pressure brought to bear upon members of the Government, even by supporters of the Government themselves. That, he thought, was not creditable to them. He knew, in his individual case, in the city of Montreal, that men whom he had been instrumental in placing in positions, not only voted against him, but canvassed against him. But they had acted in that manner, not for any reason against him (Mr. Ryan), but because such pressure had been brought to bear upon them that they had either to do so, or take the consequence of dismissal from office. It was discreditable to any Government to exercise that power. They might follow this matter a little further. They had been taunted by the statement that they were about to introduce the pernicious American system. He desired to say a few words about the dismissal of the Harbour Commission. They succeeded in inducing Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George E. Cartier, the then leaders of the Government, to bring

about a change in the constitution of the board which would deprive the Government of the power of appointing the majority of the board. The nomination of the majority was made elective. After three years' labour, they got the Government to consent that the majority of that body should be elected, two by the Board of Trade, one by the Corn Exchange, one representing the shipping interest, and one elected by the corporation of the city, making five elected by the various interests of the city, and four elected by the Government. Immediately after the change of Government took place, the late Government had not been in power two months when the Commissioners nominated by the former Government were dismissed. They also deprived the Board of Trade of their power of electing two Commissioners, and increased the number of Government nominees to five, and reduced the elective members to four. That was what members of the Opposition called a spirit of liberality. Gentlemen who claimed to be of the Liberal party, should, in carrying out their principles, give as much power as possible to the people, instead of which they had deprived the people of their powers, and centered it in their own hands. Then, in regard to the appointment of official assignees, the Government took away the power of appointing official assignees from the Boards of Trade, and took it into their own hands, with a view of giving the patronage to their political friends. He simply referred, in passing, to these changes, which, it would be admitted, were not in a proper direction. He now came to a matter which was personal to himself. In his canvass in the city of Montreal, in the late contest, he told civil servants, holding office, that he knew what they had done in the past, and he was prepared to condone it; also, that they might vote against him, and that they might exercise the influence they possessed, in a private and legitimate way; but that, if they neglected their public duty, slandered the party with which he was identified, and slandered himself, he would, if his party were successful, say they must be prepared for the consequences. These men who had been active in the election had not been dismissed. Some of them,

he knew, were instrumental in getting up an organisation for the purpose of disturbing public meetings, and of causing disturbances which jeopardised the lives of those attending the meetings. Whatever party might be in power, he believed there might be exceptional cases of this kind, where an example ought to be made.

MR. CURRIER said that he did not think he had said anything that would lead the House to believe that he subscribed at large to the doctrine of "to the victor belong the spoils." What he did say was that he hoped the doctrine would prevail, so far as the interference of Government officers was concerned in the elections. For his part, he had not the slightest objection in the world to every Government official giving his vote and expressing his views privately and in a decent way. He thought Government officials should refrain from taking an active part in the elections, and this was the only way in which he subscribed to that doctrine.

MR. SHAW said he was very much pleased this discussion had taken the course it had, because it would, perhaps, lead them to avoid the introduction of the American system into this country. If it were well known throughout the country that persons in office would not be permitted to interfere in politics, then they would not require to introduce the American system here. But, if it were understood that parties holding office might go from place to place and meeting to meeting, and canvass in favour of Government candidates, then they would soon have the American system. He desired to refer to what had occurred in his own county. In his riding, the postmaster of an incorporated village was president of the Reform Association. The official assignee of the county was secretary of the Reform Association. A postmaster in another village, a former president of that association, assisted at the public meetings. The Inspector of Weights and Measures for that county travelled from one end of the county to the other doing political work. In fact, the whole of the postmasters were banded together, and went by the name of the Postmasters' Association. Now that, surely, was very inde-

cent, and ought not to be tolerated. He had not asked for the dismissal of these men. He had only asked for the dismissal of one postmaster, who was also poll clerk, and he asked for his dismissal because he was guilty of interfering with the ballot-box itself. That gentleman thought it was necessary that he should attend a neighbouring polling place, and he left his own ballot-box in the custody of his wife. He travelled some five or six miles in order to vote, his own polling booth being closed for about an hour till he returned. The Inspector of Weights and Measures, when told that he would be reported, replied that there was no fear, as his friends would be returned to power. He (Mr. Shaw) hoped there would be an investigation into that gentleman's accounts, because he feared from the sum indicated in the Public Accounts, that they required investigation. What he objected to was the open interference of public officials in the elections, and he thought it would be well, if it was perfectly understood, that, if public servants interfered actively in politics, they should be dismissed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the postmaster you refer to still president of the Reform Association?

MR. SHAW said he was not. There was a petition filed charging him (Mr. Shaw) with bribery and corruption, and asking to disqualify him. These gentlemen went through the polling divisions collecting money with which to conduct the proceedings. When they found that they could obtain no evidence against him, the postmaster, who was president, resigned his position in the association. The secretary, who was the official assignee, also resigned, and they published a notice that they had no evidence against him. These gentlemen were very willing to advocate the principle of non-interference in elections, when they found their friends were no longer in office.

MR. FORTIN said he concurred with the gentlemen who had agreed that the British system ought to be followed in this country, and that the Civil Service ought, in a certain way, to occupy a neutral ground, and should not meddle in politics. Everyone knew that the system which prevailed in England, as well

as in other European countries, as regarded the Civil Service, was, to the greatest extent, the basis of their success in war, and progress in peace. The political heads of the different Departments had the direction of the general policy both at home and abroad, and they directed it, but the service really did the work; and in the Civil Service they included Ambassadors and Consuls. He (Mr. Fortin) had been a civil servant for sixteen years. He commanded an expedition for the protection of the fisheries in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and no doubt he could have exerted a good deal of influence in those ports, but he had never meddled in politics, although he had his own opinion, and never interfered in the elections; and his masters—that was, the Conservative Government—never allowed him to do so. It showed that true principles in regard to the Civil Service reigned then in this country. Five years ago, however, another reign was inaugurated. He left the service voluntarily, and became a public man. A man who, before 1867, was a most inveterate Reformer, succeeded in passing himself off as a Conservative, and getting appointed to the situation which he (Mr. Fortin) had left. The moment the Liberals got into power, he turned his coat back again, and became a most violent partisan, his field of operations being the coasts of the Gulf of St. Lawrence; and everyone could conceive how a man that commanded a Government steamer, the duty of which was to cruise constantly along the coasts, and who had the power to spend large sums of money; who had from twenty-five to thirty mariners in his vessel,—could exercise a good deal of influence over the populations inhabiting the coasts. This man was particularly active against him (Mr. Fortin) in his election. The people of the county of Gaspé were not going to contest his election. The person in command of this vessel, in violation of his duty, left the North Shore, and come hurriedly into the Bay of Gaspé, and, going to his friends on the Liberal side, said: "I am going to contest Mr. Fortin's election." They said, in reply: "No, we have no money, and not much chance." The commander, however, insisted upon the election being contested. He went

about and collected a sum of money for the purpose. He got his vessel under way, and he then proceeded to Percé Bay, where he collected more money for contesting his (Mr. Fortin's) election. From that place they sent a message to Mr. Carlyle to get a petition against his return drawn, with which petition they arrived back at Percé on a Monday at ten o'clock in the morning, and at two o'clock the same day, the time during which this election petition could be presented was lapsing; but for the employment of the Government steamer, it was physically impossible to collect the money, and get the petition drawn in time, thus proving that, if this Government officer had not interfered and used the Government vessel, and burned the Government coal for this purpose, his election would not have been contested. This House was aware how unfortunate he had been in this contest. His first lawyer took sick on the coast of Gaspé, and died there in a couple of days; the second one met with an accident, and he had to go on with his case without the aid of counsel, as he could not get a chance to get another, and he had to give up the case. He had the names of a great many other officials who had canvassed day and night against him. He mentioned the name of this one because he was known all over the Province of Quebec, and he mentioned it to show the disastrous consequences that might ensue, if they did not put a system strictly in operation by which officials would be prevented leaving their duties to go canvassing, and using the facilities in their power to compass their ends. The steamer this official used was the celebrated *Glendon*. She did not go fast, but she went fast enough that time.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Slow but sure.

MR. FORTIN said that, although the commander of the *Glendon*, and afterwards of the *Lady Head* had done all this, he (Mr. Fortin) had never complained. He was in favour of maintaining the British system, and was opposed to the introduction of the American system. He did not want mob rule. He wanted the authority to come from

above, and the Civil Service to be respectable and not meddle in elections.

MR. SNOWBALL said he had the honour to represent a county which was one of the largest in area of any in the Dominion, and which was swarming with officials from one end to the other. His experience had been similar to that related here by other hon. members, except that it happened to come from the other side of the House. Taking the whole of the officials of his county, not one Grit could be found among them. How that had occurred he need not inform the House. It had turned out that even the officials appointed during the late Administration had used their utmost influence against him during the past election. He ran twice for the county as an independent candidate, and each time almost the whole official staff, from those who earned \$10 to those who received \$2,000 per year, had, on every opportunity, used their influence against him. Several of them had followed him from place to place where he had occasion to address his constituents, and had disturbed the meetings. He did not blame the Government so much in these matters as had been done by others, as these things were largely governed by the representatives of the different constituencies. The whole thing in his county had been in the hands of its late representatives, who had all the offices filled as they were to-day; and the late Government had not made a single change, with but one exception, where an official was removed for just cause, not a political one. There were numbers of officials who had been appointed simply to vote and use their influence at elections. There were men who held office for the past twelve years who performed no duties, never did and never would act, but had been given offices for the reasons he had named.

MR. HADDOW asked if the hon. member stated that all the officials, from those who received \$10 to those who received \$2,000, took an active part in the late election against him.

MR. SNOWBALL said he did not wish to be understood that all the officials of his county had made violent opposition to him, though he believed they had

voted against him. The higher officials were, in most instances, men of respectability and standing in the community, whom he had no desire to misrepresent. Those of whom he had chiefly complained were persons holding petty offices of from \$10 to \$400 a year, and who had been appointed solely for political reasons.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time :—

Bill (No. 52) Respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Act of incorporation of the Confederation Life Association.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

PUBLIC BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time :—

Bill (No. 28) To amend an Act intituled: "An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway," passed in the 39th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Act for the repression of betting and pool-selling.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 31) To amend and consolidate the Acts respecting duties imposed on bills of exchange and promissory notes.—(Mr. Baby.)

Bill (No. 54) To amend an Act respecting police in Canada.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES PREVENTION BILL.—[BILL 37.]

(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for second reading discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

House adjourned at

Thirty minutes past

Eight o'clock.

MR. SNOWBALL.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 20th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

EXTENSION OF TIME.

MR. ROBINSON moved that the time for receiving petitions for, and the presenting of, Private Bills be extended for ten days respectively. He stated that this was the last request the Committee would feel justified in making in that direction.

MR. MILLS: Why is it extended now?

MR. ROBINSON: At the request of members of Parliament who attended the Committee, and made the request, to which the Committee unanimously consented.

MR. HOLTON said these requests would always be yielded to until they came to the stern determination not to extend the time at all, which was the intention when the Rules were revised two or three years ago.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bill were severally introduced, and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company. — (Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 57) To make further provision in relation to Statutory holidays.—(Mr. Domville.)

READJUSTMENT OF QUEBEC JUDGES' SALARIES.

QUESTION.

MR. BAKER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in view of the fact established by official returns, that the burden of judicial work borne by the Judges of Montreal is proportionately heavier than that of the Judges residing in other districts, to readjust the salaries of the Judges of the Province of Quebec; or whether the salaries of the

Judges in the said Province are to be increased during the present Session of Parliament.

MR. TUPPER: In the absence of the hon. the Minister of Justice, I beg to say it is not the intention of the Government to readjust the salaries of Judges during the present Session.

DISMISSAL OF CAPTAIN OF THE
"RIMOUSKI."
QUESTION.

MR. Fiset enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, on the opening of navigation, to continue to employ Captain Pierre Lavoie as captain of the steamboat *Rimouski*; if not, the reasons which have necessitated his removal.

MR. TUPPER: Instructions have been given to notify Captain Lavoie that it is not the intention of the Government to employ him, in consequence of his persistently disobeying the orders of the Department.

DEEPENING OF L'ASSOMPTION RIVER.
QUESTION.

MR. HURTEAU enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry on the deepening of the River L'Assomption, begun in 1861.

MR. TUPPER: The Government, at present, have the subject under their consideration, and are not aware whether it will be in their power at the present time to proceed with that work.

DISMISSALS AT GROSSE ISLE.
QUESTION.

MR. LANDRY enquired, The reasons for the dismissals of Mr. Edouard Jolicœur dit LaChaine, an employé of fifteen years' standing at Grosse Isle; also for the dismissal of Mr. Benjamin Hurst from the position held by him for a number of years at Grosse Isle.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): Mr. Jolicœur was superannuated, not dismissed, because the staff was much larger than was required. Eight or ten

others have been dismissed with the understanding that, when their services would be required, they would be re-engaged.

DISMISSAL OF RÉGIS CARDINAL.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Huntington's proposed motion for papers relating to the dismissal of Régis Cardinal, heretofore an employé of the Inland Revenue Department.

MR. VALLÉE said that he was greatly surprised to see that the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) dared to raise a discussion in this House upon the dismissal of public officials. If there was a member who had not the right to invoke principles in order to blame the conduct of others, it was certainly the member for Shefford. But, since the debate had taken so wide a range that the question of patronage was now in order, he would profit by this occasion to make known his views upon this important subject. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had said that it was the Conservative party that had wished to introduce the American system into the Civil Service of Canada. He would state that, if this system had been introduced into the Province of Quebec, it was by the Liberal Government, that had obliged public employés to cast their votes against their convictions, and coerced those who asked for employment on public works into making a declaration that they had belonged to the Liberal party. Orders had been sent to the city of Quebec, from the very highest authority, to oblige the Customs officials to vote for the candidates who supported the Ministry of the day. In the district of Quebec, Federal employés had been seen to leave their work in order to go canvassing, for several days, in favour of Government candidates, and, after having done so, they had been seen presenting letters to Government officers, setting forth the services they had rendered, in order to get their pay. If ever there had been a shameful use of official influence in an election, it was in the city of Quebec during the late elections. The members of the late Administration could not say that this statement was injurious,

for the late Minister of Inland Revenue had spent a fortnight in the city of Quebec electioneering. All the canvassers, all those engaged in electioneering, met in his office to organise their measures. With respect to public works what had been seen? A certain number of persons employed on these works had been actively engaged in elections. Their day's wages had been paid them, but not for laying stone, their time being spent in working for the Liberal candidate. If the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) wished to deny that, he was ready to prove it. On that occasion, men had been paid by the day to canvass the electors, and not to do the work that they ought to have done. That was the system that had been inaugurated by the Mackenzie Government. He believed that an enquiry was now being made in one of the Departments, which would show that one of the head officers of the Liberal Government had said, in his office, to the employés under him: "Gentlemen, if, to-day, you do not vote as you should, to-morrow you will all be dismissed." That was what an officer of the Liberal Government had said on the morning of the 17th September. And this party now complained because an employé who had badly conducted himself had been dismissed. The Liberal party wished to invoke principles that they had always denied, that they had trampled underfoot, but this party had always shown themselves tyrannical towards their opponents, and they had not the right to invoke principles now in order to prevent the Government from doing justice to those of their friends to whom justice was due. He would, perhaps, be considered too severe, but he merely related facts that were known to everyone. These were public facts that required no proof. It was not necessary to prove that such and such an employé had not performed his duty, that others had spent their time canvassing in the public offices, for these facts were too notorious. As to these officials, no inquiry was needed. It was a sound principle to say that, as a general rule, a public officer should not be dismissed without an enquiry, but there were exceptions to this rule, and there were cases so grave that an enquiry was not necessary. He did not desire to prevent

public officers from voting according to their principles, nor from expressing their opinions in a suitable manner, but he protested against a public official's declaring himself an ardent partisan in the contest, making himself the champion, the fighter, the bully of a party,—that was what he protested against, and he believed that in all such cases the Government should act without fear, and do justice to their friends. There were men who had been the victims of the Liberal party for the last five years, who had been dismissed without cause whatever, through political hatred, because they were favourable to a man opposed to the Liberal party. Public employés had been seen, who, after having faithfully served the public for many years, had been dismissed, because their sons were valiant champions of the Conservative party. In such cases it was the duty of the Government towards those who had borne the brunt of the battle, who had endured the hatred, the persecution of the Liberal party, to do them justice, and to replace them in the positions they had so unjustly been deprived of. As a general rule, he did not desire the dismissal of public officials without an enquiry, but there were exceptions. Those who had come forward in the contest, who had organised rows, who had acted as bullies, those should be dismissed without enquiry, because, in such cases, there was no need of enquiry, the fact being public and known to everyone. It was a bounden duty that the Government owed to their friends to do them justice. Those who were now in power, thanks to the efforts, to the sacrifices of all kinds, to the devotedness of their friends, would do wrong, he thought, to allow themselves to be intimidated by the complaints of the Liberals. There were complaints better founded than these, the complaints of those who had been persecuted by the Mackenzie Administration. Let the Government do justice to their friends; the voice of gratitude would drown the recriminations of their opponents. The other day the House had declared, by a majority of 85, that a Federal officer was worthy of blame; the Government could no longer ignore this expression of opinion, and should give effect to this censure by forthwith dismissing this officer. He

trusted the Government would listen to the voice of their friends, for this voice was public opinion.

MR. Fiset said his intention had been to refrain from speaking on the question now before the House; but, after listening to the remarks, to say the least of it, imprudent, made by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée), and the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works on the subject of the dismissal of Captain Pierre Lavoie, he deemed it his duty, not merely to say a few words, but to protest most strongly, on his own behalf and on behalf of the independent electors of the county of Rimouski, against the unheard-of tyranny exercised towards public officials in their district. He had characterised as imprudent the expressions used by the hon. member who had just spoken in connection with public servants interfering in politics. How could he complain of their doing so, when he himself was indebted to them for his introduction to the county of Rimouski? Had he forgotten that, in the local election last spring, it was Mr. Heppel, an officer of the Customs,—appointed to that position by the late Administration, on his (Mr. Fiset's) recommendation, with a yearly salary of \$200—who introduced him to the people of the county, who carried on the contest for him, acted as one of his agents, and, in short, secured him an equality of votes with Mr. Chauveau? Had he forgotten that the fishery overseers, Messrs. Martin and Grondin, both of them officers of the Dominion Government, also worked for him, and went so far as to represent him at the poll? Was he not well aware that many of the leading officials of the Intercolonial Railway, in the county of Rimouski, gave him their support? And, after all this, the hon. member (Mr. Vallée) complained of public servants interfering in politics. He might, with all justice, have said that the hon. gentleman was the last man who should make such a complaint. He had stated further, that, after the elections, certain employés of the Intercolonial Railway were dismissed. If that were the case, they were not dismissed for having taken part in the elections, nor was he aware that one single public ser-

vant in the county of Rimouski, under the control of the Dominion Government, lost his position by reason of his having supported the hon. member for Portneuf.

MR. VALLÉE: Mr. Heppel was dismissed two weeks after the election.

MR. Fiset said the hon. gentleman was mistaken, Mr. Heppel was not dismissed; he never asked for his dismissal, and he was still an officer of the Customs, drawing his pay from the Government, with the prospect of still higher pay for his services to the hon. the Postmaster-General in the late contest,—services rendered while he was still an officer of the Government. Not only did Mr. Heppel meddle in politics in a most improper manner, during the local elections; but, in the last general elections, he did for the hon. the Postmaster-General what he had done for Mr. Vallée in April last,—he canvassed for him, made speeches in his favour, and was, in fact, one of the election agents of the hon. the Postmaster-General. But this was not all. Hon. gentlemen would be much mistaken if they fancied that but one public servant in the county of Rimouski promoted the interests of the hon. the Postmaster-General during the late contest. He made good use of all who declared themselves in his favour. He (Mr. Fiset) could mention as his agents or canvassers the same fishery overseers who had previously manifested their zeal during the election of the member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée); also, many of the leading officials of the Intercolonial Railway, who resided in the county of Rimouski. He might enumerate the host of postmasters also who made themselves the political slaves of the hon. gentleman. But he desired to be understood; if he alluded now to these public servants who laboured to overthrow the Government from whom they received their daily bread, it was simply in order to meet the reproaches of their opponents, who, now that they were in power, would fain persuade this House and the country that their worst enemies at the last election were the public employés; and this with the view, doubtless, of mantling the base vengeance now being exercised against them, and of furnishing a pretext for dismissals. The county of Rimouski was the place where

that vengeance was allowed full swing, for it was there he (Mr. Fiset) defeated a Minister of the Crown. And what mercy was to be hoped for in behalf of the independent electors of that great county, after voting for him, and thereby inflicting on the hon. the Postmaster-General a defeat so humiliating? Hence it was that dismissals were the order of the day. They had just heard the hon. the Minister of Public Works declare to this House that Captain Pierre Lavoie, of the steamer *Rimouski* was dismissed because he persistently disobeyed the orders of the Government. Now, the whole time Captain Lavoie had charge of that steamer, he received no orders from anyone but Mr. Brydges, and he held in his hand documents showing, not only the high capacity of Captain Lavoie, but also the fact that, up to the 15th of February last, he gave perfect satisfaction to his employers. He read letters from Mr. Brydges, the British mail conductors, the Customs officers, the Mayor of Rimouski, and others, in reference to Captain Lavoie's ability to discharge his duties. These documents, he contended, showed, first, that Captain Lavoie always obeyed the orders of the Government, since he received those orders only from Mr. Brydges, who, on the 15th of February last, declared that that officer always faithfully discharged his duty; secondly, his excellent conduct on board the steamer was proved by the British mail conductors, and Mr. Gauvreau, three gentlemen whose high respectability could not be questioned; thirdly, his skill and ability were also proved by the mail boat pilots, and they all knew that the Allan Company employed none but pilots of good repute in every respect. In spite of all this, Captain Lavoie was dismissed without any enquiry, and without being afforded any opportunity of defending or justifying himself, and hon. gentlemen had, in truth, a good reason for dismissing him without an enquiry. They knew full well that, if an enquiry had taken place, they could prove nothing whatever against Captain Lavoie, and the injustice of the act would have been made manifest. But that was not all. They would see the Government pushing still further their party vengeance. As the House was aware, he had been so

MR. FISET.

unfortunate as to displease one of the Ministers of the Crown, by inflicting on him a defeat which, he must admit, did not add to his renown. Having succeeded in finding a refuge somewhere or other, he was now availing himself of his position to punish those persons in Rimouski who were within reach of his arm. The hon. gentleman began, in the first place, by taking away from those who did not support him the mail contracts, which were under the control of the Post Office Department, and which the Postmaster-General could cancel at his pleasure. He would mention the case of Mr. Joseph Danjou, of St. Fabien, not the least interesting case of the kind. At the beginning of the Session, he had questioned the Government as to the reasons which had induced them to deprive Mr. Danjou of the contract for carrying the mail between the railway station and the post-office of St. Fabien. The hon. the Postmaster-General made answer, with a degree of courtesy for which he had not been prepared to give him credit: "That it was understood that the contract should terminate whenever we thought proper. Thus, on the 17th December, Mr. Danjou received notice that a contract on which he received \$135 was to be taken away from him and given to another for \$100, a saving of \$35. That was the only reason for the change." The House appeared to be satisfied with the explanation, and rightly so, inasmuch as the change had been made with a view to economy. Let them now see whether the facts corroborated that statement, and whether the change was really made with a view to economy. Mr. Danjou had carried the mail from the railway station to the post-office of the parish of St. Fabien for the sum of \$135 a year, since 1872. At first he was practically only a sub-contractor, as the contract for the mail between River du Loup and Rimouski had been awarded to Mr. Worthington, while that portion of the Intercolonial Railway was as yet unfinished. In 1874, the Government confirmed the contract with Mr. Danjou on the same terms he had from Mr. Worthington. Now, on the 17th December last, Mr. Danjou was notified that his contract would terminate on the 31st of the same month, and at the same date the Government awarded the

contract to Mr. O. Desjardins, not for the sum of \$100, but for the price of \$125 per year. The pretended saving was, therefore, reduced to the sum of \$10 in place of \$35, as stated by the hon. the Postmaster-General. At the same time that the contract was taken away from Mr. Danjou, the postmaster of St. Fabien was notified that he must remove his office to the vicinity of the church, thus shortening the distance for the new contractor by some twelve arpents. Thus the distance was reduced by some twelve arpents for each trip, and yet they economised by taking off only \$10 from the new contractor. The Government, when notifying Mr. Danjou, had forgotten that he was entitled to a month's notice under the terms of his contract, and he availed himself of that provision, and wrote to the Postmaster-General the following letter :

"ST. FABIEN, 23 Dec., 1878.

"Sir,—In a letter of the 17th inst., W. Sheppard, Post Office Inspector, informs me that my contract for carrying the mails from St. Fabien Station to the post-office of that parish will expire on the 31st instant.

"I beg to point out that, under the terms of my last contract, dated the 15th October, 1874, I am entitled to receive a month's notice before the expiration of my contract, which I have not received.

"In the second place, as I take it for granted that it is through economy your Department is acting in this manner, I wish to do my share in so laudable a course. I, therefore, beg to say that I will undertake to carry the mail, as I have hitherto done, for the sum of seventy-five dollars (\$75) per year, as the post-office is to be more central.

"It may, perhaps, be said that my offer comes somewhat late. I may be permitted, however, to point out that neither the Liberals nor the Conservatives ever afforded me an opportunity to diminish the amount, inasmuch as I always accept what was offered to me.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your most humble servant,

"JOS. DANJOU.

"HON. H. LANGEVIN,

"P. M. G.

"Ottawa."

It appeared, then, that Mr. Danjou offered to perform the contract, not for the sum of \$125, not for \$100, but for \$75 per year. The Government were obliged to grant the first claim of Mr. Danjou, that was to say, his contract was continued up to the 1st February, 1879; but, although he offered to carry it out for the future for \$75 per year, the latter offer

was not entertained, and the contract was given to Mr. Desjardins—this time, not for \$125 but for \$100, leaving still a difference of \$25 between Mr. Danjou's offer and the price given to Mr. Desjardins. Another resident of St. Fabien, Mr. Théophile Lebel, also tendered for the same contract for the sum of \$75. The offer received no more attention than that of Mr. Danjou. In the face of these facts, the hon. the Postmaster-General told this House that it was purely with a view to economy that he took away the contract from Mr. Danjou, and awarded it in the first place at \$125, and then at \$100, when he saw that two residents of St. Fabien—both of them responsible parties—offered to perform the same service for \$75. In order to prove that the first contract awarded to Mr. Desjardins was for \$125, he produced the declaration of Mr. Joseph Danjou. If the hon. gentleman had no other object in view than to effect a saving, as he pretended, why did he not call for tenders? He could tell him that, instead of one hundred dollars now paid by the Department for the mail contract in the parish of St. Fabien, he would not have to pay more than fifty dollars, for he would have found, without any difficulty, parties who would have tendered and performed the service for that sum. The same thing happened as regarded the transport of the St. Simon mail. The contract was taken away from Mr. Mag. Danjou and given to Mr. Bernier, who got the mail carried by another party for some 35 or 40 per cent. less than the Department paid him. In this instance, also, if economy were the object in view, why did they not ask for tenders? But economy was not the motive of the hon. gentleman in the changes made as to these contracts; he was instigated by a far different motive. The Messrs. Danjou had their own views in political matters, and were not afraid to express those views and support them in season, and, inasmuch as those views were not exactly in accordance with the opinions of the hon. gentleman, the exponents of those views must be punished. The great county of Rimouski manifested its independence at the last elections, and now all those who did not share the views of the hon. the Postmaster-General, were everywhere paying the penalty.

And yet, after the remarks made by that hon. gentleman on the hustings, those public servants who did not venture to vote for him (Mr. Fiset) had reason to hope, at least, for just treatment, for the hon. gentleman almost invariably wound up his speeches by saying: "Let those who are opposed to me not be afraid. I shall respect their rights. I will do them justice;" and it was probably because they put faith in the magnanimous professions he used without stint, that some few of them ventured to record their votes in his (Mr. Fiset's) favour. They must now understand the true value of the magnanimous professions he made to them, for, in the county of Rimouski, any public officer who was suspected of not having supported the views of the hon. Minister must expect to be subjected to an enquiry, and, in fact, to be relieved of his duties. This had just been exemplified on the Intercolonial Railway, in the county of Rimouski and in Temiscouata. Moreover, the party who had been employed to conduct these enquiries was a man who did not understand a word of French. And in what manner had these enquiries been conducted? Telegrams were sent beforehand into nearly every parish, to the leading supporters of the hon. the Postmaster-General, requesting them to attend at such-and-such a station in order to summon before their judge all unfortunate public servants who might have shown the slightest Liberal tendencies. The first victim was the station-master at St. Simon, Mr. Bouchard. His great crime was the fact that he was a nephew of the Messrs. Danjou, and his case was soon disposed of by dismissal. Mr. Proulx, the Station-master at St. Fabien, was the next to undergo the ordeal. Judgment had not as yet been rendered. This occurred everywhere. Some of the parties had received their sentence, and others were awaiting it. The postmasters, of course, had not been forgotten. Five or six of them had already been put to the ordeal. But there was one case still pending, which was more interesting than the others—the case of Mr. Alp. Couillard, postmaster of Rimouski. It derived its special interest from the fact that Mr. Couillard's father, who had been postmaster of

Mr. Fiset.

the same parish for many years, was dismissed by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Langevin), when he was Acting Postmaster-General, during the absence of the Hon. Mr. Campbell, who was then Postmaster-General. Mr. Couillard, senior, was dismissed without any reason. At all events, his books were found to be perfectly correct, and the Department never had occasion to charge him with any defalcation; but he was so unfortunate as to have incurred the displeasure of some member of the hon. gentleman's family, and it was decreed, as they knew, that no man should, with impunity, lay an irreverent hand on the ark. He was dismissed. Who succeeded him? Mr. George St. Pierre, in the first place, and then Mr. Dion; and these men, after filling the office of postmaster of Rimouski for some three years, or three years and a half, left the Government in the lurch, with a deficiency of over \$15,000. Such were the men appointed by the hon. member for Three Rivers as postmasters of Rimouski, as successors to Mr. J. T. Couillard. This was economy as the hon. the Postmaster-General understood it. Mr. Alp. Couillard succeeded Mr. Dion, and was appointed postmaster of Rimouski by the late Administration. Since he had held the position, he had succeeded in giving perfect satisfaction to the Government and to the citizens of Rimouski; and no later than last year the Post Office Inspector, Mr. Sheppard, told him (Mr. Fiset) that the office was one of the best managed post-offices below Quebec. There had never been a single complaint against him;—he was wrong; since the present Government came into power complaints had been lodged against Mr. Couillard, by envious persons who wanted to take his place. He had just gone through the ordeal of an enquiry, and there were, at this moment, in Ottawa, in fact they might see wandering through the lobbies of this House, persons from Rimouski who were craving and begging for the dismissal of Mr. Couillard, in order that they themselves might be appointed in his stead. Would the hon. member for Three Rivers give way to their solicitations? Would he enact over again, in the case of the son, the injustice formerly committed towards the father? This he

could not say. However that might be, this House would know, the country would know, the base vengeance, the tyranny exercised against the independent men who had supported him in his contest.

Mr. CARON said that the recriminations which had provoked the present discussion were quite of a nature to astonish somewhat those who had followed the course of political events for the last few years. The motion of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had come opportunely, so as to allow the members of the House to bring forward before the House and before the country, the cases of dismissal which had taken place in the various counties, in which the liberality of the Liberal party had made itself felt when they were in power. It appeared strange to him to hear the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) speaking in that way, belonging, as he did, to a party, one of whose organs proclaimed the doctrine that, when the Liberal party came into power, the Conservatives ought to give up to it the various public offices,—to give way from top to bottom. It was easy, on looking over the list of public officers who had been discharged from the various Departments, to see that the indignation of the hon. member was only a superficial one. In the county of Quebec, as well as in the other counties around Quebec, had been seen cases where public employes, appointed by the Liberal Government, and receiving from the public an annual salary, left their offices, put to one side their employment in order to run over those counties, carrying out an electoral campaign in favour of their friends who were in power. There were many other members who had expressed the opinion, which he had himself expressed, namely, that the Civil Service ought not to be subjected to change for political reasons; he thought that, in the public interest, it was important that the Civil Service should not be at the mercy of any one party whatsoever, and that the public employes should not lose their situations in consequence of changes in the Administration. But, if this principle held good for one party it should be recognised by the other, and it seemed to him

that that party which made most use of an abuse of power, in order to gain an electoral victory, ought not to come to-day before the House and complain of the results of such a line of policy. He could mention that, in the county of Quebec, there was a case where an officer of Customs (Mr. O'Brien), receiving a high salary, left day after day his official employment in order to be present at all the meetings which took place in the county; who made himself one of the chiefs of the clique, in fact the principal leader. He could not blame them for the sympathies which they possessed for their political friends; but, when the country paid a salary to one of its servants, it had a right to expect from him, that he should remain in his office in order to carry out his duties, instead of neglecting them in order to take an active part in politics; otherwise it would be impossible to understand how he could render those services to the country for which he had received a salary. That was not all that could be said when speaking of dismissals. In the county of Bonaventure, for example, even among the employes of that Department over which at that time presided the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington); who had spoken with so much eloquence of the disadvantages which would result by changing public employes solely on account of their political opinions, some had been dismissed by him. In the same Department might be found the case of an employe who, without enquiry, who without having any previous warning given to him, had been deprived of his position as postmaster. He spoke of Philippe Loisel, postmaster at Paspébiac. At Quebec, it would be found that Mr. Jacob Lapage, Government architect, without any investigation, without having reasons for his dismissal given to him, had been similarly laid on the shelf. Further, they saw Michel Reynard, who was foreman of works at Grosse Isle, dismissed in the same way; they saw Mr. Cyr, postmaster of Maria, dismissed without enquiry, and replaced by an unlicensed tavern-keeper. In face of these facts, which could not be gainsaid, he found it strange that the hon. member should be raised to such a pitch of warmth in opposing the system, which they asserted

had been carried out in the case of Mr. Cardinal. But, besides these dismissals, all from Quebec, he knew of a case of abuse of power still more grave, and occurring under the Liberal régime. They were constructing their important public works, and they had required from the workmen, who endeavoured to earn their bread by working on them, that they should procure tickets establishing the fact that they were Liberals, and without these certificates it was impossible for them to obtain employment on these works. It appeared to him that, in the face of these facts, it came with a bad grace from those hon. members, to say that the system which they had carried out on so large a scale when they were in power, was a system which the Conservative party was desirous of inaugurating, since they occupied his side of the House. He thought, as the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée) had said, that cases might present themselves in which the facts were so notorious, in which the conduct of the employés was so well known to the public, that it became the duty of the Government to replace them without investigation. He would mention again the case of Mr. Vallée, postmaster at St. Thomas, who was unjustly dismissed; as well as that of Mr. Jolicœur, postmaster at Crane Island, dismissed without investigation; and it seemed curious to him that all these dismissals, or nearly all, took place without preliminary enquiry, and almost all of them occurred in the Department of the hon. member for Shefford—the former Postmaster-General—who had risen to-day to protest so forcibly against the system which he himself had been the first to apply. Not only was it necessary for those who were employed in the public works in the city of Quebec to produce certificates establishing their political creed, but they were, besides, obliged to become the tools which were made use of during the last Dominion elections, in order to cause the Liberal party to triumph in Quebec. These were they who were found at the head of those organised bands who overran the various counties. Without doubt, when they took out their certificates, it was made an indispensable condition that they should be found at their posts on the day of election, in order that they might be able

to assist those who went forth to fight on the side of the Liberal party. The hon. member for Rimouski had spoken at length about Captain Lavoie. Well, he believed that it is universally admitted that the Liberal party had never had a more zealous and more devoted supporter than Captain Lavoie. He did not consider the being a supporter of the Liberal party a crime on his part, he had fairly the right to be so. But, when Captain Lavoie abandoned his post on board his steamboat, in order to be able to go and vote in the county of Rimouski—exposing, in this way, his vessel to the danger consequent on being left without a commander—doing this in order to give his support to his friends, this appeared to be fairly one of those cases which should properly be treated with severity, by no matter what party coming into power, which had really the public interest at heart. And more than once did Captain Lavoie find himself under the necessity of abandoning his steamboat, in order to be able to render service to his political friends. A lengthy enquiry had been held upon his conduct, and even his friends, who happened to be on the Board of Trade at that time, declared that his conduct had not been such as ought to have been expected from a man having such a responsible charge. If they would, as a party, avoid the errors into which the Liberal party fell, by acting, as it did towards the Civil Service, he believed that they would render an important service to the country and to their party, and they would hinder the introduction of the American system, which they were desirous of introducing—if the statements of the hon. members on the other side of the House were to be believed. He believed that the complaints made by the hon. members on the other side of the House could not be made against the Conservative party, but, on the contrary, were complaints which could be fairly brought against themselves, by reason of the cases which he had brought forward, of employés dismissed without any investigation, and without having an opportunity of explaining their conduct; these cases would always remain to show that the Liberal party, when it was in power, had adopted quite a different line of conduct to what it advocated to-day in Opposition.

MR. LARUE said that the hon. member for the county of Quebec (Mr. Caron) complained bitterly of the conduct of the Liberal party, who, according to him, conducted themselves in a cruel manner towards the Conservative party, and the public employes belonging to that party, when the Liberal party were in power. He regretted having to state that the hon. member had not always been exact in what he said. For example, he stated that, when the Liberal party were in power, they required from the workmen at Quebec, as a condition, *sine quâ non* for their employment on the public works, that they should present certificates establishing the fact of their being Liberals. He (Mr. LaRue) had his domicile in the city of Quebec, and could state, from his own knowledge, that a great number of the men who worked for this Department were Conservatives. The workmen in sympathy with the Liberal cause in the city of Quebec complained, and demanded that justice should be done them by the leaders of the party, in whose favour they had always worked and voted. The actual case was this: In order to render justice to the Lower Canadian contingent, and also to the defunct Ministry, he ought to state that workmen belonging to both parties were employed without any distinction. Of that, if need were, proof might be given, if time were allowed to publish the names of those who obtained employment under the Liberal rule. There was no occasion for making so much noise, no occasion to stir up prejudices, when the truth was that the Ministers representing the Province of Quebec under the late Government, very far from being unjust to the Conservative workmen did not always render justice, he did not hesitate to say, to the Liberal workmen. They were, nevertheless, strictly just, as the workmen, Liberals in politics, when there was work to be given them, had their legitimate share. The hon. member for the county of Portneuf (Mr. Vallée) would agree with him, he had no doubt, that, when one party had an opportunity to favour their friends, without being unjust to their adversaries, gratitude and decency would compel them to do so; the Conservative party had never been reproached on account of rendering jus-

tice to their friends, but it was only right that the Liberal party might be allowed to do as much. The hon. member for the county of Quebec had mentioned the dismissal of Mr. Vallée, of St. Thomas. He thought that, in the interest of the cause which he defended, he did wrong in bringing to light this history; he very well knew that an elaborate enquiry had been made into the conduct of the postmaster of St. Thomas, and that it had been made in the most impartial and strict manner; that he had only been dismissed after serious charges had been proved against him. He did not wish to enter into details, for personal reasons, and from a delicacy for one who was listening to him that very moment, but, if ever justice was rendered to a public employé, he could assure the House that it was certainly so in the case of the postmaster of St. Thomas. When he (Mr. LaRue) had the honour to be beaten by Mr. Speaker in the county of Bellechasse four years ago, he had ascertained that the postmasters of the county were good Conservatives. All of these were very zealous in working against him, day and night. However, he had never been heard to ask the Liberal Government to dismiss any of these employes. No, it was known to all that not a single postmaster had been dismissed for political reasons within the county of Bellechasse. And now that the Conservative party had come into power, and that they were dismissing the public employes right and left, employes whose sympathies were with the Liberal party, he found this to be a course of conduct pre-eminently unjust. A postmaster was not remunerated to such an extent by the Government that they should prevent him from displaying his political opinions; his position was not, in other respects, that of any other employé in the Civil Service. As to what related to Captain Lavoie, the hon. member for Quebec stated that he abandoned his vessel, in this way exposing it to danger. The hon. member knew full well that Captain Lavoie had a pilot on board his vessel, and that in consequence he could absent himself without exposing the vessel to danger. When such serious questions were raised, questions of such serious importance as this one, only in

order to find an opportunity of making a hullabaloo over his name, and to render it odious to the country, in opposition to the adverse party, serious reflection should be engaged in, for one was exposed to the danger of seeing the arms which should be employed to attack and overthrow the enemy turned against one's own breast.

MR. VALIN said he could relate many instances in which public officials had actively interested themselves in elections. In the county of Montmorency many clerks in the Custom-house had canvassed the electors against him, and he had demanded an investigation into their conduct, not because they were Liberal in politics, but because they had exceeded their duty by their interference in the elections. The late Ministers had availed themselves, without scruple, of the services of public officials, to advance their private and political ends. On different occasions, the late Minister of Inland Revenue had taken a number of the water police force down to the Island of Orleans for his special benefit, thus leaving the shipping unprotected for a certain time, as far as these men's services were concerned. The same hon. gentleman had also used the Custom-house of Quebec as a place of meeting during his elections. In the engaging of men to repair the walls of Quebec, the late Government discriminated politically. No one could obtain work without producing a note from the Liberal representative of his section. He (Mr. Valin) hoped a new policy would be inaugurated in this respect.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he wished to reply to statements made in regard to indiscriminate dismissals of officials by the late Government. So far as the Post Office Department was concerned, no one was dismissed from it for his political opinions. He defied any hon. gentleman to show a single case in which a single dismissal was made from the Post Office Department, during his term of office, for other than good cause, entirely independent of political opinions. Those young members who came here with those absurd charges, should know that both sides of the House, in the Administration of the Post Office Department had taken ground for years that no post-

MR. LARUE.

master should be dismissed, except for cause utterly apart from political bias, and never for a political offence, and he had always acted on this principle.

MR. ROBITAILLE said he was not a young member, nor a very young man, and, as the hon. member for Shefford had challenged anyone to say that he had dismissed any postmaster without cause during his administration, he felt bound to state a few cases in his own county. The postmaster of the township of Nouvelle was sent adrift, and another man appointed in his place, on the understanding that he would work for the Liberal party at the next elections. In the township of Maria the post-office was in the vicinity of the church. The postmaster, Salomon Cyr, a respectable and efficient man, was sent adrift; the post-office removed to a place nearly a mile from the church, and put in the hands of a man who kept a tavern without lice. se. At Paspébiac, Philip Loisel, who had performed his duties to the satisfaction of everyone, was summarily dismissed, not for cause, but because he had interfered in the local election in favour of the Conservative candidate, and a representative of strong partisans was appointed in his place. These were facts, for the truth of which he vouched here on his honour, and, if the hon. gentleman doubted them, let him call for the papers.

MR. HUNTINGTON said of course he accepted the assertion of the hon. gentleman, but there was not a word of truth in what had been represented to the hon. gentleman. He dared the hon. gentleman to move for a Committee of Investigation.

MR. ROBITAILLE: I take note of the words of the hon. gentleman, and, if it comes to that, we shall examine those cases.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Go on, you are in the majority now.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) said he could not agree with hon. gentlemen who had expressed their surprise at the speech which the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) delivered to-day. That gentleman did not now preach what he had practised the last four years.

British justice and fair play were not in him, notwithstanding his professions now. He (Mr. McDonald) had correspondence relating to a dismissal which was made in the county he had the honour to represent, which showed how incorrect the ex-Postmaster-General was. The letter was as follows :—

"I have been superseded in the way office very suddenly, and without warning. Will you be pleased to favour me with the cause of my dismissal. If there were complaints against me, it would be right I should know them, in order that, if innocent, I might have an opportunity of answering them."

To this letter, the following answer was sent :—

"I am desired by the Postmaster-General to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st inst., and, in reply, beg to inform you that it was found expedient in the interests of the public service to supersede you in the charge of the way office in the county of Cape Breton."

This case did not bear out the statement of the hon. gentleman yesterday, that he had always shown British fair play and justice, and had never dismissed an officer without giving him an opportunity to defend himself. He could relate another case of a similar character. The contractor for carrying the mails from Sydney to Cow Bay was dismissed, and the contract was awarded to another, without tenders having been called for, and by private arrangement.

MR. HUNTINGTON : The particular dates.

MR. McDONALD : They are found in the papers brought down last Session.

MR. HUNTINGTON : Why did you not call attention to them then ?

MR. McDONALD said he had done so, and attention was called to the matter in the Senate, and the hon. gentleman was never able to justify the dismissal, and, in consequence of the enquiry, the private arrangements made with the contractor were cancelled. The hon. gentleman said the present Government was introducing the American system of dismissals. He, and the Government of which he was a member, were the last men who should say so. What did they do? The first act of the late Government, on com-

ing into power, was to dismiss officials wholesale. In his county they had dismissed five pilot commissioners and five shipping masters; postmaster, collector of customs, lighthouse keeper, preventive officer, etc., and, in this connection, he was surprised that the hon. member for Westmoreland should have denied that he ever dismissed any man for political reasons.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH : I would have the hon. gentleman to point out where there are five shipping masters in his county.

MR. McDONALD said he had the names here. They were : Captain Murdoch McGregor, of the port of North Sydney; Captain Brookman, of the port of Sydney; R. McDonald, of Lingan; Captain McNeil, of Glace Bay; Jos. McPherson, of Cow Bay; and the hon. gentleman immediately appointed others in their places.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH : Were these appointments not made during the last hours of the late Government, in 1873?

MR. McDONALD said it did not matter when they were appointed. They were appointed to fill vacancies which then existed under the law. They were dismissed by the hon. gentleman shortly after he came into power, and one of them was re-appointed because he had voted for the Ministerial candidate at that election. Another was offered his appointment again by the hon. gentleman who ran in behalf of the Government, provided he would vote for him, but he refused to do so. In addition, the gentleman whom the late Government re-appointed, they again dismissed a second time, and, no doubt, for his politics. The late Minister of Customs acted in the same way, dismissing a Custom-house officer in the county of Cape Breton without giving any reason for it. He (Mr. McDonald) agreed with the view expressed yesterday by the hon. members for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) and West Elgin (Mr. Casey), in regard to the impropriety of public officials taking active part in elections, and the justice of dismissing those who did so. This view had been expressed in this House during the past four

years. The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw) had said yesterday that this discussion would result in a great deal of good, and would prevent Dominion officers from actively interfering in elections. If the hon. member had been in the House last year, he would have known that this question had been then discussed thoroughly, and that the late member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) had stated that, while the present law gave the members of the Civil Service the franchise, the Government would not prevent them from voting, but that any public servant who went further than that deserved censure or dismissal. He said dismissal. In the face of that opinion expressed by the leading man of the Reform party in this country (Mr. Blake), and by several hon. gentlemen on the same side, as was known by the Dominion officials throughout the country, he thought that, if Ministers did not make an example of some of those officials who took an active part in the elections, they would hurt their party. Offending officials had nothing to fear from the party in power, while, if the opposite party succeeded, they had everything to expect for their services to it. This state of things should not be allowed, and an example should be made of the leaders of these officials. In his (Mr. McDonald's) county, the only opposition he had was from Dominion officials: the postmaster of Sydney and the port physician were members of a political society, of which another public officer was president, whose object was to defeat him at the last election. The unanimous request of the people of Cape Breton county, therefore, was the dismissal of those officials, not because they took an active part against the Conservative candidate, but against the people. They wished to interfere with the rights and liberties of the people as far as they could. In the discussions on this question during the last four years, the Conservative party took the ground that those dismissals of 1873 were improper and unjust, and that the dismissed officers should be restored on the return of their party to power. Members of that party would be very much disappointed if it did not do justice to its friends unjustifiably dismissed in that year. If it did not restore them, he was afraid

MR. McDONALD.

the country would lose a large portion of that confidence in it, given on the 17th September last.

MR. HUNTINGTON said it was manifestly impossible for him to know all the cases mentioned, and answer every member who mentioned a grievance.

MR. RYKERT rose to a point of order; the hon. gentleman had spoken six times on this question.

MR. TUPPER: I hope my hon. friend will not object to his present remarks.

MR. HUNTINGTON said that, however anxious some hon. gentlemen opposite might be to silence him, he should not submit to it. This cry was that he had dismissed from his Department officials for political reasons, and it had elicited much approval from the Ministerial side, particularly from the Minister of Justice; but he would tell the Minister of Public Works, who, last year, objected to a Committee of Enquiry, because he could not get a majority of his political friends on it, that he (Mr. Huntington) had never dismissed anybody, nor exercised patronage, for political objects. He dared any hon. gentleman opposite, to move for a Committee, and try to disprove his assertion. He did not know every little school-house or post-office in the country, but he did know the principles on which he acted, and the present Postmaster-General knew as well as he did that no such offences as stated had been committed while he was at the head of that Department. If he knew differently, he ought to proclaim the fact, and brand him (Mr. Huntington) with the deserved ignominy. Let this great Conservative party, which was going to regenerate the public service, exhibit their bravery and boldness, by moving for a Committee, and giving their friends an opportunity of establishing their charges. He was prepared, at any moment, to prove they were false.

MR. FARROW said he was astonished to hear the ex-Postmaster-General call for a Committee, when they remembered that, on a certain occasion of the appointment of a Committee of Enquiry, he would not appear before it; he could not be

found. He (Mr. Farrow) would be glad of such a Committee on the present occasion, as he could bring three cases in point before it. They were the dismissals from the Nile, Carlow, and Porter Hill post-offices. These were not idle tales, as he could show before a Committee, which would, if named, probably find the ex-Postmaster-General in the United States, as before, when wanted. He (Mr. Farrow) would be glad to see law forbidding the interference of postmasters in Dominion elections. In Ontario to-day they would find a host of postmasters interfering in the local elections. If postmasters would not submit to such a prohibition, plenty of others could be found to take their places.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said it was very easy for hon. members to rise and attack the late management of the Departments, particularly that of the Marine and Fisheries, when there were hundreds of transactions without an ex-Minister being able to remember and reply with respect to each. The hon. gentleman opposite, who had attacked his management for the dismissal of five shipping masters, could not well justify the appointment of some five for one county in the last hours of the administration of the Government of that party, in 1873. That number was a public inconvenience.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton): The hon. gentleman appointed five himself immediately afterwards.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. Those appointments, made when the Government was expiring, fell under the Order in Council of the late Government, cancelling a great many of them. If they were appointed, were there five in that county now?

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton): There are six.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said the hon. gentleman must mean the appointment of shipping officers, of whom none was appointed if not really necessary. By the law, Custom-house officers had the power of shipping-masters. It was much more convenient, as a rule, to have

the one officer discharge both sets of duties. No appointments of such officers were made except in exceptional cases.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) said he was right, and would give the names of the gentlemen dismissed, and those of their successors. In the first place, Captain McGregor, of North Sydney, was dismissed and replaced by Mr. Corbett. In the next place, Captain Brookman, of Sydney, was dismissed and replaced by Mr. William Oliver. In the next place, Mr. R. Macdonald, of Lingan, was dismissed and replaced by Mr. Rouch. In the next place, Captain McNeil, of Little Glace, was dismissed but reappointed, and dismissed a second time, when some one else took his place. Then Mr. Joseph McPherson, at Cow Bay, was dismissed, and R. McKenzie took his place. That made five. Then W. H. McAlpine was appointed to Louisbourg, which made six.

MR. COSTIGAN said he had found that, with the late Government, the ruling principle was, not only, to the victors belong the spoils, but to give them to the defeated as well, when it suited their circumstances. He had learned of postmasters all through his county being threatened with immediate dismissal if they voted for him, their places to be filled with his opponents. He found that one canvasser had gone to one of his friends and said he could save him from dismissal if he would authorise that canvasser to write to the late Government, that he was supporting Dr. Bernier, his (Mr. Costigan's) opponent. He was told that that was the only way he could save his office. He did not complain of this, but that the canvasser should have been authorised to act as he had done by a letter from a Minister of the Crown, in another Chamber. He did not blame the ex-Postmaster-General particularly for this conduct, but Ministers were in a general way responsible for each other's acts. The Minister of Agriculture had written that letter of warning to officials, and in reference to their voting for the Conservative candidate, and which promised the situations to Dr. Bernier's supporters; whether he was elected or not, he was to have the patronage of the county in any event. He (Mr. Costigan) did not, therefore, think it consis-

tent in hon. gentlemen opposite, to make such a noise about the dismissal of some of their friends for good cause.

MR. BERGIN said that this debate had taken a much wider range than he imagined had been anticipated by the mover of this resolution, and that gentleman must have forgotten, when bewailing the sad fate of that poor innocent and martyr, Régis Cardinal, that he was singing the requiem of the last remaining plank of the Liberal party, and the only one to which it adhered rigidly while in office. He did not intend to bring before the House any case of dismissal, for political reasons, in the constituency he represented, by either the present or the late Postmaster-General, or by any member of the late Government; but he did intend to call the attention of the House, and of the country, to the disgraceful manner in which the late Government interfered in the three elections in his constituency since 1874. They had it on record, as one of the Cardinal principles of the Liberal party, that no public servant should interfere in elections. He had before him the resolution moved by the hon. member for Lambton, in 1873. It was a resolution for which he voted, and it was a resolution enunciating the principle of the Liberal party, and which went the length, not only of condemning the interference of small postmasters and other petty officials, but which denounced all manner of interference in elections on the part of Ministers of the Crown. Mr. Mackenzie moved, seconded by Mr. Holton:

"That it is highly criminal in any Minister or Ministers, or other servants under the Crown, directly or indirectly, to use the powers of office in the election of representatives to serve in Parliament; and an attempt at such influence will, at all times, be resented by this House as aimed at its own dignity, honour and independence."

He thought there was not a man in the Dominion who did not approve of the principle enunciated in this resolution. He did not think there was any honest man, who had heard the debate on the question proposed by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), but must condemn every member of the late Government as recreant to his principles, and as dishonest to his professions of political purity. At the time the hon.

MR. COSTIGAN.

member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) undertook to elevate the standard of political purity by dissolving Parliament and calling for a new election, he wrote to his friends throughout the country to the effect that he regretted that he had not been able to advise them sooner as to the dissolution, but that, as an honest man, he felt that he ought not to give them any advantage over his opponents, or to put it in the power of the Conservatives to say that he had taken them more by surprise than he had his friends; therefore, he had put them on the same footing with the Conservative party. He received a letter from the hon. gentleman to the same effect, but by the same train which bore his letter came the Postmaster-General to call together the friends of the Liberal party for the purpose of selecting another candidate in his place. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) followed that letter up with another, in which he stated that he regretted very much that an Opposition candidate had been brought out against him (Mr. Bergin). He omitted to state that the hon. member for Lambton, in his first letter, said he was sure there would be no opposition to him (Mr. Bergin). He would not characterise this conduct by the words which could only be properly applied to the conduct of the then Premier. He thought, however, he could appeal to every fair-minded man in the Dominion to say that such conduct could not be condemned in words too harsh. In that letter the hon. gentleman promised him all the support which the Government could legitimately give; but how was that support afforded? Every official in his constituency worked against him, and those who were not prohibited from voting, voted against him. Every civil servant in Ottawa who had a vote in his county, except the Sergeant-at-Arms, went down to Cornwall and voted against him. Promises of office and emolument were made wholesale. He rose for the purpose of saying that he fully approved of the principle enunciated in the resolution he had read. He hoped the Government of the day would not be deterred by any language that came from the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), the Bombastes Furioso of the Liberal party, from executing

strict justice upon those gentlemen who had interfered in the late elections. He believed, with the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), that when a man accepted a situation under Government he did so with a full knowledge that it was his duty to give up his franchise.

MR. CASEY: I did not say his franchise. I only questioned his right of active interference.

MR. BERGIN said he would ask if it was right for a man drawing \$1,200 or \$1,500 from the country to go around amongst labourers, and mechanics, and those who could be influenced, asking them to vote for the candidate of the Government, at the same time telling them that, unless they voted for such candidate, they could not hope to receive any further favour from the Government. He was rather amused at the indignation displayed by the hon. member for Westmoreland, when challenged by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDonald) in regard to the dismissals made in his constituency. He was also much amused at the manner in which the hon. gentleman denied that he had replaced these officials. He was very much amused, in view of the past conduct of the Government, to hear the hon. gentleman get up in his place and say that he highly approved of the dismissal from office of anyone interfering in elections. This appeared to him to be a sort of deathbed repentance. Why did the hon. gentleman not square his practice with his precept, at the time he held the office of Minister of Marine and Fisheries? Why did the late Government not act upon that principle when they were in office, instead of telling them, as the member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) and the hon. member for Shefford had that day, that they highly approved of dismissing from office anyone interfering actively in the elections? Had not this Régis Cardinal interfered actively in the elections? Was it not proved by Mr. Cook, than whom there was not a more respectable man in this county, that he not only solicited his support in favour of Mr. Laflamme, then a member of the Government, but that he went further, and insinuated that his (Mr. Cook's) position as a contractor would be improved if he gave

his support to that gentleman? He paid very little heed to the argument of the hon. member for Shefford, when he said that, because the Supreme Court had refused to disqualify Mr. Laflamme, it therefore refused to believe Mr. Cook. A case was once tried before Mr. Justice Hagarty, at the Assizes at Cornwall, in which a man was accused of stealing a web of cloth. He was acquitted, and, in discharging him, the Judge said: "You have been acquitted by a most intelligent jury of your countrymen. They have rendered a verdict of not guilty, and I warn you not to do it again." That was about the verdict of the Supreme Court. They did not condemn Mr. Laflamme by disqualification, because he supposed they acted upon the principle, that to err was human, and to forgive, divine. He would not detain the House longer by calling attention to further interference in his own and neighbouring counties, during the late election, by Government officials. But he must ask the Government to carry out the principle of the Reform party, as contained in this resolution of Mr. Mackenzie, which he supported in 1873, and which the country would sustain. He was assured that the feeling in the country was, without exception, that it was highly criminal on the part of any Minister, or on the part of any public servant, to prostitute his power in influencing elections.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said he was sure it must be somewhat amusing, to those who had been watching the debates of Parliament for the last five years, to hear the speeches that hon. gentlemen opposite had made. He remembered, during the earlier part of the career of the late Government, the strong claims to public approbation which the then hon. leader of the Government made to the country and to the House for having dismissed a number of officials who had been appointed by the previous Government. Then he remembered that, in the late elections, the same hon. gentleman, in one of the western counties, expressed his great regret that he had been so lenient with civil servants who had been opposed to him politically, and promised that he would take care to be less lenient in the future. It was a re-

markable fact that this particular case illustrated how insincere hon. gentlemen opposite were. What were the facts of this case? This man, Régis Cardinal, owed his appointment, as a public officer, to the dismissal, for political reasons, of another official. He was, first of all, appointed caretaker of the flour sheds at Montreal, and an old man was dismissed in the month of December, just as the long, cold winter of Montreal was coming on, in order to make a place for him. This place was provided for him as a reward for past services, and in order that he should have plenty of time for political influence in the future.

MR. HOLTON asked what was the name of the man who was discharged.

MR. WHITE said that the old man's name was Racine. Then, in order to provide him with a better position, one in which he would be able to devote more time to politics, he was appointed to a place on the Lachine Canal, *vice* Mr. Clark, who was removed, his only offence being that he was a Conservative. He was assured that there was no one in the city of Montreal acquainted with the facts of the case, who would say that the principle laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite in this debate had been violated by the dismissal of Régis Cardinal. This man exerted himself, and took an active part in the late elections. And he was foremost among the cabaleurs; among those who were parties to that system of personation which had brought so much disgrace upon the city. Considering the circumstances of the case, he thought they might as well dismiss this man from their attention, as an object unworthy of the slightest commiseration or consideration at their hands.

MR. HOUDE said that the hon. members on the left should begin to feel the inconvenience of having two weights and two measures, to establish principles in opposition, and to violate them when coming into power. The facts brought to the light of day by the discussion provoked by the proposition of the hon. member for Shefford, showed that they have no right to throw stones at the members on his side of the House, in the matter of intrigues and other unwarrantable acts which might have been prac-

tised in the elections by public employés. It was not his intention to prolong this debate, but he hoped that he would be allowed to remark that the reason alleged by the hon. member for Westmoreland, in order to justify certain dismissals, which the Cabinet of which he was a member had made at the end of 1873, and at the beginning of 1874, was no reason at all, and it was the conduct of this very Cabinet which furnished him with proof that this was the case. In fact, if, as the hon. member pretended, the Conservative Government had no right to make appointments to public offices when on the eve of resigning in 1873, and that the Government which succeeded it was justified in annulling these appointments, why did the Ministry, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, themselves make appointments after the elections on the 17th September last, on the eve of resigning after the shock of an astounding expression of non-confidence on the part of the country? Nevertheless, the present Government did not annul these appointments, or at least those that were required by the necessities of the public service, and they had done well in not imitating the example of their predecessors, an example to be condemned. He never paid any attention, during his election, to the public employés, nor to those who aspired to become such, and he would not occupy his time in this House with the object of complaining about their acts and conduct. The hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers) who represented a county next his own, had cogent reasons for complaining of certain employés in the Customs and Inland Revenue, at Three Rivers, for he suffered much from the means which they brought to bear against his election. For his own part he simply desired to profit by the great latitude allowed in this debate, in order to attempt to draw a useful lesson from the facts which had just been brought forward to the notice of the House, and of the country. This discussion had revealed a deplorable state of affairs, and it seemed to him that the duty was incumbent upon them to correct this condition of affairs, at least to as great an extent as possible. These abuses were certainly favoured by the system of appointments in use in this

MR. WHITE.

country. He regarded this question from a point of view distinct from all party feeling. In his humble opinion, so long as the Government were compelled to appoint to the Civil Service political supporters, they would inevitably have to experience and to regret abuses like those which had been exposed in the course of this debate. This system appeared to him to be a vicious one, for several reasons. In the first place, it compelled the Ministers to lose a considerable portion of their precious time, time which might be much more advantageously employed, so far as the country was concerned, than in deciding paltry questions about patronage. It would be preferable to place the Ministers in a position to apply themselves better to the great political problems, by freeing them from this employment, and by entrusting it to a Special Committee, as was the practice in England. It was found necessary in England to resort to an expedient like this; nevertheless, in this country, the population being generally less rich, the number of those who sought to live at the expense of the Government, was comparatively much greater; consequently, the need of such a reform was keenly felt. He stated that the present system was opposed to the independence both of Ministers and members. In more than one electoral division the respective forces of the political parties were almost equal; in these cases it was the public office seekers, very often a species of vampire, persons without convictions, changing their political complexion at each change or prospect of change in a Ministry, who hold, so to speak, the balance of power in their hands. Then how was it to be expected that a member, under such circumstances, could really be independent? It was very difficult. On the other hand, neither could a Minister be completely free to act for the best, when he was solicited and importuned by dozens of members to grant such or such an employment to their *protégés*. This was not all. By leaving the choice of public employes to be made directly by the Government, and by allowing the members to influence the choice, by this very course of action a much greater number of office seekers were enticed to put themselves forward. Serious inconveniences resulted from this; a considerable

loss of precious time, as respected the Ministers; a lessening in the independence of the members; too great a number of employes, and much incompetence; the service more badly performed, and a useless increase in expenditure. The result would be different if the aspirants to public employment were obliged to address themselves to an impartial commission from the Civil Service, who would examine their claims without regard to party politics, would assure themselves of their capacity, and would recommend to the Government the best qualified and the most deserving. For his part, he considered it unjust that personal or political friends should be rewarded out of the public Treasury. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. LaRue) expressed, a few moments ago, a contrary opinion, stating that a party in power should favour, before all, its own friends in the distribution of official patronage. He did not consider it a crime on his (Mr. LaRue's) part for holding this opinion, which, although he (Mr. Houde) considered it false, was held by many others on both sides. This he considered as one of the inconveniences inherent in the system which had always been in use in this country, rather than as the fault of the men who were subject to its influence. The Public Treasury was formed of contributions from the whole population, without distinction of party; consequently, the money which came from the whole society ought to be applied to the advantage of society in general, and not merely to that of a privileged class. He would cite an example in order that his idea might be more easily caught, and would remark that the money coming from the majority of the inhabitants of New Brunswick, who were found not to approve the policy of the present Government, and who had sent to this Parliament members the majority of whom were opposed to the Government, was employed in that Province in paying public employes, chosen exclusively out of the minority. Even when this exclusive choice was made out of the majority, he did not give his approval; it ought to be made from out of the whole population without distinction of party, and only according to the best qualifications. A person was no

less a citizen enjoying civil equality, though he should not belong to the party of the Government of the day. There might be certain employments to which it would be necessary to appoint particular friends of the Ministers, but there should be very few of them. Moreover, he would add, in a forcible manner, that public employes ought to be forbidden to meddle with politics. They should be the servants of the country, and not of any political party whatsoever. If they persisted in meddling with politics, let them give up the Civil Service. Public employes were required who were neutrals in politics. Mention had been made of the employes of the Provincial Government. They had nothing to do with them in this House. They ought not to mix Provincial politics with Federal politics, any more than with simple municipal matters; by mixing them, it would come to pass, in this country, as in the United States, that Federal politics would absorb Local politics, to the injury of the independence of the Provincial Governments, and contrary to the well-understood interests of the people. He occupied a novel standpoint, but he did it with a view of making use of this already sufficiently long discussion, taken up by more than one digression, to redress abuses which appeared to him to be more or less inevitable, no matter what Ministry might be in power,—although the preceding one seemed to have particularly encouraged these abuses,—so long as the present system of appointment to public offices remained unchanged. They enjoyed a system of government free and advantageous; he was as sincere and as devoted an adherent to it, as anyone could be; but it could lend itself, and in fact did lend itself, to some abuses. At the moment when these abuses were discovered, and their gravity ascertained, it was their duty to labour, in order to cause them to disappear. This was the object which had inspired the number of suggestions which he had taken the liberty of making. Adopted and put in practice, he thought that they would contribute greatly to prevent the repetition of occurrences to be regretted, similar to those which were brought to light in the course of this debate. If the appointments to the Civil Service ceased to

have a political character, the dismissals, when there were any, would likewise cease to have politics for their cause. Every Government would, in the end, find itself better, and the country would likewise.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said it was astonishing, after what had been represented by hon. gentlemen opposite, that any Conservatives had succeeded in obtaining seats in this House at all, in view of the great official influence that had been brought against them. It would appear, from the tenour of the discussion that had taken place, that no Conservative member had ever been assisted by public officials in any election which had taken place in the Dominion, but he believed differently. He thought it would be in the memory of everyone that the very same grievance had been brought up against Conservatives, after the election of 1872, as was now brought of against the late Government and their supporters. He knew that public officials had strongly and openly used their influence against Messrs. Jones and Power in the general election of 1872, in Halifax, and that prominent and well-known railway and Inland Revenue officials had worked against Liberal candidates at that time. He did not agree with some hon. members that "to the victor belong the spoils," and that certain members of the service should be dismissed; but, if such a policy were pursued, he hoped that hon. members of this House would have an opportunity of recommending the dismissal of certain Conservative officials; and he would, with pleasure, name several Conservative officials who had interfered in the recent elections against him, and whom he would like to see handed over to the tender mercies of their friends. Notwithstanding the influence used by members of the Civil Service against the Liberal party, in 1872, in Nova Scotia, the late Government refused to take any action against those officials, though several cases had come under their cognisance. The lesson to be learned from this discussion was that officials would always use their positions if the gentlemen on the Treasury benches allowed them to do so. They should profit by the parting advice of Lord Dufferin to

the people of Canada, and endeavour, by legislation or otherwise, to place the Civil Service of this Dominion upon a permanent footing, and removed from political influence.

MR. GRANDBOIS said there did not appear to exist two opinions in the House respecting the question raised in connection with the motion of the hon. member for Shefford. They were in accord in declaring that the Civil Service system ought to be maintained, and that they did not desire the system in vogue in the United States. But could they affirm that they were not proceeding towards the adoption of the American system? Could they declare that they would not soon come to it if they did not take care? If their adversaries had not been beaten on the 17th September last, they would have seen, perhaps, at that very hour the American system in force in Canada; they would have seen, perhaps, a practical application of the maxim of the Liberal party, that "to the victors belong the spoils." In fact, did not the position taken by the hon. member for Shefford, in the present debate, permit them to come to that conclusion? That gentleman, who was one of the eminent leaders of the Liberal party, had taken the opportunity of declaring before the House and the country that the Conservatives would inaugurate the system of dismissals for political reasons, and that, in consequence, upon them would fall the responsibility of introducing the American system in this country. After what had just been said about the intermeddling in the last contest of members of the Civil Service and other employés, either through disposition or inclination, or because the Government allowed or even required this intermeddling, one could imagine that it was high time to bring forward a remedy for this state of affairs. If they did not take positive steps to put an end to these abuses, it was certain that they would adopt, sooner or later, and very soon, perhaps, the system in force among their neighbours, with whom each new Administration changed the *personnel* of the Civil Service, in order to reward their political friends. The whole world agreed in acknowledging that it was a bad system. It had been

rightly said that England, and other European countries, owed, in part, their greatness to the perfection arrived at in their Civil Service. They had the same system here that they had in England; they had reason to be proud of their Civil Service, and they ought to desire to keep it intact. But to do this it was necessary to find a remedy for the defects pointed out in the course of this debate. He had, himself, no special plan to propose, owing to the uncertainty in which he was, as to whether it was good or not to allow employés to continue to meddle in any way with elections for the future. But he earnestly begged the Government to take the matter into consideration; he begged it, in the interests of the country, to labour earnestly to find a means for assuring the maintenance of their Civil Service system, and to make use of it without delay.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said that the assertion of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), that the elections in New Brunswick had been run on the principle that, "to the victor belong the spoils," was incorrect. There had been no instance of the working of any such principle, as far as the Liberal party was concerned, in the city of St. John, or in the Province of New Brunswick, as far as his knowledge went. At the meeting at which the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) delivered addresses at St. John, some officials in the Government service created disturbances, and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was, with great difficulty, able to finish his speech. That was a fact fully established, and which led to the remark made by the chairman referred to by the member for King's. He could state, positively, that neither himself nor his colleagues had interfered to obtain the influence of public officials, in the elections in New Brunswick. He was not aware of any official in St. John having been dismissed for voting for the present Government. When in power, he could safely say that no influence had been brought to bear on civil servants there by him (Mr. Burpee) to vote for their party.

MR. TILLEY : Hear, hear.

MR. BURPEE: The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." I assert positively that I did not interfere with the officials in St. John to induce them to vote for the Government. In regard to the reference made by the hon. member for Pictou respecting the dismissal of the officer at New Glasgow, it was a very small matter. The collections at that port at that time, 1874, were very small, and the salary attached to the position so small, that it was a matter of indifference to any person to occupy the position at the time, who would give his whole attention to it. However, since then the collections have gone on increasing—

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): That was the reason you dismissed him.

MR. BURPEE: I shall explain that in a moment. He (Mr. Burpee) was going to say that the collections had gone on increasing until, at the present time, they reached \$23,000 or \$25,000. The person who occupied the position of collector at that time was engaged in other business, which took a large part of his attention. That was reported by the Inspector, as well as some mismanagement of his office.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): No, it was not.

MR. BURPEE: I so understood it. He (Mr. Burpee) was spoken to by the Inspector, and, if he remembered aright, he thought it was referred to the Inspector to report the full particulars.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): No, it was not.

MR. BURPEE said the Inspector's report of the fact would be in the Department, and the hon. gentleman could refer to it.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. BURPEE said that his impression was that, among the reasons given for the change of collectors at New Glasgow, was one that the previous collector found his other business of more service to him than the office. The salary of his

successor at the time the change was made, was \$200 or \$250, for the reason he had before stated; it was increased from time to time as the collections of the port increased. He believed that the present salary attached to the collectorship at that place was not so large in proportion to that granted at other ports. The collections at New Glasgow were now much larger than at many other ports of the same size. The hon. gentleman from Pictou had stated that the collector at Pictou had been superannuated against his own wishes. He (Mr. Burpee) thought he was correct in saying that he had himself applied for superannuation. He was an officer of about twenty-six years' service, and was sixty-nine years of age at the time, and his application was granted. He sincerely believed that officers in Government employment should not meddle, in any way, in politics. As far as the city of St. John was concerned, he had not interfered with the officers. He had strictly adhered to the rule to allow Government officials to act as they pleased with regard to voting, and whenever any question was put to him by officials on the subject, he told them it was very unwise to meddle in politics in favour of any party, one way or the other.

MR. RICHEY said he had not intended to trouble the House with any observations but for the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Mr. Robertson), who appeared in the House less as the member for that county than as the representative of the defeated candidates for Halifax, and he thought it necessary to make one or two remarks in reference to the branch of the question that gentleman had brought before the House. He confessed there was to him something grotesque in the attitude and utterances of that hon. gentleman, when he stated he was surprised that any member of the Conservative party could find his way to this House in the face of the opposition of Government officials. Was the hon. member's recollection of events so short that, fresh from conflict with victory over a Minister of the Crown, he did not remember the triumph he, himself, had won in the face of official influence. If it were so limited, he

MR. BURPEE.

(Mr. Richey) thought it was but a poor guarantee of his (Mr. Robertson's) ability to carry his memory back to a period so remote as 1872, and, in fact, the statements made regarding the transactions of that period, he could not look upon as correct. Did not the hon. gentleman know that, whilst it was considered, when Confederation took place, that certain officials were entitled to vote—not to exert their influence as partisans, but to record their suffrages on behalf of the candidates of their choice—that the Liberal Government of the Province of Nova Scotia passed an Act, explaining the Act previously on the Statute-book, and depriving them, not simply of the privilege of canvassing, or exerting their influence in favour of a particular party, but absolutely taking away from them the franchise to which they were otherwise entitled. There was no difference of opinion between members on one side of the House and the other in regard to the principle which should guide them in this matter, and he felt himself perfectly in accord with those gentlemen who had spoken on behalf of the Opposition in that respect. He did not, for a moment, call in question the right of an official to cast his vote; he did not even question his right to discuss, in his own private circle, after office hours, the merits of the respective candidates; but, when he went beyond that limit, when he not only became a member of a committee, but actually organised committees; when he spent his time in office hours, instead of attending to the duties of his office, in addressing meetings, and in denunciation of one party or another, then, he thought, the boundary had been passed when the patience of any Government should have exhausted itself, and the time had arrived when the Government of the day should interfere. And yet, gentlemen who had gone about addressing meetings where postmasters presided, with other public officials on their committees, desired particularly to disavow any recognition of such practices. That was the time for them to have expressed their disapproval of public officials mingling in public affairs. They were told—indeed, this whole discussion had arisen from the taunt thrown across the floor of the House—that the

American system was being introduced into the politics of this country. The system that had been introduced into the politics of this country was a system altogether unique; it was neither American nor British. It was designed that an official of the Government, in this country, should have all the benefits of the American system, and none of its perils; all the benefits of the British system, with none of its difficulties to encounter. In the United States, the officials, in time of elections, carried their offices in their hands; they knew the worst that could happen to them; they knew that, if the party they worked for were sustained, they would retain their positions, and that, otherwise, they would not. He who held office under the British system knew that, at the peril of his position, he must not interfere in politics. If this system were to be applied here in its integrity, it should be applied by dismissing all those gentlemen concerned in the transactions cited, and it would not then be carried one whit beyond what was acknowledged to be right by the members for Shefford, Elgin and St. John. He trusted that the Civil Service would be placed upon such a footing that no such question would have again to be brought before the House. He thought it necessary to say, whatever might be the view entertained by gentlemen on the other side of the House, and however carefully the Government of the day might desire to pursue the principles laid down, that he felt the people of this country would not allow the interference at public meetings of the subordinates or officials of the Government of the day. They were told that these gentlemen were all to be retained if they went no further than to support the Government under which they served. Was that reasonable or fair? If the privilege were to remain at all, why should a Government official not be allowed to support a member in opposition as well as a supporter of the Government? He belonged not to the Government alone, but to the whole of the country. He thought that, if officials so conducted themselves that any individual, however humble, was deterred from entering a public office by the fear of being dragged into a political discussion, and hearing his political friends vilified and abused, the Civil

Service ought to be put on a different basis from that in which it was at present. When he heard the hon. member for Shefford accusing the Government of introducing the American system, he felt that that was one of the most unfounded accusations that could be made. There were those who considered that some functionaries should have been dismissed without delay, men who had gone from polling place to polling place and abused the leaders of the Opposition of that day, who had, when cautioned against interfering to so great an extent, denounced members of the present Government, and sworn they would not serve under them, and who were left in positions of emolument. It was very hard upon those gentlemen who had fought the battles of the victorious party, to see these men continuing to hold places of profit and trust. From some expression he had used, it might be inferred that he favoured the dismissal of men from office. On the contrary, he desired to secure the permanency in office of civil servants. There had not yet been one dismissal from office upon the recommendation of the members for his county. The Government were asked by them to state the principle to be applied, and act on it. It was in the interests of the officials themselves, that they should pronounce either one way or the other to show to what extent they might indulge in political partisanship. Facts had been placed to-day before them, which could not be gainsaid, and which illustrated the position that, if officials were allowed to work for the Government, and were made to understand that they were subject to dismissal if they exercised their franchise against it, human nature was not so perfect but that those who were in a position to bring a pressure to bear would exercise it; and these men, often through weakness of disposition, contrary to their own consciences, would be led into acts of which they would not be guilty but for the prevalence of a mistaken policy which protected them against the consequences.

MR. MUTTART said that, judging from the debate which had taken place this evening, hon. members on both sides of the House were agreed as to the desirability of making the Civil Service

permanent. He was in favour of the British system; but, if this system was to be adopted in this country, let us have it in its integrity, and not after the manner which prevailed under the late Administration. His experience was similar to that of other hon. members who had spoken on the subject. During the late election in the county which he had the honour to represent, the Dominion officials were among the most bitter and unscrupulous opponents with whom he had to contend. They attended and took part in the meetings, and, in too many instances, distinguished themselves more by their uncontrolled party spirit than by civility or moderation. Out of regard to members of the Civil Service who were disposed to behave themselves as became their position, if from no other motive, the Government should dismiss all offenders, no matter what political party they belonged to. Holding to the rule that no official should be dismissed without cause, he maintained that, as violent political partisanship constituted cause, it was right and proper that partisan civil servants should be dismissed.

MR. HACKETT said, as a supporter of the Government, he thought the Government was adhering too strictly to the British system. It was only right that all officials of the Civil Service who had been guilty of incompetency, insubordination or political partisanship should be dismissed. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have the House believe that they, when in power, had adhered strictly to the British system. In Prince Edward Island they had, on assuming power, made a wholesale sweep of the officials there, and substituted men of their own, who, during the last campaign, had been most unscrupulous and violent in their opposition to the Conservative candidates. These officials were particularly active in promoting the interests of the Reform candidates. They were to be found in large numbers at all the public meetings, making political speeches, and endeavouring, by every means, fair or foul, to secure votes for his opponents. They were on the Reform canvassing committees, presided as chairmen at the political meetings, and even acted as agents for the Reform candidates at the polling booths on the

MR. RICHEY.

day of election. He was pleased to hear hon. gentlemen opposite say that, with the view of maintaining the efficiency of the service, all officials taking an active part in politics should be dismissed. His desire was to see the Civil Service rendered as efficient as possible, which could only be done by at once clearing out those individuals who, by their interference in politics, had rendered themselves obnoxious to the majority of the community. He trusted the Government would take up this matter and have a commission appointed before which evidence would be taken, and all those officials convicted of active partisanship, weeded out of the service. He could give an instance of official interference which was perfectly unwarranted. In a railway station on the Island, the station master made the waiting-room a circulating library for the Government campaign literature, and forced the pamphlets on all those who stopped at the station. It was high time that officials should be taught to respect their positions.

MR. TROW said that hon. gentlemen had all complaints to make, many, no doubt, imaginary. His was an exceptional case, having no grievances. He was not aware how the officials in his riding had voted, whether for or against him. They attended to their own duties, and did not interfere in the election. He deprecated the policy of any Government, in dismissing any efficient public officer, merely because he exercised the right of franchise. He questioned very much the propriety of public officials leaving their respective offices for days, and neglecting their duties in election contests, but they should be allowed to vote. In domestic life, there was usually one washing day in the week—some alleged the most uncomfortable day of the week. They had had two days in this House this week, and it was questionable whether they would not have another one. Five weeks had now elapsed with very little work done. It would be much better if hon. members would devote their time and attention to business of importance, and not waste the time of the House in discussing petty political disturbances that occurred in their election contests. It would be advisable for hon. gentlemen

to confine their remarks to the subject under discussion, and not travel outside the record. The motion related simply to the dismissal of Régis Cardinal, and they should not go beyond it.

MR. PERRAULT said that, since the motion now before the House gave members the opportunity of stating their grievances against the late Postmaster-General (Mr. Huntington), he thought that he should be allowed to add to the record of this gentleman, certain facts that would, once made, show that the hon. member would have done better not to enter upon the chapter of dismissals. But, in the first place, he would briefly answer the charge brought against Mr. Vallée, the former postmaster of Montmagny, by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. LaRue). This hon. member had merely made a vague and undefined charge; he had not laid before the House the facts elicited by the enquiry, but he had made known his own impression, and the conclusion he had come to after having read the evidence. If, however, this enquiry had proved anything, it was that a system of spying had been organised in order to take Mr. Vallée by surprise and find a pretext for dismissing him. If this enquiry had proved anything, it was that Mr. Vallée, who had been in the public service for upwards of 26 years, had become the victim of an odious persecution. After all kinds of charges had been brought against Mr. Vallée, and enquiries held, Mr. Griffin, the Deputy Postmaster-General, had come to the conclusion that the faults that Mr. Vallée was reproached with, were committed in all the post-offices, and were occasioned by the illiterate class, who generally addressed their letters very badly. This dismissal of the postmaster of Montmagny was one of the most tyrannical acts of which the Mackenzie Government had been guilty. It would be impossible to imagine to what a system of spying Mr. Vallée had been exposed during four years. The witnesses brought against him were utterly untrustworthy, two of them being jail birds. The population of St. Thomas had been so indignant at this high-handed proceeding that a protest had been signed by all the citizens, without distinction of political parties. The Hon. Mr. Four-

nier, who was personally acquainted with Mr. Vallée, had always refused to pay any attention to these grievances that were exaggerated by some fanatical and spiteful partisans. The Hon. Mr. Huntington had, himself, for a long time, hesitated to dismiss this old and faithful public servant. It was only after the electoral contest in Quebec East that the late Postmaster-General had yielded to the pressure brought to bear on him by the persecutors. It was to be hoped that the Government would lose no time in doing justice to Mr. Vallée, who had been dismissed on account of the services that his son, the hon. member for Portneuf, had rendered to the Conservative cause, and in order to take revenge upon him for his electoral contests. Nor was that the only unjust dismissal of which the hon. member for Shefford had been guilty. He had waxed very indignant over Cardinal's case; he had bitterly complained of the dismissal of this unworthy employé. This hon. gentleman had forgotten that it was he who had introduced the American system. In the county of Charlevoix, that he had the honour of representing, the hon. member for Shefford had been guilty of several unjust dismissals. To mention only one, he would recall the dismissal of Mr. Côté, postmaster at the Eboulements. The sham inquiry held against this gentleman had shown that his dismissal was groundless, and based upon the most trifling pretexts. The House would soon be cognisant of this fact. The true reason of this dismissal was that the hon. member wished to punish a man who did not share his political opinions, and place one of his friends. When he was Postmaster-General, not only had the hon. member for Shefford shown himself to be unjust and partisan in dismissing worthy officials, but he had also shown himself to be partial and reckless of the public interests in not dismissing unworthy officials. He had the proof of this in his own county. Two grave charges had been brought against a postmaster; declarations had been made, and unquestionable evidence adduced. What had been done? A sub-official had been sent to institute a sham enquiry against this postmaster, and he hastily came to the conclusion that there was nothing against

the postmaster. He had been an eyewitness to this enquiry; it was a comedy got up for the purpose of making people believe that the Department carefully watched over the postmasters. This postmaster had been maintained in his position, although he should have been dismissed. But the Department wished to favour and whitewash the postmaster because he had been a good Liberal. The hon. member for Shefford had then, as he always had, two weights and two measures. His ideas of justice were very muddled. It was not his intention to speak at any length on this subject. He had merely desired to show that the hon. member for Shefford had no reason to complain of a dismissal since he had, himself, dismissed employés without motive, and had neglected to do so when the public interest required it. He desired that faithful officials should be maintained, but he was in favour of dismissing those who did not do their duty.

MR. YEO said that, immediately previous to Prince Edward Island entering the Dominion, the present Minister of Public Works and Finance Minister paid the Island a visit. They were waited on by leading men of both local parties, and an understanding was come to that the Dominion patronage of the Province was to be equally divided between the Conservatives and Liberals. When the Island representatives met in Ottawa, in the fall of 1873, when the Conservative Government were about to resign, they found that this arrangement had not been carried out, but that all the appointments had been made from one side of politics—the Conservative side. The Reformers contended that they had not been dealt with in good faith, and held the Government to the original arrangement. Changes were made, yet after all the Reform party did not get all that had been promised them, or all that they were entitled to. On the eve of the late elections, several officials had spoken to him (Mr. Yeo), about taking a part in the canvass. He invariably advised them not to do so, and even not to vote. He was pretty sure of success, and he did not wish them to run any risks for him. He met the gentleman whose conduct the junior member for Prince county (Mr. Hackett) had condemned

so severely at a public meeting, and strongly advised him not to speak. He replied that he intended to address the meeting, and that he would not have his tongue tied for a paltry salary. In all probability, there would soon be a Local election, and he intended to resign at any rate to contest the district. The interference of that official did not injure the hon. member in any way, but rather operated in his favour, for there were parties present who kept on interrupting him, and would not allow him to be heard. It was somewhat ungrateful for the hon. member now to speak so harshly of that official, for, in a late Local election, he canvassed the district for him, and spent both time and money in trying to get him elected. At another meeting an official said a few words on the trade question, but took no further part in the canvass. Since then, he had resigned his office, and a Conservative had been appointed in his place, so he (Mr. Yeo) thought that the hon. gentleman had not much to complain of. The assistance of officials at elections, instead of benefitting him, had done him more harm than good, as people were apt to say that he was forced to enlist their support because he could get no other help. He was also surprised at what the member for Queen's had said about officials taking the stump against him. He (Mr. Yeo) had never heard of any official in his county addressing public meetings on behalf of the late Government. He would like to hear the names of the parties who had acted in the manner described by the hon. gentleman. Those who were making these complaints ought to call for an investigation of the charges against members of the Civil Service. It was very ungenerous in hon. gentlemen accusing men in the House of Commons who were not present to defend themselves. For his part, he had never complained of an official voting against him. He had met with considerable opposition from public servants, but had never thought of complaining to the House about so trifling a matter. After the election was over he had done what he could to advance the interests of deserving officials, without any regard to what party they belonged, or how they had voted, for he thought that every man, in office or out, had a perfect right to use his franchise as his conscience dictated.

MR. RYKERT said the House must feel very much indebted to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), for the kindly advice he had given them in reference to the manner of conducting the debate. They would, however, more appreciate his kindly intentions if he had given this friendly advice to the member for Shefford, who had behaved in so unbecoming a manner. The hon. member for Perth, in complaining of the length to which this debate had been extended, had been kind enough to inform the House that there was only one day in the week for washing; but he would remind that hon. gentleman that that entirely depended on the aptitude of the washerwoman for her work. She might prolong the work over two days; so, in this case, the old lady who had charge of this resolution had displayed very little aptitude for the business, and had thus prolonged the debate of which the member for Perth complained. He (Mr. Rykert) believed that the time had arrived when the House should consider the propriety of providing a strait-jacket for the member for Shefford, who had pursued an extraordinary course during the present and former debates in this House. By the kind forbearance of the hon. the Speaker, and the courtesy of hon. members of the House, he had spoken no less than six times on this question. It was to be hoped the hon. gentleman would not run away from the House after provoking a debate, as he had been in the habit of doing during these discussions, and as he was now preparing to do. He, probably, acted on the principle that

"He who fights and runs away,
Will live to fight another day."

He never heard any hon. gentleman in any Parliament use such language as that hon. member. He had again taken hon. members to task for their youth and inexperience. Now, he (Mr. Rykert) was an older member of Parliament than that hon. gentleman, and had hardly ever seen a House in which the young members displayed more ability than the present. Most of the members possessed characteristics—showed that they possessed characteristics—which the hon. member for Shefford did not possess, namely, those that made up the true gentleman. The member for

Shefford displayed a coolness in assertion, and recklessness in debate, not often witnessed, and had the faculty of stringing together words and epithets which were only fit for a circus. If these were the characteristics of a statesman, he possessed them in an eminent degree. He was certainly, *par excellence*, the statesman of the House. It ill-became him to declaim against any hon. members on the other side as regarded their tone and style of debate. He seemed to be boiling over with wrath because his party were defeated on the 17th September last. Surely he might take it as kindly as the members for Chateauguay and Lambton, who did not declaim in the same manner, but calmly accepted the situation. It was well known the Reform party had always laid down the rule that officials should not interfere in the elections. In their placard, issued a few years ago, they said :

“ Their interference will not be tolerated or forgotten. If there is one class of persons on whom total abstinence from active participation in elections should be absolutely enforced, it is the officials of the Government. The influence they wield is derived from a position held in trust for the whole country, and they are paid from a fund to which people of all parties contribute. Their interference is a gross breach of trust, and demands severe reprobation and punishment.”

This principle they recognised at one time while in Opposition, and boldly proclaimed the same throughout the country. After the elections of 1872, they moved the resolution referred to by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), which affirmed the same principle. He commended them for the first sacrifices that they made of offenders against that rule after they came into power. There was one gentleman who had taken a very active part against these gentlemen in a great many counties in the Province, and it was right and fitting that he should be made the first example. That person was the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). Within forty-eight hours of the time they accepted office, and long before they had time to warm their official seats, they dismissed him (Mr. Rykert) from the office of agent for the Minister of Justice in the county of Lincoln, no doubt for the share which he took in the elections.

MR. RYKERT.

He freely commended them for their judgment and decision; the offender richly deserved the condemnation. Their next executive action was not so deserving of the confidence and approbation of this House. They dismissed Mr. John B. Smith, by telegraph, and, to this hour, had not the manliness to place on record any charge against him. The hon. gentlemen opposite had not enforced the principle of non-interference of civil servants in elections, in the case of their own friends. But the matter had now assumed a serious aspect, and it was important for the Government to consider the placing upon the Statute-book of an Act against such interference of public servants in elections. That seemed to be the opinion of both parties in the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in office, had allowed Mr. McMahon, a political friend, to take part in the last election for Lincoln, in the interest of his defeated opponent. In that case, however, it was inconvenient to apply the rule. His (Mr. Rykert's) adversaries in the employ of the Government had, on that occasion, resorted to a most disreputable trick to encompass his defeat. They produced a letter from the Department, said to have been written by himself, and sent it to St. Catharines; but it proved to be a bold and reckless forgery, and operated in his favour. He had defeated his rival then, notwithstanding all the desperate efforts of the two Governments and their employés, as he always would in that county. They however, failed to take any action in his county against these officials, deeming it prudent to lay aside their principles when it applied to their own friends. The effect of this rascally and stupid trick had been to gain him (Mr. Rykert) a large number of votes which he would not otherwise have obtained. He did not wish the American system introduced into this country. He believed no official should be discharged for ordinary action, such as simple voting; but, when they abandoned their duty, and canvassed, or were found energetically working for a candidate, he thought they ought to be summarily dismissed. Employés of the Government, whose time belonged to, and was paid for by, the whole country, had no right to make their offices political dépôts for any can-

didate. Their duties required them to mingle with all classes of the community, and it was ill-becoming these men to give offence to any body of men by openly and boldly intruding their opinions. He, for one, would gladly see some stringent law on the Statute-book which would, for the future, prevent a recurrence of the events which had been referred to by hon. gentlemen in this House. So long as Government officials prostituted their positions for the advantage of either party, so long would there be similar complaints made in this House.

Mr. SPROULE said he approved of the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln, just heard. The abuses he had described had their parallels in almost every county. But the reports of the debates here would go out and do good by showing the feeling of the House respecting the improper interference of public officials in elections. In his riding, a postmaster had been, for years, a strong opponent of the Conservative party; one of the men who had stumped the county against him at the last election, and made use of the most vituperative language, had been receiving, as an official, a salary of between \$100 and \$200 a year. At the same time, anonymous letters were sent to some postmasters on the other side, warning them against taking any active part in the election, at the peril of their offices. This was something that should be reprobated. While he would not deal harshly with delinquents, he would like some rule by which civil servants should be strictly guided and bounded as regarded their interference in elections. The notorious Nixon who had done so much partisan work for the Ontario Government with the settlers in East Grey, had been discharged; his retention would have been a disgrace. If this Government employé wished to go into political life, and it was a very laudable desire, he ought to resign his position. This was a case he had thought almost beneath contempt, and he had not intended to bring it before the House, but the charges which had been made against the Government had induced him to refer to it. He thought it would be well if the Government placed on the Statute-book a law which would regulate the action of pub-

lic officials, define their duty, and the penalty consequent on their violation of the law.

Mr. BOURBEAU said that, in order to follow the example of all the other hon. members who, for the purpose of answering the question put forward by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), had brought grave accusations against the Mackenzie-Cartwright Government, he would speak in support of these accusations. As to what concerned public employés, it would be easy to prove that, very often during the elections, Civil Service employés, while under the control of the late, or, so-called, Liberal Government, intrigued politically in order to favour their friends. The hon. Ministers themselves allowed post-offices to be established at a distance of one, or even two, miles from the business centre, and at a distance of two miles from the parish church; in this way compelling the inhabitants of those places to travel a very considerable distance to get their mail matter. And this was necessarily done with the view of retaining their adherents at the time of an election. In his own county, he had known a postmaster permit public meetings to take place at his own house, during the election of 1878, in this way endeavouring to obtain a kind of triumph by anticipation over the Conservative member. It was true that the triumph was somewhat premature, seeing that he had secured a victory over his adversary in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska. On that occasion they displayed a sort of rag,—a bit of blue cloth, exclaiming: "This is the Conservative standard;" and then they tore it to pieces and trampled it under foot, crying out: "This is how we will soon treat the Conservative party!" He thought that they had prophesied badly. The elections on the 17th of September had proved that these prophets were false prophets. He recollected that, last year, the Postmaster-General, during the Local elections, asked the hon. the Premier of that time, where Mr. Pitau was then to be found, who was an employé in the House of Commons at Ottawa. The answer given by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was that Mr. Pitau had obtained leave of absence, in order to visit his family, some

member of which was sick. He had ascertained later on that, if such was the case, Mr. Pitau had more affection for the elections than for the member of his family who was sick, seeing that at this very time he was off making a speech at Arthabaska, in favour of the candidate of his party, his presence, moreover, being required at Ottawa. He was paid as a public officer, but, notwithstanding, they allowed him to absent himself from his office in order to go and intrigue in the county of Arthabaska. He might go further; he might, perhaps, speak of the contested election of 1877, in which he had been respondent; he might say that not only were postmasters allowed to intrigue in an outrageous manner in election times, but sometimes hon. Judges were also found doing likewise. The hon. Judges were sometimes found to have very strange ideas, and it was also ascertained that they interpreted the law in a very singular manner. In this contested election he had filed a counter-petition against the Hon. Mr. Laurier, and this counter-petition had been dismissed, for the reason that it had been served on the last day allowed by law in such cases. The hon. Judge had stated that, in such an important case, it was not proper to wait until the last day in order to file the counter-petition. He asked the House whether, when the law allowed a delay of 10, 15 or 30 days, it was not lawful to take advantage of this delay. But, in spite of all, the hon. Judge for the county of Arthabaska had decided otherwise. In his county there were employés, both Liberals as well as Conservatives, and at election time the Liberal employés obtained permission to intrigue politically; they were seen, in every sense, to scour the county, making their influence felt. But, on the other hand, the Conservative employés received strict orders to remain quiet and not to concern themselves about the election. In this county several Conservative employés had been warned that, if they went out of their houses during the time of the election, they would lose their situations. He thought that, in consideration of all these facts, the Government would do well to adopt a measure providing that public employés should not, for the future, meddle with elections.

MR. BOURBEAU.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he was very glad that this discussion had arisen, for the reason that some understanding would be come to, as to what part Federal officials should take in the elections. The Government were charged by the Opposition with a desire to introduce the American system. They had no such intention, and he thought it came with very bad grace from those who, while in power, dismissed scores, and he might say hundreds, of officials, without cause assigned, but simply on account of their political principles. The treatment of officials in Prince Edward Island was a proof of this. The Act of Confederation provided that, when a Province entered the Union and became a portion of the Dominion of Canada, all those officials holding offices which came under the control of the Dominion Parliament should be considered Dominion officials, and, therefore, became as much a portion of the Civil Service of Canada as if they had been appointed by the Dominion Government. The Island became a portion of the Dominion on 1st July, 1873. Some appointments were formally made early in November,—a few days before the resignation of the Government, and salaries fixed by Order in Council. But, so soon as the late Government came into power, they cancelled that Order in Council, and dismissed the whole of the officials so appointed, with the exception of a small number who were known to be their political supporters. Those who were improperly dismissed were paid off at the low rate of wages originally paid by the Local Government, whilst those political friends who were retained were paid, from the 1st July, the higher salary fixed by Order in Council. No contested elections had taken place after the change of Government, consequently, no political action of those officials could have caused their dismissal. They were simply put out of office because they were known to belong to the Conservative party. He was surprised to hear the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) state that he had never dismissed, for political reasons, an official under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. member for Cape Breton had proved that there were a number of dismissals, but

the hon. member for Westmoreland ridiculed the correctness of that statement, on the ground that there was not that number of shipping masters in any one county in Canada. He maintained that, not only had that number of these offices been filled by that Government, but also one in addition. He desired to state that their friends of the Conservative party did not want the American system introduced. They maintained that no man should be dismissed without cause, and they took the ground that those of their friends who were dismissed without cause should be reinstated, and the principle that they believed in thus maintained. Another case which proved that the hon. gentleman had not been accurate in his statement, that he had not made dismissals for political reasons, was one which occurred in 1874. A charge was made against a lighthouse-keeper in Ontario, that he had used some abusive and profane language against the Government. A copy of the charge was sent to the lighthouse-keeper, who denied it *in toto*, and, in reply, he said :

“ I beg to state that I did vote against Mr. Walter Ross, at the elections in 1874 ; but, as to using any violent or profane language concerning the present Government, I deny altogether, and I furnish you with a statement, signed by supporters of Mr. Ross and all my immediate neighbours, and who would have heard me if I had been guilty of any of the charges with which I am accused. Party feeling runs very high in this county, and this is done simply to injure a political opponent. Trusting my explanations will be satisfactory.”

In addition to that, they found the certificate from a number of Mr. Ross's friends, which was as follows :—“ We, the undersigned supporters of Walter Ross, M.P. for the county of Prince Edward, hereby certify that we are personally acquainted with Lewis Hodgins, Esquire, light-keeper, Salmon Point, and we also certify that we never heard him use any abusive language concerning Mr. Ross or the present Ministry, but, on the other hand, have heard him speak in their favour. We believe Mr. Hodgins is a faithful and efficient servant, and one who has discharged the duties of his office to the satisfaction of the public generally.” This was signed by about twenty supporters of Mr. Ross, but, notwithstanding this, the man was dismissed

the hon. member for Westmoreland, who appointed another man in his stead. He mentioned this case to prove that the hon. gentleman was inaccurate in his declaration that he had not discharged any officials.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH : The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. What I stated was that I was always opposed to the adoption of the American system.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said that was the construction he had placed on the hon. gentleman's statement, and in consequence had taken the trouble to bring this case before the House. He thought he could find his hon. friend many other dismissals that had been made upon his recommendation.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he thought it would only have been fair if the hon. gentleman had given him notice that he intended to make this charge. Had he done so, he (Sir A. J. Smith) would have been prepared to have answered it. He thought from what recollection he had of the case, that there was more correspondence connected with it, and that there were circumstances connected with it that would satisfactorily account for this man's removal.

MR. McCUAIG said that this case had transpired in his own county. Mr. Hodgins was connected with one of their most respectable families, and had discharged the duties of his office to the satisfaction of the Department. It was charged that he had made use of language derogatory of the Government in power. This he distinctly denied, but his brother, Captain N. Hodgins, who was present on the occasion, admitted that he, in the excitement, made use of the language that was charged against Lewis Hodgins. The dismissal took place two and a-half years after the whole matter had transpired, and the man who was instrumental in making the charge, Mr. Peter Huff, received the appointment. Mr. Hodgins complained of his dismissal to the member of the county, who promised Hodgins that, if he gave up his office, the Government would provide for him in some other way. That promise, however, was never fulfilled. All they desired was to obtain possession of the

office. While upon this subject, he would refer to the circumstances that transpired in connection with the collectorship. Mr. Clute, the late collector at the port of Picton, had his salary increased from \$600 to \$750. A short time afterwards, he was asked if he would like to enter upon the superannuation list. He expressed his willingness to do so, and calculated that, after thirty years' service, he was entitled to receive \$510 per annum. His successor was appointed, and, at the end of two or three months, Mr Clute was informed that his allowance would be \$392. He (Mr. McCuaig) told him that there must be some mistake, and that he had better communicate with the Government on the subject. He did so, and received in return a letter informing him that he should charge \$150, the increase of salary, to horse hire. Mr. Clute had never hired a horse, having no use for one, during his term of office, and he (Mr. McCuaig) thought it was an extraordinary recommendation for the Government to make. It held out inducements to public officials to make false entries in their books, and should be condemned, as it was calculated to throw doubt and suspicion upon the whole public returns.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said that in this case the superannuation was allowed for which the law provided. He did not remember the particulars connected with the case, but he believed, if he recollected rightly, that the late collector did make application for travelling expenses incurred in travelling to certain other ports some distance from where he lived. Whether the amount was put in as expenses or not he could not say. He did not know if it had been done in this case, but it was allowed in other cases. The application had been made for that purpose; it was presumed that the Collector should be paid extra for this service—superannuation allowance on salary received—and no more.

MR. MCCUAIG said he would read the following letter:—

“CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT,

“OTTAWA, 10th March, 1876.

“SIR,—I am instructed by the Minister of Customs to inform you that he will recommend to His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, that an addition of \$150 shall be

MR. MCCUAIG.

made to your salary, to date from the 1st January last, making your full salary from this date \$750 per annum.

“As soon as the Order has passed Council, a new *pro forma* pay-list will be forwarded to you, with the amount of arrears, as well as addition for the future.

“I am, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“J. JOHNSON.

“The Collector of Customs,

“Port of Picton,
“Ontario.”

Then there was the following letter:—

“CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT,

“OTTAWA, May 3, 1876.

“SIR,—Enclosed, I hand you a cheque for \$56.25, an allowance made you for horse hire from the 1st July to 31st March last.

“You are authorised to charge at same rate (\$75 per annum) for same services in future contingent accounts.

“I am, Sir,

“Yours, etc.,

“J. JOHNSON.

“J. S. Clute, Esq.,

“Collector, etc.,

“Picton, Ont.”

He had every document necessary to support the statement. The collector was known to be a respectable, honest man, and he was astonished that the Government of this country should have instructed him to make such a charge. He (Mr. McCuaig) was opposed to the American practice, and approved of the British rule, that secured the civil servants of the Government permanent employment during good behaviour, and he hoped, as Mr. Hodgins had been unjustly deprived of his office, he would soon be restored to his old position.

MR. BOWELL said the member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) had sustained his position by the documents he had read. It would be well if the late Minister of Customs were to make a full explanation of this and other matters in connection with the administration of his office, when it would be seen in what manner the affairs of the country had been carried on for the last five years. When the Supplementary Estimates were presented to the House, it would be seen that it was necessary to ask for \$17,500 to pay the excess of expenditure over the estimates of the Department for the year ending June, 1878—expenditures

made in the way referred to by the member for Prince Edward, not merely in one or two offices, but in almost every office throughout the Dominion, which showed how the late Government manipulated office-holders in order to obtain influence during the last election. The member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) clearly and distinctly proved that the late Minister of Customs had promised an increase of salary to the collector of that county, and that, after that promise was made, he had been asked to accept superannuation, and informed that the superannuation allowance should be based upon the increased salary which he supposed he was to receive. Having accepted the superannuation, he claimed allowance upon the full sum, but, instead of that, he received superannuation on the smaller salary. What the collector complained of was that he was first promised an increase, and then induced to resign, in order to make a position for a relative of the then member for the county, who was appointed at the increased salary which was denied to this old man who had been in the service some years, and was then refused the full superannuation allowance. In order, however, to keep that gentleman's mouth closed, the Minister of Customs instructed his officer—he was not finding fault with officers of the Department, because he always found them ready and willing to write such letters as they were instructed to write by the head of the Department—to inform him that he thought he could not be allowed any larger sum, under the Superannuation Act. He might retain a sum equal to the promised increase of salary, but he must charge it to horse-hire, thus swelling the contingent amount. There was scarcely, in the Dominion, an office where there were not one, two, three, or more officers who were paid in this way, out of contingencies. This he (Mr. Bowell) supposed had been done to meet the demands made upon the Minister by the officers themselves, or by supporters in the House, to increase the salaries of friends; and, in order to mislead the public, when the Public Accounts were looked at, the not very creditable practice had been adopted of allowing such extras, and charging them to contingencies, instead of taking the more

straightforward course of charging such expenditures under their proper head. In this way, the outside world could know nothing of the exact expenditure for salaries in any part in the Dominion. With this state of affairs, the difficulty which presented itself was, that he (Mr. Bowell) had either to deprive these officers of the sums which had been paid them out of contingencies, or to have Orders in Council passed, increasing their salaries. If he pursued the latter course, then the hon. gentlemen in Opposition would exclaim, at the next meeting of Parliament: "You have increased the expenditure of your Department, by increasing salaries." Every hon. member having the slightest experience knew well how the Estimates were seized hold of to criticise every such increase of expense, as that referred to, and accuse the Minister who had acted honestly in the expenditure of money of having increased the whole expenditure of the Dominion. What he desired to call the attention of the House more particularly to was the fact that the charge made by the member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) was literally true; that the collector of Prince Edward was told his salary should be increased, that he was then asked to accept superannuation, and that, when he was induced to acquiesce, his superannuation allowance was based upon his old salary, and the promised increase was paid out of contingencies, with instructions from the then Minister of Customs to charge such amount to horse hire. In Prince Edward County, nearly all the officers were preventive officers, and there was no necessity for the collector to have a horse to go around that county, and if he did it would be only for a few days in the year, but certainly not to the amount of \$150 per annum. This system of covering up transactions of that character was one that this House should condemn. The letter to which the hon. member (Mr. McCuaig) referred, recognised the claim of Mr. Clute, because the accountant's letter read as follows:—

"When writing to you on the 17th instant, I acted upon a pencil memorandum, which I understood to imply that the further increase was to date from the 1st of January previous; but the Commissioner's letter of the 10th of

March, 1876, is definite, and must be carried out. This leaves the balance due you as you state."

That was \$150. Then he went on to say that he should be paid that sum out of contingencies, but he must charge it to "horse hire." He did not wish to detain the House on the subject of dismissals generally, further than to say that it had been charged against the Department over which he presided, that certain dismissals had been made for political purposes. He denied that *in toto*. He would say more, that no dismissals had been made from the Customs Department, except where the offices were not required. There had been a case in Montreal, in which the office had been vacant for some months, an office in which the previous officer had not had anything to do; but, during the last days of the late Government, a friend was appointed at \$1,200 per annum, against the advice of the collector that such an officer was not required, and that he had no duties to assign him; yet that office was filled, and a political friend provided for at the expense of the revenues of the country, and he (Mr. Bowell) did not hesitate one moment in removing him. He had made full enquiry into another case, that of Clifton, where he found that a gentleman had been appointed to an office that had been vacant for some time, and where it was stated by the collector that there was no duty for him to perform; that no surveyor was required, and that the book-keeper had performed from year to year all the duties required. True, the previous occupant had not then resigned, he had been ill, he was allowed to retain his position, but had been from the office a long time before the appointment was made. Here also a friend was provided for, without anything to do, at \$1,200 a year; and he (Mr. Bowell) had not hesitated to tell that gentleman that his services were no longer required. He believed, on full investigation, that the revenue of this country could be relieved by the removal of others who had nothing to do at different ports, and he thought it was his duty to his country to lessen the expenses wherever he could. There were other cases under consideration, where the hon. gentleman, no doubt contrary to his own desires and better judgment, was

MR. BOWELL.

compelled to appoint men to positions who were totally unfit for the offices they held, and that, too, in the most important branch in the Customs Department—appraisers had been appointed who scarcely knew the difference between one class of goods and another. And yet these gentlemen had raised this discussion to condemn the present Government for the dismissals they had made. Why, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) had stated, these gentlemen had made it their boast, and it was one of their trump cards during the last election, that they had dismissed five or six hundred officials after their acceptance of office in 1873, because the appointments had been made just before the Conservative party went out of office. But they failed to explain that these very positions which they had, in that manner, rendered vacant, had been again filled by them with members of their political party, and, to such an extent had this been carried out, that there was scarcely a port in the whole Dominion where such political appointments had not been made by the hon. gentlemen. He had not been in the House when the hon. gentleman had referred to the dismissal of the officer at New Glasgow, but he could say he (Mr. Bowell) had discovered that, whenever the hon. gentleman wanted to carry out some little job, in order to comply with the wishes of some of his supporters, he generally imported the Inspector from New Brunswick to make reports that he could not induce the Inspector of Nova Scotia to do. Hence, in every case where they found a trumped-up case for the dismissal of a Conservative in Nova Scotia, it had been done upon the report of the New Brunswick Inspector. If the hon. gentleman had had no confidence in Mr. Kerr, the Inspector for Nova Scotia, why had he not removed him instead of keeping him drawing a salary, and the New Brunswick Inspector doing his duty? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Burpee) had stated that one officer had been removed because he was in business. He (Mr. Bowell) had evidence that one gentleman had been dismissed, and that the person who had been appointed in his place in New Glasgow was connected in business with a relative who was

actually importing. That was reported to the Department, and yet the reason given for the dismissal of the sub-collector at that port was that he was doing business. He repeated that it was not the policy of this Government to remove any man from office except for good causes. In the hon. gentleman's own constituency (St. John, N.B.) the collector and another officer were allowed to retain office during the last five years, after having given a bond to indemnify the country for from \$28,000 to \$30,000, which they owed the country, by becoming defaulters through some mismanagement, to that extent, although they had not paid a cent on that bond. This was another instance of the manner in which this country had been governed. With reference to the hon. member for Sutherland, who had been aptly described as the "Bombastes Furioso" of the Opposition, he would not enlarge on that gentleman's administration of his Department, as he was not in his seat. He was amused, however, to hear him deprecating the bringing up of old evidence which should have been allowed to remain in abeyance forever. One would imagine he was one of those models before whom all should bow down in veneration.

MR. DOMVILLE said the late Minister of Customs had challenged his veracity this afternoon, and had stated that, in New Brunswick, the late Government had not acted on the principle that "to the victors belong the spoils," and had not committed any of those outrages complained of. When he heard such a statement as that, he doubted his individuality. Murray Nase, of Westfield, a faithful postmaster of many years' standing, was dismissed without a moment's notice, or any cause assigned, and replaced by a man who had been most active against him (Mr. Domville) in elections. That man was a servant on the European and North American Railroad, with which the hon. gentleman had been largely connected, and of which his brother was a managing director.

MR. BURPEE: It is the first word I ever heard of it.

MR. DOMVILLE: The hon. gentleman will forget next that he ever built the

railroad, or got \$10,000 a mile from the New Brunswick Legislature, brought the line down to the Suspension Bridge, and got a subsidy from the city to bridge the river and carry the railroad into the city, and, as soon as they got the money, swung it round the other way, and made the terminus at Carleton instead.

MR. BURPEE: I never had a dollar of stock, or any interest, in the railroad, any more than the hon. member himself.

MR. DOMVILLE said he had seen the hon. gentleman in the office where he was connected with that railroad. One brother was virtually the paymaster, in his capacity as director, and the other the engineer; the one running it, while the other got the bills paid, and the poor people in England furnished the money. There was a petition against Mr. Nase which he (Mr. Domville) had often tried to obtain access to, but without success; and, when he did see it, on enquiry he learned that a large portion of the names were said to be forged, and many of the names represented women and children, and parties not residing in the parish. He was present when one of the postmasters went round to his customers with his ledger, telling them that, if they voted for him (Mr. Domville), he would sue them for their accounts. In the case of the collector at St. John, when he had asked the hon. gentleman, in Committee of Public Accounts, if the collector at St. John had paid what he was in default for, the hon. member said he had never heard of it, and the next thing was the sending of a gentleman from Quebec, Dunscomb by name, to examine the matter, who recommended the money should not be collected, because it was an accident. The same collector delivered goods out of bond to friends of the party, allowing them to bond other goods in their stead without paying the duty. This officer came up here, and they gave him \$100 and a letter signed by Mr. Johnson, Commissioner of Customs to the Hon. Edward Blake, recommending him for a public situation, to get clear of him, and when they found they could not get him to go to Manitoba, they locked the door and tried to get the \$100 back. If they doubted this assertion, he would

place the letter to Mr. Blake before this House, and produce the witness from the Senate Chamber, to-morrow at three o'clock. He could produce the papers from the Post Office, showing the irregularity in the dismissal of Mr. Nase, the order of the collector, Mr. Ruel, authorising the swapping of the goods. He could prove that the late Minister of Customs had said he knew nothing about these men being in arrears \$20,000, and then had whitewashed him through the agency of the Dunscomb report. He had a few more papers which he would hold back as a *bonne bouche*; but, as regarded Mr. Cudlip, he was sorry the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell) did not know more about him personally. He was a good man and had done his duty faithfully to his employers. If that employer had directed him to do dirty work, as complained of, he would be compelled to do it, and whatever he undertook he did faithfully; but, at the same time, with great qualms of conscience, he had to carry out the work made for him. He had no option but to do it. He was not in the position of his hon. friend; he had a large family, and was not in a position to furnish the Intercolonial, or other railroads, with supplies, as the late Minister of Customs was whilst a member of the Cabinet.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said he did not remember having told any person to charge horse hire in the contingent accounts. Of course it was impossible for him to remember every circumstance that had occurred in the Customs Department in the past five years. He believed that such expenses, whether travelling expenses or other similar expenses, were charged to contingent account before he entered the office. Applications were made frequently by collectors to reimburse them for travelling expenses in visiting out-stations, sometimes from five to twenty miles from their port. In some cases these claims were allowed, and it was charged to whatever service performed; no doubt this was one of the cases. With regard to his salary, whatever was allowed him was only allowed for the last year. If it had been for one year only, he could not have been superannuated on that amount, as superannuation

MR. DOMVILLE.

would have to be on the average of three years previous to superannuation. He believed he was allowed all the Superannuation Act would allow him. In the case of Montreal, the appointment was not, to his knowledge, remonstrated against by the collector there, and was made to fill a vacancy which occurred at the time. With regard to Clifton, the collector there needed an officer as a surveyor, and the man was well fitted for the position, which was then vacant. With regard to Picton, he did not say he was dismissed because he was in business, but he said, in addition to other reports, he believed he was engaged in business, and his business was worth more to him than his office, and demanded all his time. The salary was increased as the business of the port increased. With reference to sending the inspector to Nova Scotia to do jobs for the Government, he denied any such motive as described by the Minister of Customs, and the Inspector (Mr. Cudlip) was too conscientious and honourable a man to be engaged in anything of that kind. The Inspector was often sent from one Province to another. He did not require the inspector of one Province to work exclusively for that Province. Mr. Cudlip was frequently sent to Nova Scotia, just as an officer of Montreal or Quebec would be sent to one of the Lower Provinces. The collections at St. John, referred to by the Minister of Customs, was a long story, too long to be entered into now, at a moment's notice. The discrepancy in the bonded warehouse of Mr. Brown took place in 1872. The collector had not been in office more than a year or so, and was carrying on the business in the office, as the late collector did; and it was owing to the custom established, and this system being carried on, that the discrepancies arose, more than from the collector's fault. Three or four merchants, or more, had the privilege of taking goods out of bond, paying the duty from time to time.

MR. DOMVILLE: Any merchant in St. John had the privilege of taking out of the warehouse sufficient goods to owe the country \$20,000 or \$30,000 thereon.

MR. BURPEE said three or four merchants had access to the warehouse to

take out bonded goods. There was no limit, and the system was such that if Brown had goods in other warehouses the collector could not take them for his defalcation. The law had been changed since then. He held, notwithstanding what the hon. member for King's, N.B., had said, that the Government, under the present law, could not now take any merchant's goods out of any city warehouse for a defalcation of his. Had the law been in existence at that time they could likely have saved that amount of Brown's defalcation. Other matters connected with that defalcation the hon. the Minister of Customs knew. The offender claimed certain credits, of which he (Mr. Burpee) did not know the particulars. But the collector thought, whether rightly or not, that he was hardly dealt with, and wanted a hearing.

MR. BOWELL: Do the hon. gentleman and the other members of the late Government contend that the collector should not pay this money?

MR. BURPEE said he did not mean to say that; he was speaking of the collector, not the late Government. The late Government notified him of the claim and he resented it. They never relieved him of it. The system of that day rendered that kind of service common in more places than St. John. In 1870 or 1871 an officer was sent to Halifax to investigate, respecting its warehouses. They could not ascertain exactly what was missing, but a larger amount by a great deal, would be found in default in Halifax in 1870 and 1871 than in St. John. In Montreal, and the smaller ports, they saw the same thing under the old system of bonding warehouses—more or less deficiencies occurred through goods being taken out of bond, that the collectors were not called upon to pay for. He (Mr. Burpee) had never spoken to the collector at the time of the elections, about his political opinions, nor asked him for his vote. Some time after the elections, he asked him if the story about his ballot was true. He replied no, that he had not gone near the ballot-box to mark his ballot, that the returning-officer told him to go behind the screen, that he did so, and marked and deposited his ballot in the box. He (Mr. Burpee) did not see why the Govern-

ment could not believe the collector's as well as the returning-officer's statement, as he was known to be a truthful man.

MR. DOMVILLE: What does truthful mean?

MR. BURPEE: A man who speaks the truth. As to the post-office matter, he never heard of Nase till to-night. So far as St. John was concerned, he had exercised no coercion whatever.

MR. TILLEY: Hear, hear.

MR. BURPEE said the hon. gentleman cheered that statement.

MR. TILLEY: Three-fourths of the Customs officers were appointed by myself.

MR. BURPEE said he brought no influence to bear on them. He believed, sincerely, Government officers should keep out of politics, beyond exercising their franchise. He did not know the matter the member for King's spoke of; but the papers he asked were before the House, and their perusal would show how far they justified the action of the late Ministers. The personal insinuations he did not intend to reply to.

MR. DOMVILLE said he wished to explain the Custom-house matter.

MR. PATTERSON (South Brant) rose to a point of order. The discussion, brought on by a motion respecting one person, had taken a very wide range, including many others, and lasted two days. The whole Civil Service had been discussed. Should the discussion on this motion have taken such a wide range?

MR. SPEAKER: The discussion has gone too far on both sides; many hon. gentlemen have spoken two or three, and some, five or six, times. I hope hon. members will confine themselves to the question better hereafter, so that there may be more regularity in our proceedings. Of course, specific charges were made, and it was very difficult to put bounds to the discussion.

MR. CASEY said he would ask Mr. Speaker to rule that, as soon as the present points were settled, the rule should be absolutely enforced hereafter.

MR. TUPPER said he rose to a question of order. He was not at all surprised to find hon. gentlemen opposite now more alive to the desirability of limiting this discussion. He rose to ask whether this discussion had taken a wider range than, under the circumstances, was proper. It arose in connection with the motion of the hon. member for Shefford, for the production of papers connected with the dismissal of Mr. Cardinal, in proposing which he charged the present Government with having introduced the United States system of indiscriminate dismissals. Having made that charge, he (Mr. Tupper) believed it was pertinent to cite instances and adduce arguments in rebuttal, and of a nature to show the action of the accusing parties when in power themselves. It was important to show that the hue and cry of hon. gentlemen opposite rested on an unsubstantial foundation, and that they only had offended against the Constitution by endeavouring to shake the tenures of the Civil Service in this country.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he only wished to call the attention of hon. gentlemen on the front benches opposite to the inconvenience of the practice of springing here a number of charges, such as those of the present Postmaster-General, against his predecessor, without any notice whatever. It seemed to him (Mr. Cartwright) wholly out of order and unbecoming for a Minister to make irrelevant charges without notice. Because the contingencies and Customs matters had nothing to do with the question whether Régis Cardinal was rightly or wrongly dismissed, or whether the tenure of the Civil Service had been affected; still less had the question whether the defalcations in St. John had been rightly or wrongly dealt with by his hon. friend (Mr. Burpee). If the Minister of Customs desired to act in this question let him move for papers, when they would be quite prepared to discuss it.

MR. BOWELL said that the hon. gentleman who had just sat down had committed one mistake, perhaps from lack of memory. He did not bring a charge against the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee), but merely commented upon a charge made by the hon.

MR. CASEY.

member from Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig), which the member for St. John denied in plain language, but which was substantiated by official letters.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: They are not in possession of the House.

MR. BOWELL said they were the moment that they were read, and the hon. gentleman did not dare to deny that they were letters sent by his Department to the collector of Picton; it was only on his denial and attempt to shirk the responsibility of these letters, that he (Mr. Bowell) made any reference to them whatever. They must be very grateful to the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) for his homily on parliamentary propriety and parliamentary practice; but he and the House must see that the charge was that Cardinal had been dismissed on account of his political opinions, and not for any other reason. His (Mr. Bowell's) remarks were designed to show that the power held by the ex-Minister of Customs was exercised to aid and assist his political friends at the expense of the country, that expenses had been charged to contingencies to cover up promises. The member for St. John asserted that the contingencies of the Customs Department had and would always be very large. They all knew that; but the late Minister of Customs had concealed the actual facts by charging to the contingencies of the Department that which should be charged to salaries, and paid a promised increase of salary, and instructed it to be charged to horse hire, which was never ordered. He (Mr. Bowell) called attention to the fact that the ex-Minister of Customs had four or five extra clerks in his own office, at from one and a half to two dollars per day, which was also charged to contingencies. Under these circumstances, was it any wonder that the contingencies of the Department increased so largely?

MR. BURPEE (St. John): The contingent account is much less than for the year 1873.

MR. BOWELL said he would again explain that: In order to meet these extra contingent expenses, which did not appear in the papers before the House, the sum of \$17,000 or \$18,000 would

have to be asked for to cover deficiencies. The hon. gentleman had told them that these four or five extra clerks did not increase the expenditure of the Department. What he maintained was that they had provided for their friends, and paid them out of the contingent account, in order to keep the list of permanent clerks down to the minimum, as it was when they accepted office. In reference to the appointment in Montreal, the hon. gentleman must know that the gentleman who formerly held the office had not done any work in it for about two years, and that, just as he (Mr. Burpee) was leaving office, he had appointed a successor who would have nothing to do. The St. John case was precisely as he informed the House it was. The hon. gentleman had said that this man was hardly dealt with by the Department in asking him to give that bond. The late Government must have held the same opinion, or they would have insisted on the payment of the bond. If they did not insist upon the payment, the Government either thought he should not be made to pay, or else they were prepared to treat him leniently on account of the change of his political views which had taken place, after the late Government came into power; and this, no doubt, was his reward.

MR. PATTERSON (South Brant) said he would like to have the ruling of the Speaker on the point of order, as to whether the discussion that had taken place had been pertinent to the question.

MR. McCALLUM said he thought the discussion which had taken place was strictly in order. Hon. gentlemen had merely tried to illustrate their opinions by bringing forward particular cases.

MR. SPEAKER said that the discussion, to be strictly in order, ought to have been confined to the question of the papers and correspondence which had been asked for. But the discussion had taken a wide range, and the general question had arisen as to the right of allowing public officers to take part in politics. A great many members had tried to illustrate their opinion by bringing forward some particular case, and thus the discussion had become irregular. He was afraid that, under the circum-

stances, it was now too late to limit the discussion. He, however, hoped that hon. members would not unnecessarily lengthen the debate.

MR. DOMVILLE said that the late Minister of Customs had placed him (Mr. Domville) in a false position in denying the statement which he had made in regard to this matter. His hon. friend had said that it was the custom in St. John to take goods out of bond in the manner he had indicated. He knew it had been the custom for two or three firms to take goods out of bond in that manner; one firm in particular had taken out a quantity of iron for the completion of the Intercolonial Railway, and had substituted more iron in its place at a later date. As he did not wish to be irregular, he would not name the firm. He maintained that the Collector of Customs had written orders over his own signature for the permission of goods to be taken out of bond, without the payment of the duty.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said that this custom of taking goods out of bond had always prevailed, but he had never heard before that the locker had told the collector that such things were given out of the warehouse from time to time.

MR. DOMVILLE said that that fact came out in the evidence before the police magistrate.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said he had not read the evidence, and did not know whether it did or not. This warehouse system had been carried on from Confederation until about 1875, and he thought that, if a merchant had access to a warehouse, he was as liable to take out \$20,000 or \$30,000 worth of goods, as he was to take \$10,000 worth. The same system obtained in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, and other cities of the Dominion. And it was very difficult, under that system, to find out what goods were in bond, and what were not. This was as full an explanation as he could give to the House until the papers were brought down.

MR. WELDON said that the remarks of his hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville) were not correct. He (Mr.

Weldon) acted as counsel for Mr. Brown in the prosecution of the Collector of Customs, when the matter was brought before the police court, and he maintained that no evidence was given showing that the locker had called the attention of the collector to the state of things which then existed. When the matter came before the Grand Jury, they ignored the Bill, and refused to indict Mr. Brown. When it was found that these goods had been taken away the collector seized a portion of them in order to obtain security for the payment of his duties, and the then Minister of Customs ordered some of these goods to be restored, and amongst other securities handed over, a note was taken for the amount, which had never been collected.

MR. BOWELL: Does not the hon. gentleman know that that note was taken under false pretences?

MR. WELDON said the note was not taken under false pretences, but no steps were taken to show it could not be recovered. No effort had been made to recover the amount in a Court of Justice. His hon. friend from King's stated that Mr. Ruel, the collector, had voted openly. That was utterly incorrect. He voted in the ordinary way, and he never asked how that gentleman was going to vote. He did, however, suppose, until a few days before the election, he was opposed to the Government. He himself was opposed to the dismissal of public officials, unless they did something wrong. In 1872, no stronger supporter of the hon. the Minister of Finance existed in the city of St. John than the present Collector of Customs there.

MR. DOMVILLE: Do you expect us to believe that?

Some HON. GENTLEMEN: Order.

MR. WELDON said he believed it could be proved that, when Mr. Ruel told him he had not voted openly, he had stated what was correct. He (Mr. Weldon) believed this matter had been brought up somewhat irregularly. It had been investigated in the Court of Equity and Police Court, and it was shewn that for the system then in vogue the collector was not morally responsible. His hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville)

MR. WELDON.

had spoken about having this man turned out. During the last elections that hon. gentleman had gone around the country saying he was going to have Mr. Brydges dismissed, and he had succeeded. He (Mr. Weldon) deprecated this system. Whilst he believed that a civil servant should not take an active part in politics, he did not think he should be dismissed merely because he exercised his right of the franchise, and voted for the party he supported. A majority of the officials in the Custom-house, etc., in his county had been appointed by the present Minister of Finance. He understood that a man who had introduced a supporter of his (Mr. Weldon's) to the employés on the Intercolonial Railway to solicit their votes, had received notice of dismissal. If that system were carried out it, would hurt most injuriously the best interests of the country.

MR. TILLEY said he would not have taken any part in the discussion had it not been for the assertion made by the member for St. John city and county (Mr. Weldon) that certain proceedings had been stayed on his (Mr. Tilley's) advice by the acting Minister of Justice, at St. John, and a friend of his had been relieved from his obligation. He denied that most distinctly. It was found that, under Mr. Ruel's management, valuable goods had been removed from the warehouse at St. John, through which the Government were likely to lose some \$20,000 or \$30,000, by the neglect of some person or other. Mr. Johnson, then Assistant Commissioner of Customs, was sent to St. John to enquire into the facts of the case. Upon the report of the investigation being received, the Government felt they could not meet Parliament with Mr. Ruel as Collector of Customs at that city, though Mr. Ruel had been, as he (Mr. Tilley) supposed, his friend up to that time—he had had no reason to consider him otherwise—as he had been appointed Collector of Customs by his (Mr. Tilley's) advice, on the recommendation of the principal merchants of the city of St. John, and he supposed a good appointment had been made. From that investigation, it also appeared that two or three other officers in the Department had neglected instructions given them by the head of

the Department at Ottawa. Under these circumstances, they felt they could not meet Parliament with that gentleman as Collector of Customs, as there was nothing that could possibly prevent an adverse vote, unless the strong feelings of their friends against the condemnation of a gentleman whom they had selected for the appointment. Accordingly he was suspended. Some five or six months after the suspension, upon the recommendation of the hon. member for the city and county of St. John, and many other friends, a proposition was made to the Government that he should be reinstated. He (Mr. Tilley) stated that, unless the Government were made secure for the loss sustained, the Government could not be justified in restoring him; and it was only after receiving a bond from himself and another officer that, upon his (Mr. Tilley's) recommendation, his colleagues decided he should be reinstated in office. He was to pay so much per month, until this deficiency was cleared up. Their successors increased this man's salary—it was said, for the purpose of enabling him to pay this bond, and from that day to this they had never collected one dollar from him. Still he (Mr. Tilley) had not moved a hand against him, and he appealed to the Minister of Customs to say whether he had five minutes' conversation with him (Mr. Bowell) on the subject while the investigation had been going on, and he had not intended saying a word about it until it would be first reported to Council, and the whole case had been submitted for consideration. He did not know what correspondence had taken place in reference to this matter, except that he had heard that a letter had been written to Mr. Tuck about this note, and that Mr. Ruel had given as a reason he should not pay this money because there was a certain note in the hands of Mr. Tuck to collect; that a statement had been made by Mr. Tuck to Mr. Ruel which left Mr. Ruel perfectly satisfied that he had no justification for making that statement. He did not hesitate to assert that the charge which had been made that Clark had been improperly favoured, was without foundation. He did not hesitate to say that this gentleman, who had been appointed to office on his (Mr. Tilley's)

advice, had, since 1873, instead of being his friend, been one of his most disappointed and bitter opponents, because he (Mr. Tilley) had exacted what he felt was his duty to the country, that that money should be secured to the Government. But they had not insisted on the payment of the bond; and, consequently, no one was a stronger supporter of the hon. gentlemen opposite than Mr. Ruel at the last election, or more openly or above-board exercised his influence in their favour. He (Mr. Tilley) did not desire to enter into the other matters referred to in reference to the last election at St. John. He had been for many years a member of the Government. They all knew that when they were having a warm contest they were very glad to get support from all quarters; but he must say that he never saw, in any election which had taken place since 1850, when he was first elected a representative in the New Brunswick Legislature, Government influence so openly used in favour of an Administration as in the last election in the city and county of St. John. Out of the officials in that city two-thirds had been appointed upon his (Mr. Tilley's) recommendation, and were his political and personal friends. Many of them were threatened by supporters of the Government, that, if they did not vote for the Government, they would be turned out. Some of them, much as they desired to vote for him, remained at home, and others, no doubt, recorded their votes for the Government, because they had been led to suppose that the Government would be sustained for another five years. Never had there been a more shameless use of Government influence than that used by the Government in the county and city of St. John. He was not charging it home on the members of the Government, but he did on the men nearest them. At the meeting in the Rink in the city of St. John, where the chairman declared that "to the victor belong the spoils," the sympathies of the meeting were clearly in favour of the Opposition; but was it true Liberalism that, in a meeting such as that, when probably one or two officials, who cheered for the men who they believed were adopting a policy that would advance the interests of the country, should be told that their occupation

—their bread and butter—was at stake, if they manifested any interest whatever in the coming election. He had not intended to speak on this matter but for the mention of his name in connection with it, and he regretted it had been brought up.

MR. BURPEE said he regretted, as much as the hon. the Minister of Finance, that this discussion had taken place, because it had taken a wider range than had been anticipated, but it was introduced by the hon. the Minister of Customs. He repeated, most distinctly, he had not influenced the officials in St. John, and that the charge made against him by the Minister of Customs, that this matter had been lying over to gain political support, was without foundation. Mr. Ruel had seized goods, valued at, he thought, about \$8,000, as well as other assets to a similar amount, and he was perfectly right in holding that these were claims for consideration in his behalf, the duty not having been paid. They had a similar case in Montreal, in 1876, where a large amount of goods were taken out of the warehouse and scattered all over the different ports of Ontario, and those goods had been seized wherever they were found.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he was very reluctant to take part in the discussion, but he was driven to do so by the statements made by the late Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee), in reference to the policy pursued by the Government of which he was a member, in relation to the dismissals of officers in the county of St. John; and he regretted exceedingly to have to reiterate the statement of his hon. friend beside him that the memory of the hon. gentleman and the Government of which he had been a member was extremely defective. He (Mr. McDonald) supposed they must condone the offence—if offence it could be called—on the ground that they did not recollect what they were doing, because it was only upon such considerations they could understand the defence made by the hon. member for the city and county of St. John and the hon. member for Westmoreland. He would state, in a very few words, the New Glasgow case. He desired it might be correct, because it illustrated, as

MR. TILLEY.

strongly as it could be illustrated, the mode in which the hon. gentlemen opposite had dealt with the public servants of this country. Mr. McDonald was appointed when the railway went through New Glasgow, the appointment being necessary on account of goods in bond being taken from Halifax. Mr. McDonald was appointed by the then Minister of Customs, at a salary of \$150 a year, and he occupied the position until 1873. In 1874, at the election, a gentleman—an opponent of his—approached Mr. McDonald and told him his salary was too small for the work he did. At that time over \$12,000 worth of property passed through his hands. His salary remained as it was, and in 1874 he was approached by Mr. Carmichael, and was told that if he would vote for him he would retain his office and his salary would be increased; if not, he would be dismissed. These statements could be proved. He would not make statements in this House of the truth of which he had not the evidence in his hands, and witnesses ready to testify before a Committee or Court of Justice. Mr. McDonald refused to vote for Mr. Carmichael, and remained in office until 1875. His office was regularly inspected by Mr. Kerr, Inspector of Nova Scotia, than whom there was no more trustworthy man in the public service. Mr. Kerr inspected Mr. McDonald's office yearly, and as frequently as he thought necessary, or as the rules of the service required. From the time Mr. McDonald was appointed in 1871 or 1872, down to the time he was dismissed, not one word of complaint was ever made by Mr. Kerr against him, nor was any report made against him. The hon. the late Minister of Customs must not "think," when he talked on the subject, because Mr. McDonald "knew." When the hon. gentleman admitted he could not recollect the transactions of his office, he must not contradict him (Mr. McDonald) by thinking. Mr. Kerr was as much astonished as he (Mr. McDonald) was when he learned Mr. McDonald was dismissed, and without being informed of the reasons, though he wrote on two separate occasions for them. Mr. Kerr would not report Mr. McDonald as incompetent, or that he was in business

with another, which was false, for the year before he was dismissed he was not engaged in business, and was, consequently, free from the insinuation that his business relations made him incompetent to hold his office. The late Minister of Customs procured Cudlip, the Inspector of New Brunswick, who had no connection whatever with the business at Halifax, but, as the hon. gentleman had said, he was sent there on special occasions. He was sent there when there was something to be done which Mr. Kerr would not do. He went into Mr. McDonald's office and warehouse. He never intimated to him that he went there to make an examination for the purpose of dismissing him, and the first intimation that Mr. McDonald had was an officer from the Pictou Custom-house walking up with a letter from the Minister of Customs, demanding the keys and the transfer of his books. Mr. McDonald asked the reason. The officer said he knew nothing about it, and he took over the goods in the warehouse and the books, and gave McDonald a receipt for the property, finding everything correct and proper. The report of Cudlip was entirely false and unfounded, and a disgrace and discredit to the man who made it. What he did say was that McDonald was, he understood, connected in business with his son, which was untrue, and that, being a very old man, it was convenient for the public service that he should be dismissed. He was dismissed accordingly, lost his \$150 per annum, and the friend of Mr. Carmichael, the representative of the county, was appointed in his place at a salary of \$500 a year, and that gentleman was now the collector in New Glasgow, with a salary increased since then. He (Mr. McDonald) had nothing to say against that gentleman, but he did not hesitate to say that McDonald's case was the most gross violation of every principle on which the Civil Service was based, even at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen opposite had deprecated the discussion. Mr. Speaker had properly ruled that no discussion could be more proper to the occasion, or more acceptable to the country, than this one, which had demonstrated the corruption which existed in the conducting of public

business for the last five years. He did not wonder that the people of this country were indignant that the Government had not retaliated, that their friends said that they were not done justice to, and the perpetrators of the most unblushing wrongs were allowed to hold their offices. The hon. the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the late Minister of Customs, had stated that they never dismissed an officer for political reasons, and the statement was re-echoed by the late Postmaster-General; and this, in the face of undeniable facts to the contrary. The hon. member for Cape Breton had proved, conclusively, that ten officers in his county had been dismissed by these gentlemen, and the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries was at last actually cowed down into admitting that he did not recollect or believe there were so many officers in the county. The worst part was when the hon. gentleman stated they only dismissed officers appointed by a moribund Government, a few days before they went out of power. Why, Mr. John McDonald was appointed in 1873, and dismissed in 1875. They said they only dismissed those whose appointments should not have been made. That he denied. His right hon. friend had a majority so far as the constitutional usage demonstrated the fact. He had not been outvoted in this House, and there was no sign that his Government did not command a majority in the country. But what did hon. gentlemen opposite do? In September, he supposed they would admit they were overwhelmingly beaten, and had they a due regard for the decencies and the Constitution, they would have resigned on the 18th of September, instead of waiting till October. During those two months, when they were not moribund, but dead, when the execution had taken place, they appointed their adherents to offices all over the country, in utter defiance of every principle of the Constitution as laid down by themselves; they discharged every man they could lay hands on, and appointed incompetent men in their place. They obtained power on false pretences by misrepresentation, by means which had brought discredit on the party, and political death on themselves, and the facts brought out in this debate

would only strengthen the feeling of the people against them.

MR. MILLS said that those hon. gentlemen who had brought charges against the late Government should, if they were sincere, have moved for the papers relating to them. There was no means before the House of testing the correctness of those charges. The hon. gentleman had undertaken to defend the appointments made by the former Government, of the Premier, on the eve of their leaving office, by saying that at the time there was no evidence that they had lost the confidence of the Legislature or the country. The best proof of the contrary, was, that a motion of non-confidence was pending, and they retired before the judgment of Parliament was pronounced. The course pursued by them, on that occasion, was eminently wise and prudent, but it did not lie with them to say that appointments made to offices newly created, and for which no appropriations were made, while a vote of censure was hanging over them, should be respected. He was not aware that the late Government, before retiring, had created new offices, or that any appointments were made for which there were no appropriations, or for other purposes than to fill vacancies, and until hon. gentlemen opposite proved there were, they had not made out a case against the late Administration. The Finance Minister himself sat in this Parliament for several days with a commission in his pocket.

MR. TILLEY : It is not correct.

MR. MILLS : Let the hon. gentleman bring down the Order in Council by which he was appointed, and see whether it was not prior to the time he sat in this House, and spoke in defence of the Administration of which he had been, but was not then, a member.

MR. TILLEY : I stated distinctly, after the recommendation was made to the Governor-General, that I did not intend to accept the position, and did not, but that afterwards it was decided I should accept. I said that even in the House.

MR. MILLS : If the hon. gentleman had not accepted office under that com-

MR. McDONALD.

mission, there would have been another Order in Council ; but there was none, nor any other commission. When so appointed, his seat was thereby vacated, and yet he sat in this House with the commission and emoluments attached in his pocket.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) : Do I understand the hon. gentleman to assert that appointments by Order in Council, without acceptance or the commission, vests the right of office in a party ?

MR. MILLS said he repeated that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Tilley) received the appointment from his colleagues, and accepted the office of Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick. He (Mr. Mills) was not going to discuss the question just put. It was unnecessary. Did the hon. Minister of Justice pretend to say that, if the hon. gentleman had not been in the country, and in the Administration, it would have been worthy of him to put that question, and for him (Mr. Mills) to answer it ? Did he pretend that, after that commission was issued, he could properly accept office ? Did he pretend that the hon. the First Minister advised His Excellency to appoint one of his colleagues to such a position without consulting him, and without informing him of what had been done ?

MR. TILLEY : He did not consult me.

MR. MILLS : The hon. gentleman was appointed, and, knowing of the Order in Council, took his seat in this House, and, notwithstanding, subsequently accepted.

MR. TILLEY : This is a personal matter, and I should like to ask the leader of the Government, in view of the many statements made on this subject, whether their recommendation was made to His Excellency when I was in the country, or whether I knew anything of it—whether there was any understanding that I should take the Lieutenant-Governorship ?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The recommendation to His Excellency was made without the knowledge of the Minister of Finance, when he was out of the country.

MR. MILLS said then the most improper part of the proceedings rested, not with the Minister of Finance, but his leader. What was his position, then? That he appointed his friend and colleague while he was abroad, secretly appointed him to an office that disqualified him to sit here, kept him in ignorance of what had been done, and that he, nevertheless, permitted him to sit and exercise the duties of an independent Minister, knowing that, if he had accepted the office, his seat would be vacated, thus placing him in a false position before the House and country. The hon. gentleman had alluded to the number of persons said to have been improperly dismissed by the late Government; but, last year, his colleagues were unwilling to move for a Committee of Enquiry, because the majority of the House then supported the late Government. The hon. gentlemen opposite were unable to conduct an enquiry unless they possessed a majority. Now, however, there was nothing to prevent an investigation, if they wanted one. It was easy for them to make charges, many of them wholly unfounded, but it would be more becoming and consistent for them to move for the proofs. He and his friends were perfectly sure there could be nothing disclosed in any way inconsistent with strict uprightness of conduct in their management of the public affairs. With regard to the improper conduct of officials, he was not aware of any of them having improperly interfered in public matters on behalf of Reform candidates, in the time of the late Government. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in office before, the Minister of Public Works pressed on the House a measure giving the Custom-house officers in Nova Scotia the right to vote, in order that they might be influenced and coerced by the Government to support it. In the election for 1872, they found Custom-house officers in Ontario voting for the members supporting the then Administration in violation of the law.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman is not correct in saying those officers were not able to vote at the time mentioned. Under the law, then and now, those very officials disqualified in Nova Scotia voted in New Brunswick and the other Provinces.

MR. MILLS said he referred to Nova Scotia. He knew right well that they were disqualified from voting both in Ontario and Quebec. With regard to the merits of this question, the law never contemplated the disqualification of country and village postmasters for taking part in the elections. In his own constituency, some of them took an active part against him, and they had an undoubted right to do so. In many places, it was difficult to get men to so far promote the public convenience as to accept postmasterships, and hon. gentlemen could not do the public a greater disservice than by preventing them from participating in the elections, which they would resent. Those receiving large salaries were disqualified already, and should not interfere. It was unfortunate that officers of the Customs Department anywhere, and the inside branches of the Civil Service here, had a right to vote, which sometimes subjected them to unjust suspicion. It would be more convenient for themselves to separate them from all political associations. In this city an inspector of weights and measures, and an official assignee, Mr. Clemow, had worked energetically for the present members against one of the late representatives. He was loud in his denunciations of them, and loud in his praises of the Tory party. Yet, the late Government did not dismiss him. Messrs. Barber and Audy had openly discussed what they regarded as the demerits of the Liberal Government, and worked against it, but were still in the Civil Service. He thought it unfortunate that they did so, as it interfered with their public duties. A political partisan was, to some measure, disqualified from honestly serving a chief in political antagonism to him. It would be well to disqualify all such by law; but, till then, the Government had no right to interfere with them. He said the Government should introduce a measure disqualifying civil servants, especially those entitled to superannuation, from taking any part in the Dominion elections, at all events, if not in those of the Provinces. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) had felt disappointed at not being taken into the late Government, which accounted for his hostility to his former party; but

he did not think he had anything to complain of in not receiving the support of the late Government, while actively opposing one of its members. If the hon. member for Lambton promised support, it must have been as a political friend, and, when the hon. member's hostility was disclosed, he had no right to complain of being opposed.

MR. MCCALLUM said he did not desire to introduce the system that "to the victors belong the spoils," into the public service of the country. All public officers should exercise freedom of opinion in elections, if not deprived by law of that right. He was, however, very much amused at the course of hon. gentlemen opposite. They felt very uneasy and nervous about this matter. They were evidently uncomfortable, and acted as though they were resting on thorns. They did not want the country to know all their short-comings, which were many. He would give one or two instances of occurrences which took place in his own county, showing how the late Government used their influence during elections. They appointed to office a man over 65 years of age, and paid him \$400 or \$500 per year, while, at the same time, he was publishing a newspaper in their interest. He (Mr. McCallum) considered that money was paid for the purpose of attempting to assist in defeating him in Monck. They made this position for the old man referred to, by creating an additional office, a useless office, so as to secure his services for the party, and the money was paid in the interest of the Grit party, and not in the interest of the country. This, he thought, he could prove, if necessary. In his opinion the public works of this country had for the past five years been run in the interest of the late Government, not for the good of the country, but in such a way as to bring all the political support possible to the hands of the Government. The standard by which appointees to office were judged by the late Government, was the amount of support they would bring to that Government. In his county, postmasters had systematically interfered in elections. He did not complain of that. The law allowed them to do so, or, at all events, it did not deprive

MR. MILLS.

them of their votes, and, as long as they exercised that right quietly, he did not think it should be a matter of complaint. Hon. gentlemen opposite claimed that Sir John A. Macdonald's Administration filled up all vacant offices before going out of power in 1873, but he found that in 1877 the number of civil servants in the Departments was 78 more than in 1873; so that, if Sir John's Government appointed more than they should have done, the Government of the hon. member for Lambton soon added to the number. A year ago a deputation from his (Mr. McCallum's) county waited on the then Minister of Public Works, with regard to some improvements required, and it was said that its members were treated very curtly and received a direct snubbing. Afterwards, when it was found that this conduct was operating against the Government candidate in Monck, a few days before the election, the work was ordered to be gone on with, so that what was refused to be done in the interest of the country was very soon done when it was found to be necessary in the interest of the party candidate. The hon. member for Lambton was ready to do anything to get votes. He (Mr. McCallum) thought there had been a great deal of mismanagement in the public works in his county. By looking into the Public Accounts, hon. gentlemen would see that it cost about \$23,000 more under the late Government than under Sir John A. Macdonald's Government, to pay the staff of employes on the Welland Canal. Hon. members might wonder how this occurred. It was because the late Government appointed men to office for political reasons, though their services were not required, and in many cases against the wish of the Superintendent. He (Mr. McCallum) did not want the Government to dismiss anyone from the public service without just cause, if their services were required in the interest of the country. But he wanted to get rid of these useless supernumeraries. He did not want to employ persons simply because they had given political support to the Government. He maintained that the late Government had violated every pledge they had made to the country, and he thought he would not be doing his duty if he did not raise his voice against

the manner in which these elections had been conducted. He did not wish the Government to adopt the policy that "to the victor belonged the spoils." Public officers should hold office for life, and during good behaviour; but directly they acted the partisan, they had nothing to complain of if they went under with the party they supported.

MR. MACMILLAN said that, in view of the remarks of the hon. member for Cardwell, he thought Régis Cardinal deserved dismissal. He did not desire that, whenever a Ministry went out of power, public officials should go with it. On the contrary, whenever a civil servant did his duty, he should be allowed to retain his position, so long as he did not interfere in politics. He regretted the late Postmaster-General was not in his seat, as he desired to ask that gentleman a question. He would, however, put the question in his absence, and at some future day he might, perhaps, receive an answer. There was, in his constituency, a Mr. Lilley, who took an active part in politics, in 1873, against the Administration, of which the ex-Postmaster-General was a member. A short time afterwards, with a view of getting rid of him, another post-office was established within a few hundred yards of the one already existing. After that had been in existence a little time, it was thought desirable that these two post-offices should be amalgamated. He was informed a report was asked for from the Inspector of the locality, which he believed that gentleman gave conscientiously. He asked for those papers last Session, and was told that there was no correspondence of any kind in connexion with the dismissal of Mr. Lilley. He had no doubt that there was no correspondence of that kind, for the simple reason that the report, as he was informed, had been sent back to the Inspector, with instructions to have it destroyed, so that it might appear as if no document of the kind had ever existed. If hon. gentleman who occupied the Treasury benches treated correspondence in that way they would be charged with being something more than letter-stealers. He was afraid they would be charged with the crime of being document-destroyers as well. He would have liked

the late Postmaster-General to have been present, in order that he (Mr. Huntington) might have stated whether this did not actually take place. He was exceedingly desirous that an answer should be given to this question, because he would be sorry to blame the hon. gentleman upon incorrect information. On the other hand, if he was guilty, he should not possess the right to be a member of this House, or at any rate of any Administration. In the constituency which was surrounded by the one he had the honour to represent, one of the public offices was used by Reformers for the purpose of caucus meetings during the last elections. This he regarded as an improper use of a public office. He had not, however, complained of this, because he did not desire that the present Government should carry out the system of dismissals which the previous Administration had adopted. But he wished it to be understood that, when such things did take place, they were known by the public generally. Another complaint which he had to make was in reference to the superannuation of the collector of Inland Revenue in London. Mr. McClary had performed the duties of that office without complaint. The late Administration, however, saw fit to superannuate him, without giving him any information upon the subject prior to his superannuation, and another gentleman was placed in his stead. He (Mr. Macmillan) held that Mr. McClary was better able to fill the office at the time he was superannuated than at the time he was appointed. He had grown with the business, and thoroughly understood it. Hon. gentlemen might say that he was superannuated because he was getting old. It was true he was sixty-two years of age; but, singularly enough, the late Government appointed a man fifty-eight years of age as collector of Customs, who had to work under the same roof, and who had never been in the Civil Service before. He maintained that Mr. McClary, under the circumstances, should have been continued in his office. With regard to Mr. Reed, who had been appointed Collector of Customs, he knew nothing of him as a public officer. The reason he was appointed was because he was one of the strongest opponents of the

present Administration in that part of the country. That fact, he supposed, was a sufficient guarantee that he was able to perform the duties of the office. Other dismissals had taken place in his county. A Mr. Nicholls was dismissed from the position of letter-carrier, because he told Mr. Glass that he would not support him. As soon as Mr. Glass's friends got into power he succeeded in getting this man dismissed from that minor position, though it was considerable to the man dismissed. He wished the late Minister of Public Works had been in his place, for the simple reason that he was so honest and conscientious that he would not allow an officer of the Government to interfere in his behalf. Notwithstanding this, one of the leading members of his (Mr. Mackenzie's) committee, in the last campaign, was the postmaster of Sarnia, who spent more of his time in the ex-Premier's committee-room than he did in his own office, and even he was allowed to retain his present position. He thought, under the circumstances, hon. gentlemen opposite would have done better to have left this matter where it was, for the result of this enquiry had led to an exposure of their own party, which reflected very little credit on their conduct.

MR. MACDONNELL said that this debate had certainly been irregular, and he thought it would have been better if the House had confined itself to the question. Almost every dismissal, or supposed dismissal, which had taken place, had been discussed. Questions had been brought up which the members of the late Administration were not prepared to answer. He had no complaint to make about the interference of officials. He held that one of the dearest rights enjoyed by a British subject was the right to vote at elections. He held that the right to return to that House representatives should not be lost simply because the subject held an office such as the postmastership in a country village. There was no law to that effect. If it were contended that the law proposed should be that any person holding a public office should be divested of the franchise, he would say that there was such a law on the Statute-book, that certain officials should not be allowed to vote or use

their influence for political purposes. If an official voted or used his influence in an election, was that officer to lose his position? No. There should be some Court in which such a case could be tried, and, if the charges were proved, then let the official be discharged, but, if they were not, he should be allowed to retain his position. He did not believe that any Government should have the absolute power of dismissal, without any means of appeal whatever being allowed the sufferer.

MR. BERGIN said he desired to say a word in reply to some remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). That gentleman was reported to have said that he had abandoned the Reform party because he was dissatisfied at not having been taken into the Cabinet, and that the opposition given to him by the Government, was because of his taking part against the then Postmaster-General in his election. To use an elegant phrase of the hon. member (Mr. Mills) he had been full of "traitorous" conduct towards the Postmaster-General.

SOME HON. GENTLEMEN: That is what is said.

MR. BERGIN said he would deal with the Cabinet matter first, and, when he remembered that so profound a philosopher as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and such able and such honourable men as Messrs. Laflamme, Ross and Coffin, had been taken into the Ministry, he did not think that for him or for anybody else to aspire to a place in a Government could be regarded as very great presumption. With regard to the Postmaster-General, there was a difference of opinion between the Premier then and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to-day, and the evidence was that the same train which had brought him (Mr. Bergin) a letter from the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, expressing his belief and his sincere desire that he (Mr. Bergin) should not be opposed at the coming election, also brought the then Postmaster-General (Lieutenant-Governor Macdonald) to ask his (Mr. Bergin's) friends in the town of Cornwall to select some other person to represent the constituency in the interest of the Government, and

Mr. Macdonald said he was sent there by the Government because they had no confidence in him (Mr. Bergin). As to the second reason advanced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) for the opposition offered to him in 1874—a reason which, if correct, would convict Mr. Mackenzie of duplicity and hypocrisy of the deepest dye—he would say that he had offered no opposition to the then Postmaster-General, nor could he have offered any, because he was not then before his electors—the writ had only the day before been issued. He (Mr. Bergin) had every reason to believe from the letter he had received, that Mr. Macdonald was in Cornwall to assist him in the approaching election. Mr. Macdonald called his (Mr. Bergin's) friends together, and they assembled to the number of some thirty or forty in a law office in the town, representing that he called the meeting at the instigation of the head of the Government to select some person to represent them, in whom this Government could rely, and offering the support of the Government to any amongst them. But, to their credit, every man spurned the offer. After that meeting was over, three gentlemen, deputed by it, waited upon the Premier at his office in this city. He denied the charge most indignantly, and stated that Mr. Macdonald had grossly misrepresented the facts, and had no authority to act as he had done. He would leave it to the House to judge of that action. If the views of the member for Bothwell were the true ones, then he must believe that upon that occasion, if upon no other, the Lieutenant-Governor had told the truth. If he slandered his leader, that leader was not in a position to complain, for he should not, as an honourable man, have sat one instant longer at the same Council Board with him; and this left room for the suspicion that the then Postmaster-General stated the truth, and that that the Premier, when he wrote him (Mr. Bergin) did so dishonestly and hypocritically, without any desire whatever to carry out the intentions he expressed.

MR. MILLS said he regretted very much the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergin) had not been in his seat when he (Mr. Mills) had spoken, or he was quite sure

the hon. gentleman would not have said what he did. He (Mr. Mills) had said nothing which he thought would be personally offensive to him. He (Mr. Bergin) alluded to a private communication he had received from Mr. Mackenzie.

MR. BERGIN: The communication was not marked private.

MR. MILLS said he had stated he had no personal knowledge of this matter, nor had he ever heard of it until the hon. member spoke. He understood that the reason why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergin) was opposed was because the hon. gentleman was opposed to the Postmaster-General, a member of the Administration. He had never spoken to his colleagues about it to ascertain whether the Government generally took any particular interest in the election or not. He understood that the opposition to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergin) in his own constituency had been caused by the Postmaster-General, and, further, the hon. gentleman could scarcely expect, even if he had received letters from Mr. Mackenzie, to have the support of the First Minister against his own colleague.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, on behalf of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), who was not then in his seat, he desired to say that, although he was not personally cognisant of this matter, he had not the smallest doubt that his hon. friend the moment he returned to his place would take an opportunity of setting matters right on this question. But, from his knowledge of the hon. gentleman during five years, he would take upon himself to assure the House that it was perfectly impossible that he (Mr. Mackenzie) could have sent a letter to the hon. gentleman directly opposed to one sent to the Postmaster-General in opposition to him.

MR. HESSON said he rose as a lifelong Conservative to repudiate the charge that they, on his side of the House, were desirous of introducing the American system. He did not desire to make any complaint of officials in his own riding; but he did say that, where men were in the employ of the Government, and, drawing their salaries from that Government, they could easily

afford to forbear mixing themselves up in political struggles. He was sure they all agreed it would be most unfortunate in the interests of this country to introduce the American system. He fancied that the hon. gentleman from Shefford, who had brought this question before the House, did not expect such a disagreeable and unpleasant *dénouement* for him and his party. The little cloud, at first only the size of a man's hand, had become a rushing torrent, overwhelming hon. gentlemen opposite with an accumulation of evidence of having themselves adopted the American system of "to the victors belong the spoils." He imagined there would be less of such enquiries from hon. gentlemen for the future.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at

Twenty minutes before
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 21st March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NIAGARA CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Galt, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Controverted Elections Act, 1874, a certificate and report in the matter of the Controverted Election for the Electoral District of Niagara, with the Township of Niagara thereto attached. He also stated that in conformity with the Act, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, directing him to alter the return for the said Electoral District, by expunging therefrom the name of Patrick Hughes, and inserting therein in lieu thereof, the name of Josiah Burr Plumb, as the member duly elected to represent the said Electoral District in the House of Commons of Canada in the present Parliament, and that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown

MR. HESSON.

in Chancery, a certificate that the said alteration had been made accordingly.

TRURO AND PICTOU RAILWAY TRANSFER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Tupper.)

FIRST READING.

MR. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 58) To amend the Truro and Pictou Railway Transfer Act, 1877. He explained that the object of the Bill was to remove certain difficulties which had been encountered in connection with the Act passed in 1874. Under the authority of that Act, the late Government made an agreement with the Government of Nova Scotia to transfer the Pictou branch of the Intercolonial Railway on certain conditions. The Government of Nova Scotia entered into a contract with certain parties in order to carry out these conditions. It had since transpired that there was some illegality in relation to the position of the contracting parties who undertook to construct the railway from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, so a difficulty arose between the company and the Government of Nova Scotia. Under these circumstances, an agreement had been come to between the Government of Nova Scotia and the contractors, with whom they agreed to construct the railway from New Glasgow to Pictou, and the Dominion Government. The present Bill was to carry out the arrangements that had thus been entered into between the three parties concerned, in order to carry out the spirit of the Act of 1874. The Dominion Government had taken the opportunity of providing for securing that the branch, after its transfer, should continue to be operated, or otherwise it would revert back in the first instance to the Government of Nova Scotia, and, failing to be operated by them, to the Government of the Dominion.

MR. DOULL said he would like to ask whether the Government were prepared to guarantee to the Coal Mining Association of Pictou county, that the Eastern Counties Railway should be fitted with sufficient coal rolling stock, not only to prevent the Company from losing their present business, but also to meet the increased trade, as shown in the

memorial of the Coal Mining Association of the 17th February to the Minister of Public Works. This, of course, had reference to the part of the road about to be transferred.

MR. TUPPER said this was not a Bill to provide for the transference of this branch. A measure to that effect was passed in 1874, and the present Bill only provided an increased guarantee on the part of the parties receiving the road, that they would continue to operate it in a thoroughly efficient manner. He did not think there was reason to apprehend any difficulty, as the Company would have the same interest in providing every facility for carrying on trade as the Government had.

Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT (1868) AMENDMENT
BILL.

(*Mr. Tupper.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 59) To amend the Railway Act, 1868, as respects bridges over railways, and railway bridges over canals and rivers.

Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY ACT
(1874) AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Tupper.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 60) To amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874. He said the Act was somewhat similar to that introduced by his predecessor last year, for the purpose of providing for the operation of the Pembina branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the connection with the American line of railway, in the hands of the St. Paul and Pacific Company. The present Bill, so far as that part of it went, ratified the lease made since Parliament rose, a copy of which had been laid on the table of the House. Difficulties were encountered in carrying out that arrangement, under one of its propositions, which assumed that the

road was to be operated down to Winnipeg, by the St. Paul and Pacific Railway Company. But there was a clause in that running arrangement, entered into by the late Government with Mr. George Stephen, representing the St. Paul and Pacific, in which it was provided that, whenever the Government were prepared to equip the branch, they or their assignees could operate it, and provide for a running arrangement, and an exchange of traffic between the St. Paul and Pacific and the Government on the Government line. The difficulties were very serious, inasmuch as the contractors for the construction of the line were not obliged to have the line finished until the end of the present year, and it was found practically an insuperable difficulty to put in force a contract with one set of contractors to operate the line, while another set had the line in their possession for purposes of construction. The present Bill provided for a ratification of an arrangement made with the contractor, Mr. Upper, and those associated with him, for the purpose of overcoming the difficulty, and securing the operation of the line a year sooner than under other circumstances they could hope it to be.

MR. ANGLIN: By the same lessee?

MR. TUPPER said no; but the new arrangement entered into would secure the running of the road one year earlier than otherwise.

Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

TENDERS AND CONTRACTS SUBMITTED.

MR. TUPPER laid before the House, —Articles of agreement entered into between Frazer, Manning & Co., and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented by the Minister of Public Works of Canada, to do the excavation, grading, bridging, ballasting, track-laying, etc., from Eagle River to Keewatin, 67 miles, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway (B); also, articles of agreement entered into between Thomas Marks, John Ginty, P. Purcell and H. Ryan, and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented by the Minister of Public Works of Canada, to do the excavation,

grading, bridging, ballasting, track-laying, etc., from English River to Eagle River, 118 miles, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway (A); and also, schedules of tenders for contracts, Canadian Pacific Railway, viz.: Schedule A, from English River to Eagle River, 118 miles;—Schedule B, from Eagle River to Keewatin, 67 miles,—and Schedule C, from English River to Keewatin, 185 miles.

STOCK GAMBLING SUPPRESSION BILL.

(*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) introduced a Bill (No. 61) To regulate stockbrokers and suppress gambling in stocks. He said that, in view of the depreciation in stocks during the last few years, he was convinced of the need of some legislation for the relief of stockholders and the public at large. During the last two or three years the quotations of stocks in Montreal and Toronto, as would be seen by the tables of the brokers, had considerably depreciated. The object of the Bill was to introduce into this country the provisions of the measures of other countries, and particularly of the law of England till as late as 1734, which regulated stockbrokers. Since 1734, the London stockbrokers were under the regulations of the corporation of London till 1870. In 1734, it was enacted that all sales of stock to be delivered or transferred in future by a party not in actual possession of the stock at the time of sale or transfer, should be null and void. In 1870, new provisions were made, placing the stockbrokers under different regulations, but preserving those old provisions. The law of the countries on the Continent of Europe contained more stringent provisions respecting brokers and the regulations of the Stock Exchange. In Prussia, Russia, and every commercial country, brokers were bound to keep registers of their sales, and enter the names of their principals, the buyer and the seller, and to deliver to them a copy under severe penalties. Stockbrokers were under State authority in those Continental nations. In France, there were still more stringent regulations; stockbrokers were not only prohibited from buy-

MR. TUPPER.

ing in other transactions than those entrusted to them by their principals, but from speculation in stocks on the Exchange or anywhere else. The justice of those dispositions seemed evident. If brokers were allowed to speculate when entrusted with sales of stocks, they would be purchasers, especially if not bound to disclose the names of the principals. The first provision of this Bill was that the stockbroker should be licensed by the Board of Trade of his locality, all the sales of unlicensed brokers to be null and void. The second provided that he should deliver to his principal the name of the party dealt or contracted with. In every case a dealer in merchandise would exhibit the names of his customers. Now there were more reasons for requiring this in the case of stockbrokers. The merchandise-broker was not in a position to do so much mischief as the other. Stocks were not only the property of the dealers in them, but, to a great extent, public property. Within twenty-four hours the stockbroker should give to his principal the names of the purchasers, prices and all the terms. The third clause provided that no broker should be personally interested in any contract, either as seller or buyer, directly or indirectly, nor speculate, in any way, stocks or securities, either in his own name, or by any agency. The other clauses intended introducing the provisions of the Act of 1734, and the later British Act of 1876, to the effect that a party, or broker, should not sell stock, unless actually in possession of the same. This would prevent the system of shorts and bulls, so detrimental to the stocks of this country. Another clause provided that a stockbroker, from the moment that he became insolvent, should no more act till reinstated or discharged by his creditors. They knew of a case in Montreal where a stockbroker failed for nearly two millions, and, although not yet discharged, was still operating on the Exchange to the detriment of *bond fide* holders of stocks. Besides, a stockholder convicted of fraud or felony should ever after be prevented from operating. The last clause provided that any breach of this Act should forfeit the offender's right to deal in stocks, and subject him to a penalty-

They needed some regulations to stop the gambling of stockbrokers, carried on, now, to the detriment of owners, generally, and to the national credit also.

Bill read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he called attention the other day to a false report of his remarks that had appeared in *Le Canadien*, of Quebec. To-day, he wished to notice a report in *Le Courrier du Canada*, also published in Quebec, on the same subject, which did him great injustice. The passage might be translated thus :—

"Mr. Huntington called the attention of the House to a report in *Le Canadien*, in which he was represented to have said that he was glad that the Province of Quebec had a Protestant for First Minister. He said that he withdrew these words if they had escaped him during the discussion."

Now what he had said as to *Le Canadien* was that its report was false, which every hon. gentleman who had heard him knew. With respect to *Le Courrier*, which was once a respectable paper, he was sorry to be told that the editor, or writer, was a member of this House, since the statement attributed to him (Mr. Huntington) was a falsehood. He did not charge anything improper to the intention of the writer, but it was his duty to say the first declaration was misrepresented, whether by a member of this House or somebody else shielded by this paper in the gallery; this was evidently a deliberate attempt to prop up an original falsehood.

MR. VALLÉE said he could not allow this opportunity to pass without expressing his views as to the course pursued in that House by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington). As an old member of the House, that hon. gentleman would condescend to permit one of its youthful members to tell him the effect produced by his repeated assaults upon new members and upon the population of the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman was singular in one thing. Ever prompt in attack, he was still prompter in running away. His bravery was known to all

public men in this country, and he possessed, in an eminent degree, the art of falling back. The hon. gentleman was just now giving a fresh exhibition of his agility in taking to his heels, for the hon. gentleman was afraid. He was afraid of the French-Canadian people; and, above all, of the dauntless youths to whom the people of Quebec had entrusted the duty of maintaining their rights in this House. He dreaded them; and that was the reason of his repeated onslaughts upon them since the beginning of the Session. But, if the hon. gentleman was so great a warrior, why did he not strike. He did not quite admit that the member for Shefford was a strong, powerful brave. He had one quality, and it was neither strength, nor power, nor courage. But was it, indeed, a quality entitling a man to distinction, that he should be ready, on any pretext, to break open desks, and abstract therefrom private correspondence, and to attack inoffensive persons? However, he did not know whether the hon. gentleman might be justly credited with that particular accomplishment. But there was one quality which he must be allowed to possess, and that was that he was old. Besides, with his well-known humility, he never failed to remind them of the fact, when he rose to reply to a young member of this House. The hon. gentleman had the experience of years; but the younger members of this House had the experience afforded by study. The youthful members of this House, he ventured to assert, were not afraid to grapple, on occasion, with the doughty member for Shefford. On that occasion, he would prove to that hon. gentleman that he repudiated what he said on the floor of this House. He appealed to every member of this House who had listened to him during the debate in question. The hon. member for Shefford did undoubtedly use the words reported in *Le Canadien*, and corroborated by *Le Courrier du Canada*. The words were an insult to the people of the Province of Quebec. They were as insulting as those he used at Argenteuil. They were uttered by the same man, and in the same narrow and fanatical spirit. The hon. gentleman seized every opportunity of insulting the faith and nationality of the people of Quebec, and took evident

pleasure in doing so. The hon. member for Shefford had insulted them the other day; he had insulted the people of the Province of Quebec when he said "that he (Mr. Huntington) was happy to see that, under the Joly Government, the Province of Quebec had emerged from the servitude in which a certain oligarchy had held them." He defied the hon. member to repudiate those words. The words had been taken down by several persons the moment they were uttered. He called upon any hon. gentleman present to contradict him if he could. Now, what was the oligarchy which had kept the Province of Quebec in servitude? They knew it; it was that great moral power which had kept the Province of Quebec in submission to the British Crown and faithful to the British flag, by inculcating respect for the rights of the conqueror and the institutions of the conquered. The people of the Province of Quebec, under the guidance of that oligarchy, had always shown themselves just and impartial towards other classes in the Dominion. The people in the Province of Quebec had acted with generosity towards their fellow-citizens of a different origin or religion from themselves. When great and serious questions placed the interests common to all in danger, the French-Canadian was ever in the van, on the battle-field as well as in the more peaceful struggle for constitutional freedom. The hon. member for Shefford had insulted not only the people of Quebec, but the whole people of the Dominion of Canada. For to attribute to the rest of the population the narrow views of the hon. member for Shefford would be to admit that the nobility, courage and generosity of heart and mind of the French-Canadian people, were sentiments too elevated to be appreciated. The people of Quebec had been, and still were, faithful to their religion, and they honoured the flag that protected their liberties. Was that a reason why the member for Shefford should insult them, and revile the power that kept them in that noble path? That oligarchy, which was the Catholic party, had never done violence to the conscience of others, or denied them their privileges. The hon. member for Shefford, nevertheless, had repeatedly

attempted to infringe on their rights and to deny them their liberties. He had begun that game once again, but he (Mr. Vallée) assured him that the representatives of the Province of Quebec would render his task a difficult or, perhaps, an impossible one to accomplish. They should not be left to fight single-handed in behalf of their institutions. The great Conservative party in that House would give them its support, for their struggles were for liberty and justice—two things which the vast majority in that House loved and revered. Who were the most faithful friends of the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec? Who were the most loyal subjects of Her Majesty? The hon. member for Shefford would not find them in the party which had sought to promote annexation to the United States. He knew it. The Conservative party of Quebec had ever been faithful to the union with Great Britain. Those who persecuted them, those who insulted them and reviled them, those who acted towards them as the member for Shefford did, were the real enemies of the Constitution. They were the oligarchy which desired to keep the Province in servitude. Of that oligarchy the hon. member for Shefford was the high priest, and, it was to be hoped, the sole partisan. Apart from that oligarchy—that of the hon. member for Shefford—he knew of none in the Province of Quebec. He would ask the Liberal party of the Province of Quebec, whether there was any other oligarchy. He asked whether one single member of that party would dare to rise in this House and give a definition of the word used by the hon. member for Shefford. Not one of them would tolerate the insult that hon. gentleman offered to the Canadian people, and, above all, to that great moral power in the Province of Quebec, which had ever maintained the spirit of loyalty to the British flag. He was gratified to think that all the members of the Liberal party did not share the views of the hon. member for Shefford. Nevertheless, he would mention a few facts, in order to show the House the tactics used by certain papers in the Liberal interest, and patronised by some of the leaders of that party. He held in his hand an article from one of those Liberal papers, the object sought

by which was to divide not merely the French-Canadian population of Quebec, but the different races constituting the people of the Dominion. He would refer the House to an article in *L'Eclair* of the 19th March, 1879, under the heading "LES SAINTS DU DERNIER JOUR." In that article, the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) was pointed out to the Catholics as having earned their hatred because, in his vote of censure against the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, he had received the support of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who, that paper said, was an Orangeman. The House would recognise in that the narrow and fanatical spirit of the member for Shefford. He, himself, (Mr. Vallée) had been the object of similar tactics on the part of the Liberal party, who had sought to render him odious in the eyes of Protestants. Whenever the Liberal press referred to him, in addressing Protestants, he was described as a fanatic and a monster. But when writing for Catholic readers, the same papers declared him to be an ally of the Orangemen. He would remind the House of a fact which many of its members had witnessed. During the last Dominion elections, the city of Quebec received a visit from the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Minister of Customs. There was a public demonstration, and he (Mr. Vallée) remembered that on that occasion he stood on the platform beside the hon. the Minister of Customs, and conversed with him. Would it be believed that, on the following day, the Liberal papers called down upon him the vengeance of the Catholic population of Quebec? And why? Because, as they said, the hon. the Minister of Customs was an Orangeman, and because he had shaken hands with an enemy of his religion. One day he was too much of a Catholic, and the next he was a Protestant. Such was the wretched course pursued by writers who seemed to mould their ideas upon the model afforded them by the hon. member for Shefford. There was, however, a difference between those papers and the hon. member for Shefford. The papers maintained on the morrow what they had written the day before, whereas his valiant and venerable friend would repudiate to-day what he had said the day

before. He would conclude by saying that the hon. member for Shefford was wrong in constituting himself the standard-bearer of fanaticism, for it must be evident that, in a free country such as this, there was common ground upon which all could meet, while exhibiting due respect for the faith and nationality of others—the general good and the prosperity of the country.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he did not know whether he understood the hon. gentleman to say that he (Mr. Vallée) was the author of that letter. If not, he did not understand why that hon. gentleman had interfered with his complaint as to that statement. If he was the author, he (Mr. Huntington) thought the House would understand that there were good reasons why he and those connected with the politics of Lower Canada, should resist the party which was led by gentlemen of that class. The hon. gentleman stood up in the face of every member of the House who knew him (Mr. Huntington), and asserted that he was in the habit of insulting Lower Canada in his remarks. There was no member here, possessing any experience in this House, who did not know that the observation was false from beginning to end. He had never said a word disrespectful of his native Province. It was not because he was obliged to notice false reports by gentlemen deliberately abusing the position they occupied that, therefore, he was abusing the Province from which he came. It did not follow, because he had spoken of the DeBoucherville Government as an oligarchy, and thanked God that the Joly party had been able to upset it, that he was abusing that Province. Those French journals were trying to make it appear that he intended some insult to the Roman Catholics by the word oligarchy. He never said, here or elsewhere, a word disparaging to the Roman Catholic or any other Church. Let him tell the Conservative party of Lower Canada that he was not there by their suffrages, and he laughed to scorn the purpose of which there was multiplied, recognised evidence of making him the victim this Session. Though the hon. gentleman did not think much of giving him the oppor-

tunity, he (Mr. Huntington) believed he would be able to defend himself. As to all the accusations that could be brought against him, he had the record of an honest man, who never was charged with wrong in private life; who, to-day, under any organised attempt to crush him, dared any hon. gentleman to move for a Committee of Enquiry into his public acts. He was not young, but expected to live to see all those petty traducers, those mosquitoes of public life in Lower Canada, buried out of sight, till those persecutions aimed at him would look ridiculous in the eyes of the country; ay, till the Minister of Customs himself would forget his Argen-teuil speech, and his declaration that the Liberals of Lower Canada ought to be supported by its people. That advice was acted upon, to a large extent, since, and would be in future. He had not spoken against any Lower Canada institution, and had no prejudice against its people or the Roman Catholic religion. Half the people of Lower Canada, who had supported the Liberal party, were as good Catholics as those sustaining the other, the party of his traducers. If he had opposed the one party, it did not follow that he condemned their religion. The county, which the hon. gentleman opposite said regretted the verdict of 1874, might have an early opportunity of repeating it. He expected to see the time when the Conservatives would not be proud of this Session's work, and when the present rulers of the Dominion would not be so popular as at this moment.

MR. POPE (Compton) said that, if the hon. gentleman too often of late suffered from the attacks of his opponents, he brought them on himself. He never rose to speak that he did not condemn what he called those miserable attacks. He said that the result of the agitation and the elections was to sustain his political friends; but did ever a Government receive a larger Lower Canada majority than the present?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I was speaking of the Quebec elections.

MR. POPE said that there had not been a fair and honest expression of the public opinion at the last Provincial

MR. HUNTINGTON.

elections; the people were excited and alarmed by the prospect of the heavy taxation, and the question of the constitutionality of the Lieutenant-Governor's conduct had little to do with the elections. The people in Montreal felt that they had been dealt with injuriously in this matter, and the elections turned very much on the injustice to which they were subjected in regard to the railroad arrangements. He must confess, whether right or wrong, that the Government of Mr. DeBoucherville was unpopular from the causes which he had mentioned. He thought it came with ill grace from his hon. friend to rise in this House every few minutes and declare that everybody, except himself and a half-dozen gentlemen behind him, were a set of rascals and scoundrels, trying to put him in a false position. No one had tried to raise a conspiracy. Was it to be presumed for a moment that he was conspiring in this matter? The accusation rested on him (Mr. Pope) as well as on other hon. gentlemen, and he would like to know on what ground the hon. gentleman made such an accusation. The hon. gentleman, however, could be assured that he would not deter them, by the noise he made, from defending their principles.

MR. ANGLIN said it must be, by this time, evident to most hon. members that there was a determination to present his hon. friend the member for Shefford before the people of this country, and particularly before the people of the Province of Quebec, as one who, repeatedly and deliberately, chose to insult the religion of the majority of the people of that Province. That was manifested in a recent debate in that House, and it had been manifested by several newspapers, to which his hon. friend had been compelled to refer. Whatever might be the views of his hon. friend with regard to the politics of that Province, or whatever might be said, properly or improperly, at the right time and in the right place, in regard to the course his hon. friend had taken for some years past, in the political conflicts of the Dominion, and in the political struggles of the Province of Quebec, there could be nothing to justify the course of deliberate misrepresentation used in this House. The hon. gentleman was reported to have

said, in a recent debate, that there was reason to rejoice because Quebec had now a Protestant Premier. Such language the hon. member did not use, nor did he use any language that could, possibly, be construed to suggest any such idea. There was nothing in the language he used that any fair-minded man could regard as an insult to the Catholics of Quebec, or that was intended to have any reference whatever to the religion of the gentleman who was now Premier of that Province. Yet they found the language was distorted, and when the hon. gentleman rose in his seat to complain of that distortion, instead of the admission being fairly made that he had been misrepresented, they found an attempt was made to confirm the slander, by the statement that the hon. gentleman had withdrawn the expression. They all knew that he did not withdraw anything. He simply denied that he ever used any such language. He had nothing to withdraw. He did not insult anyone, or intend to insult anyone, and it was a gross attack on the rights of members of this House, that the language of a member should be deliberately and persistently misrepresented as the language used by his hon. friend on that occasion had been. He listened with pleasure and attention to every thing his hon. friend said, and he was one witness, and he believed there were a hundred others, who listened attentively to his remarks on that occasion, who could prove that the hon. member showed no intention to insult the Province of Quebec, and that he said nothing that could be fairly or reasonably construed into an insult of any kind. Nor was there an insinuation or suggestion of an insult. His language was grossly misrepresented, and the hon. gentleman had a right to complain. The attack made on him was entirely unwarranted. They were not here to discuss what the hon. gentleman might have done on any other occasion, or whether his Argenteuil speech was or was not such a speech as an hon. member should deliver. The only question was his right to complain about the gross misrepresentation of the words he had used in this House.

MR. DOMVILLE said he thought it came with very bad grace from the hon.

member for Gloucester to complain about these newspaper reports. The hon. gentleman's own paper had placed him (Mr. Domville) in as false a position as he could possibly be placed in.

MR. GEOFFRION : Two wrongs do not make a right.

MR. DOMVILLE said nor did two fools make a wise man. This paper deliberately insinuated and stated what was false. It stated that he (Mr. Domville) had informed the House that Mr. Purdy did not know of his dismissal until the 7th, and that he (Mr. Domville) left St. John on the 6th, and that, consequently, he could not have signed any petition to keep him in his place. He thought that, when papers, owned and edited by hon. gentlemen, made these accusations against members of the House, they should not complain when their own friends were attacked. The paper also stated that he was a party to notes made for election purposes, which afterwards went to protest. This statement was totally without foundation, and placed him in a false position in the country. The hon. member for Gloucester, before he undertook to find fault with the articles in other newspapers, should remember some of the severe articles he had written himself regarding members of the House. He trusted this would be a lesson to him to so tone down the *Freeman* newspaper of St. John that it would not pass any further reflections upon members on that side of the House.

MR. HAGGART said he could well understand the article which had been written in *Le Canadien*, respecting the hon. member for Shefford. That hon. gentleman certainly mentioned in his remarks the name of Mr. Joly as a Protestant.

AN HON. MEMBER : No, no.

MR. HAGGART said he heard it distinctly, as also had several hon. gentlemen who sat near him. He thought it was right for him to state that he understood the hon. gentleman to make the remark of which he complained.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED.

JOSIAH BURR PLUMB, Esquire, member for the electoral district of the town of Niagara, with the township of Niagara thereto attached, having taken the oath, was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Tupper, and took his seat.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Tilley for the second reading of resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th.)

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he would suggest, in accordance with the understanding which he thought was arrived at the other day, that, before they went into the regular debate, the Minister of Finance should complete his financial statement.

MR. TILLEY said that he had purposed making his additional statement under the different heads as they were taken up. He, however, would make it on the resumption of the debate on Wednesday afternoon.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said, in resuming the debate on the tariff, he felt great diffidence in taking part in the discussion of a subject fraught with so much importance to the country. As a young member, whose political existence was only created on the 17th September last, he could not conceal from himself that he might be looked upon by old members as somewhat presumptuous, in attempting to take, in any degree, a prominent part in the discussion; but the generosity of the House of Commons was proverbial, and in that he felt all due allowance would be made, and the courtesy that was always extended to young members would be cheerfully accorded to him. The question before the House was one of great gravity. It was one which proposed to revolutionise the whole fiscal system of the Dominion, and was promoted with the view of reinstating a state of things which had passed away some years ago. It was one that

MR. HAGGART,

had been discussed freely, from the Atlantic Ocean, in the east, to the Pacific, in the west, during the last two or three years, and was at last made a straight party issue at the late general election. Years before this, however, it had engaged the attention of the people; and, so far back as 1858, it was brought before the then Parliament, and the result was the adoption of a tariff which was so judiciously adjusted that, while it was eminently for revenue purposes, it, at the same time, fostered and encouraged native industries, and fairly started the country on the high-road to national greatness. He felt that he must congratulate the country upon having statesmen at the head of affairs who were not only of such marked ability as to be able to propound and inaugurate a satisfactory policy, but who so well appreciated the well-understood wishes of the people at large as to possess determination enough to carry it out. It was a matter of great satisfaction to him (Mr. Robertson) to know that the charges made by hon. gentlemen opposite and their organs throughout the country, that the right hon. gentleman who now was leader of the Government was not sincere in his advocacy of the policy of Protection were found to be utterly unfounded; so much so that the leader of the Opposition was forced to state, from his place in this House, that the Government had fully redeemed their pledges to the people. That admission for ever set at rest the oft-repeated statement of want of sincerity. As to the main question, if hon. gentlemen would carry their thoughts back to the state of affairs which prevailed in old Canada previous to the year 1858, they would remember that the manufacturing interest of the country formed a very unimportant branch of Canadian enterprise. It was not until that year that any effort was made to establish such industries in this country. But, in consequence of the then fiscal system, it was found that a protection was offered and guaranteed to home productions, and consequently many business centres sprung up in Canada, among which was the city of Hamilton, which he (Mr. Robertson) had the distinguished honour to represent in this House—an honour the more distinguished, since this city had been complimented by the hon.

the Minister of Finance, in his able and admirable Budget speech, by being designated as the first manufacturing city in the Dominion. He (Mr. Robertson) felt that the compliment was a well-deserved one, but he did not any the less appreciate it, and he was sure his constituents would join with him in thanking the honourable gentleman for the kindly recognition. It was true Hamilton was the seat of nearly every manufacturing industry in the Dominion, and it was surrounded by one of the most magnificent agricultural districts in Canada.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Hamilton is the hub.

MR. ROBERTSON said yes, he was proud to think that Hamilton might be considered the hub of the manufacturing enterprise of the country. In 1858, it did not occupy that position, nor anything approaching to it; in fact it was looked upon more as a commercial centre, where it was hoped to establish a great emporium for imported goods. But there was a dormant energy lying there, and the energy and aptitude of its citizens soon took advantage, and availed themselves of that protection which the then lately established tariff guaranteed to native industry. This was the case in many other places in the country, and they found, in a very few years, that they could boast of numerous branches of trade springing up, which proved of inestimable advantage to the whole Province. The tide of prosperity set in. Our cities, towns, and villages more than doubled their populations. New towns and villages sprung up all over the country, and the agricultural interests thereby became greatly enhanced, and that great desideratum to the farmer, a home market, was created, and farming lands almost quadrupled in value. This state of things continued from year to year, and the tariff was allowed to remain as it was, until negotiations were commenced with a view to create the Confederation of all the British American Provinces into one great Dominion. From circumstances which then prevailed, it was thought in the interest of bringing about that union, which had since so happily been consummated, that it was necessary to lower the tariff, out of deference to some of the Provinces. At

that time it could safely be done. Our American neighbours were then engaged in a fearful internecine war—a struggle which threatened to tear asunder the great American Republic, and one which required the utmost efforts of the American people to put down. During this time they became great consumers; in fact, they were destroying, beyond the hope of recovery, millions of money, week by week; they could not produce; their whole energies were demanded and required to save their country from destruction. This was a time which proved of great importance to Canada; its every industry, whether agricultural or manufacturing, flourished beyond all precedent, but the indomitable energy of the American people at last put down the strife, the war came to an end, the slave was set free, and the nation could set itself to work to place its house in order. Up to this time, Canada had a large export trade into the United States, but the "Morrill tariff" had been in force, and, although the Americans, for the reasons before stated, could not avail themselves of the advantages which it afforded, so long as the war was in full blaze, yet no sooner was it put down than they at once set their workshops in order, their swords were turned into pruning hooks, and their great and inexhaustible energies found full scope in developing the manufacturing industries of the country. They at once became producers, and although hampered with a large war debt, soon succeeded in competing with the world, and, instead of Canada finding a market there for her productions, the Americans invaded our markets and by that means crippled us, and took possession, so to speak, by underselling us, by slaughtering their wares here, and driving Canadian industry to the wall. This happened in 1873-74, at a time when, to the great misfortune of fair Canada, she had the most incapable set of Ministers at the helm of State that any country was ever burdened with. Then was the time that our Government should have exhibited a determination to do something for the country; then was the time that it was all-important that the men in power should have proved themselves something more than "flies on the wheel"—should have proved themselves able to discern

the signs of the times, and prepared to ward off that blow which was impending over this Dominion; but they proved to be unequal to the task. They were behind the age. They were wedded to the principles of the Free-trade *doctrinaires*, and, like Nero, they fiddled while Rome was burning. Happily these gentlemen have passed all but off the political stage. It was true, a few of them had yet a political existence; but their pinions were so clipped, and their power so completely dissipated, that the only privilege they now possessed was to sit in the corner, and find fault with the efforts of others, who were now trying to establish a new state of affairs, and to remove that depression which they, when they had the power, would not, in any way, attempt. In the introductory part of his (Mr. Robertson's) remarks, he had stated that the question of Protection had, for some time, engaged, to a greater or less degree, the public mind, and, if the House would excuse him (Mr. Robertson) in alluding to the question as one in some way personal to himself, he would observe that, in 1867, when he had the honour to contest South Wentworth with the hon. gentleman who now represented it in this House, he made it one of the most prominent paragraphs in his address to the electors, and advocated it during the canvass with some degree of success, before that constituency, which was entirely rural or agricultural. It was true, his hon. opponent pooh-poohed the idea, and endeavoured to make the honest yeomanry of South Wentworth believe that it was their interest that Free-trade principles should entirely prevail in this country; but, before the canvass was over, he had to modify his views, and admitted that Protection was necessary for the country. He (Mr. Robertson) alluded to this matter in order to show the House that, so far as he was concerned, he had always been a Protectionist; he had given some thought to the subject, and, while the theory of Free-trade, at first sight, looked pleasing, yet, to carry it to a proper conclusion, it must be *free-trade in earnest*, not one-sided, such as England now had—her ports open to all the world, while all the ports of the world was closed against her. That was not

Mr. ROBERTSON.

free-trade, it was quite the contrary, and, while England might be able to stagger through with it, this Dominion, situated as she was, with a Chinese wall erected along her whole southern frontier, could not afford to throw her ports open. These were his views in 1867, expressed in the month of July, and which he had held ever since, and he had now the proud satisfaction of standing here advocating those views, as the representative of one of the largest manufacturing constituencies in this Dominion. He would ask to be allowed to read from a learned work in his hand—learned, because it contained the utterances of the learned representatives of the people in Parliament—the men who were generally supposed to express the concentrated wisdom of over four millions of people:—

“It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufactures without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions. This had been notably the case with Great Britain herself; and, I think, the assertion that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive power of a nation is incontrovertible. We have had an illustration of it in the neighbouring nation. The Southern States were without manufacturing industries, while the Northern States were filled with them, and the advantage this gave them resulted in the suppression of the rebellion.” * * * * *

“I believe that the interests of the nation, at large, would be promoted by judicious protection; I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufacturer, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were three thousand miles away. With a home market of this kind, established by protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops. The purchasing power of money is not a correct measure of the purchasing power of labour. A farmer raises a bushel of corn, which he sells for fifty cents in a foreign market, and with the proceeds he can buy three yards of cotton; but, supposing the manufacturers are brought to his door, and the better market which it creates increases the price to sixty cents or seventy cents per bushel, and, although import duties are levied on cotton from Manchester, so as to add largely to its price, still he may be able to buy four yards of cotton with his bushel of corn, instead of the three yards he was able to purchase before, as the purchasing power of his labour is increased. We have at our own doors all the illustrations and experience of protection, and its benefits required for our government and guidance.

The United States have adopted a Protective policy, under which their manufactures have been fostered and promoted, until, in 1870, their products reached the sum of \$4,253,000,000, giving employment to 2,000,000 operatives and disbursing over \$775,500,000 in wages." * * * * "Look at the progress of the cotton trade in that country. Previous to the import duties on foreign cottons in 1824, British manufactures crushed out all efforts to establish factories in the Republic; but the imposition of 25 per cent. duty on foreign cottons, had the effect, in a few years, not only of building up manufactures, but led to the production of an article better in quality and lower in price than the Americans received from British manufactures before their own industries were established. In 1860, the United States were exporters of cottons, exporting nearly ten per cent. of the whole amount manufactured. The same way with the iron trade. All attempts to establish iron industries were crushed out by foreign competition, and high prices were maintained at intervals,—higher on the average than the percentage necessary to produce them in the United States at a profit. But when a protective duty was imposed, iron manufactures were established, and, in a short time, the price of iron was brought down several dollars per ton, and it is now sold cheaper than the British iron ever was offered for on that market."

These were his (Mr. Robertson's) views. He had always entertained them, and they were identical with those expressed by him whenever he had an opportunity of addressing the people on this subject; and they were sound views, and, when he (Mr. Robertson) first read that admirable speech—which he now found in the Canadian *Hansard* for 1876—he thought some one had taken possession of one of his old speeches; but, in view of what he heard the other night from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), he was astonished beyond measure, when, on looking for the name of the gentleman who had expressed such good sound Protectionist views, he found the name of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) as the author of that great speech, which was delivered in this House on the 29th February, 1876. The same hon. gentleman honoured them with a deliverance as stated; he still lived—was still here, and, as he (Mr. Robertson) saw him rise to speak, he expected (remembering what he had said in 1876) to hear an eloquent oration in support of the Government policy; that he was going to say that this tariff was exactly what this country wanted; that the principles for which he had been contending for years, in Parliament and

out of it, were now, at last, brought down, and about being made the law of the land; that heretofore he had not had eloquence or persuasive power sufficient to induce his hon. friends, the late Government, to bring down such a measure; but that now the principles which he had always advocated were recognised by the Government of the day, and he was going to advise that the tariff be allowed to go through *nem. con.* But, as he went on with his speech, and waxed warmer in eloquence, he took the *other view* of the question. He (Mr. Robertson) looked at him with astonishment, and, after the hon. gentleman had sat down, could not help saying to himself, in the words of a great poet:

"Shrine of the mighty! can it be
That this is all remains of thee?"

Why, the hon. gentleman was as strong an advocate in 1876 of this policy of Protection as he was opposed to it now. Far stronger then, because he could not now bring forward arguments to refute those he used in 1876. The hon. gentleman now said "the country had been entrapped. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches shrewdly took advantage of the existing depression." Would to Heaven that the hon. gentlemen who now were in the cold shades of Opposition had taken advantage of the state of affairs which existed three or four years ago, as well as they did now, and done something for the country, instead of sitting in their places, sucking their thumbs, if he might be pardoned the expression, and declaring they were but "*flies on the wheel.*" If one thing more than another proved the utter incapacity of the Government of that day, it was that they did not rise equal to the occasion; and, if one thing more than another proved that the right hon. Premier and his colleagues were the men who were the most capable of ruling the country, it was that they had proved themselves masters of the situation, and had prescience enough to discern the signs of the times, and the wants of the people. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) complained that the hon. gentlemen now in possession of the Treasury benches had taken advantage of the state of affairs. Well, it was their business to take advantage of the state of

affairs ; it was their business, when the country was in a depressed condition, to bring forward such measures as would give relief. They should not only be the steersmen at the helm, but they should find the motive power to propel the ship of State into a haven of prosperity. He did not think it necessary to discuss the general question with the hon. gentleman opposite, seeing that the country had pronounced so decisively upon their policy ; doubtless, the House would be again treated to the platitudes of *doctrinaires* and learned men, who believed in the Free-trade theory ; the changes would be rung upon them, and every effort would be made to convince the people, against their will, that what they were seeking for now was the worst possible thing for the country. He proposed, however, to pass in review some of the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite, when finding fault with the tariff—gentlemen who must have been conscious of that gleam of happy sunlight which was thrown over this House when the hon. the Minister of Finance, in terms made eloquent by the proud satisfaction that he was at last able to lay it on the table, spread before the country a measure of relief for our long-suffering people. The Ministerial side of this House bore unmistakable evidence of its gratification. Sunny Italy was to be seen here, but clouds as dark as Erebus were gathering on the brows of the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was admitted that the Government had kept their pledges ; yes, they had, and that was precisely what troubled the hon. gentlemen. They hoped that the right hon. Premier and his colleagues would not keep their pledges, and that they, the Opposition, would be able to go back to the constituents of the supporters of the Government, and say to them that they had been deceived. But the game of deception, it was to be hoped, had been played for the last time—it had prevailed for five long years—and the people were not to be trifled with any longer ; they were in earnest, they had placed implicit confidence in the hon. member for Lambton and his followers ; they had given them every support—the country, unfortunately, believed in them ; they had been (in the words of the hon. member for North Norfolk) deceived into placing

Mr. ROBERTSON.

them in power ; but, no sooner did they get possession of the Treasury benches, than the work of deception began, and was carried on to the bitter end—they saw the result. It was somewhat amusing to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) complain of the tariff, because, as he chose to characterise it as being “a servile imitation of the American tariff,” he (Mr. Robertson) was astonished, when the hon. member made that a ground of objection. In the first place his (Mr. Robertson’s) curiosity led him to refer to the Parliamentary Companion, and there he found what he had always understood to be the fact—that the hon. gentleman was a native-born American. Apart from this fact, which he (Mr. Robertson) presumed the hon. gentleman was proud of, he (Mr. Robertson) contended that it was right and proper for Canadians to take advantage of the experience of others, and especially their American cousins, whose circumstances were very similar to their own. It was one of the great advantages we enjoyed, in living on their northern boundary, that we could profit by their experience. We knew why they had gone on prospering to such an extent, and we were now endeavouring to follow their example. The hon. gentleman said that “there was a great depression in the United States, brought about by that fatal policy of Protection which they had inaugurated years ago.” Hon. gentlemen had indulged in a great deal of this kind of argument, especially when they changed their position and went back on what they used to preach three or four years ago, and they painted a picture of a state of things which, in fact, did not exist. Depression in the United States did not exist to the extent it did in Canada to-day. They were full of energy, full of enterprise, and were carrying out a sound policy of Protection, and going on in a career of greatness, and it would no longer do for hon. gentlemen here to hold up the bugaboo that the United States were now suffering from over-protection. The Americans were a shrewd people and understood what they were about ; the Free-traders among them had made effort after effort to change their tariff, but had been unsuccessful. The hon. gentlemen opposite were but poor prophets. They had constantly pre-

dicted a great popular movement against Protection and in favour of Free-trade, but that movement never came about. It was said that there was danger of exciting the hostility of the Americans, and they might retaliate. It was, however, high time Canada threw down the gauntlet, and said "We are going to legislate for ourselves, and ask no favours or advice from Americans." But he did not apprehend the difficulty suggested, nor did he believe such a spirit existed among the American people. It might exist among individuals in this country who used the cry for the purpose of creating difficulties, in order to carry out their views. The correspondence and expressions of opinion in the American press showed that our neighbours were of more generous stock, even if they thought we were wrong, to bring about retaliation. But the hon. member for North Norfolk, in 1876, was not afraid of a retaliatory policy—he then strongly urged that the Canadians should adopt such a policy against the Americans. He found in this speech already so largely quoted, that the hon. member made use of these words:—

"I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted which would bring the United States to terms, and would, at least, protect us against slaughter invoices."

These were the hon. gentleman's words then, and he had given them no reason whatever for the great change which had taken place in his views—if, really, such a change had taken place. But on this point he (Mr. Robertson) had been favoured with letters from some leading gentlemen in the United States, who had been Protectionists all their lives, and from these communications he would read one or two paragraphs. Henry C. Baird, of Philadelphia, the well-known writer and Protectionist, wrote:

"I hope you will impress on the public men in Canada the important fact that, unlike Free-traders, especially the English, we, the Americans, believe in the doctrine of 'live and let live.' I, for one, hope Canada will go ahead and make a tariff regardless of the Americans or our interests in this country."

E. J. Mason, tariff editor of the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, wrote:

"The experience of the United States cannot be a guide for Canada. What will suit our

conditions might be alien to the necessity of Canada. The first question and the last will be, 'How will this affect the interests of Canada?' The proposed tariff is for the sole benefit, use and behoof of Canada, and should look no further, except as the experience of other countries may indicate—an error to be avoided or a wisdom to be imitated. In my opinion the great danger to be feared is that the duties will be put too low, and the free list be made too large."

Those were the opinions of two gentlemen of the United States who were known as men of great ability, and Protectionists. The Americans knew perfectly well they would lose nothing if we were prosperous. Other writers in the United States had expressed similar views. *Judge Kelly, who had been elected to Congress for ten terms—20 years—consecutively, and was the leading Protectionist in that body,* had expressed the most decided approval of our proposed policy. *Many manufacturers in the United States, whose products had found a market in Canada, responded in the most cordial manner to requests for information, devoting much time and some expense, with an unselfishness not often found among Free-traders.* All these parties believed in Protection as a principle, and said that, although some of the manufactures of the United States might be excluded from Canada by the proposed tariff, yet the increase of prosperity among their northern neighbours would, in other ways, benefit them; and, if not, they were consistent in their advocacy of Protection as a sound policy. From men holding such views, they need fear no retaliatory legislation. The same policy that had rendered their country prosperous, would, they believed, contribute to our prosperity. The hon. member for North Norfolk need give himself no concern in regard to the apprehended unfriendly legislation of the United States. He (Mr. Robertson) saw by the morning papers, that the *New York Herald* was advising the recognition of that spirit of reciprocity which breathed in this tariff, and was looking at it in the proper light. Speaking of this tariff, that paper said:

"The Canadian new tariff must cause the spread of manufactures in Canada, and we advise Mr. Everts to hurry up reciprocity, ere they take such deep root in the country that they cannot be moved. If, by this new Canadian policy, new interests

are created, and encouraged to establish themselves throughout the Dominion, they will obtain such a firm hold on the country that, by-and-by, no Government will dare to disturb them. *Therefore, let something be done now to preserve Canada as a market for American manufactured goods, or soon it will be too late.*"

Those were the words of a wise journalist, who echoed from the distance what was known to this Government, that the policy now being inaugurated in Canada was the death-knell to any reciprocity between Canada and the United States. Without discussing the question of reciprocity, he urged that the Canadian people should have the opportunity of establishing manufactures in the Dominion. Manufactures and agriculture must go hand in hand, and neither could prosper without the other. He had alluded, a few moments ago, to the satisfaction with which the House and the country had received the Budget speech, and it now afforded him great pleasure to read a telegram and an extract from one of many letters breathing the same universal spirit of pleasure. The following was from a large firm which manufactured machine tools :—

"We are exceedingly well pleased with the tariff. The Ministry have nobly redeemed their pledges, and saved the country."

A gentleman largely engaged in the woollen trade wrote as follows :—

"I write you to say how pleased I am with the tariff. I feel every confidence that before two years are over we will find the country progressing in a substantial way. I am very much pleased to notice how Mr. Tilley has framed the tariff, as he has removed nearly every difficulty surrounding our manufacturing interests."

Those messages were sent by men who had the interests of the country at heart, who were indeed its bulwarks, because, although the agricultural interests were very great and important, yet they would be of little value if our manufacturing interests were crushed out. It had also been said that, while we would excite retaliation from the Americans, we must look out and see what England would do. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had brought to the attention of the House a notice of a question that had been given by the hon. member for Kircaldy in the British House of Commons, in reference to the proposed Canadian tariff, and he

MR. ROBERTSON.

(Mr. Robertson) had seen by the morning papers, that a much more distinguished individual than the hon. member for Kircaldy, the Right Hon. John Bright, had also brought the attention of the English House of Commons to the subject, by putting a notice on the paper that he would ask the Government, whether it was proposed to represent to Canada the impolicy of a war of tariffs between the different portions of the Empire, and whether it was true that the instructions to the Marquis of Lorne for the first time omitted the clause requiring that Bills imposing differential duties should be reserved for the Royal approval. And it was thus treated by the *Times*, the leading organ of public opinion in England—and in such a way as would commend it to the good opinion of all those who believed that it was the policy of the Empire to let Canada manage her own affairs. The article said :

"Since the Canadians wish Protection, they must go their own way, but the result is not the less deplorable."

The *Times* also said :

"The late election in Canada was a manifestation of the popular will, and the popular will must be obeyed. It must rule in Canada, and we have long since abandoned all power—even if we cherished the wish—to interfere with its supremacy there. This is practically the answer that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach will make to Mr. Bright. This tariff has been demanded by the Canadian people. We cannot approve of it; we may, and must think it unwise. We are thoroughly convinced that it will disappoint the inhabitants of Canada, in proving an injury instead of a benefit to them. But, when all this is said, what then? We may send Lord Lorne lecture after lecture to be read to his advisers, but we shall do no more. Perhaps it is true that the usual instruction was omitted requiring him to reserve for Her Majesty's approval all Bills imposing differential duties. Whatever may be the truth about it, we must remember that the differential duties now proposed differ from those to which the instruction has been generally understood to refer. The differential duties against which precautions have been taken, were differential duties against exports from the United Kingdom. The differential duties now suggested are levelled against the United States. We cannot recoil from the freedom of action we have conceded to our Canadian fellow subjects, but we are not debarred from the liberty of criticism on their policy."

He took it, as the *Times* stated, that we had a right to legislate for ourselves, the right to have an opinion and to exer-

cise that opinion with regard to protection to our native industries, as well as with regard to every other matter. We all looked back with patriotic pleasure to the Mother Country; we were proud of the relation that existed between us; and the spirit of true loyalty which was seated in the breasts of Canadians for old England and our much-beloved Queen could not be, and was not surpassed by Britons anywhere, at home or abroad, and he (Mr. Robertson) fervently prayed that the day was in the far distant future when that cord of sympathy which bound the parent and child in its tender and endearing coils of love and patriotic affection should be severed. There was no danger of such a calamity. We had long had the right to manage our own affairs, under the fostering care of her protection, and that state of things not being disturbed, as, judging from the article in the *Times* just quoted, there was no chance of its being, there was no doubt, as to the future of this, one of the brightest jewels in Queen Victoria's diadem. Before bringing his remarks to a close, he (Mr. Robertson) would like to allude to the spirit of confidence which the new tariff had inspired. He held in his hand the leading newspaper of the city of Hamilton, the *Spectator*, and in it he found an article headed in these words, in reference to what was going on in his constituency:—"REVIVING INDUSTRIES. HOW THE NEW TARIFF OPERATES. THE ROLLING MILLS TO RESUME IMMEDIATELY. THE CLOCK FACTORY. AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS MAKING ARRANGEMENTS TO COME TO CANADA. OTHER BUSINESS IMPROVEMENTS." It might be said that such words amounted to little. So they might; but, "straws show which way the wind blows," and there was no doubt that what was reported in the *Spectator* would be found to be absolutely true. This indicated, in a slight degree, the state of affairs in his (Mr. Robertson's) own constituency; that was but a fair reflex of the whole country. The people at last were able to hold up their heads and look forward to a prosperous future. The farmer congratulated himself on the prospect of the good times coming. The manufacturer saw a wide and extended home market for the fruits of his industry and

enterprise. The mining interest observed the prospect of great developments. The artisan could see the certainty of steady and remunerative employment; and the labourer was assured of that great desideratum, fair remuneration for an honest day's work. All classes would enjoy the happy prospect, and he (Mr. Robertson) had no doubt that, before two years had rolled over, they would see this Dominion on the high-road to greatness and prosperity, as doubtless this House would secure and adopt the propositions now laid on the table by the able and eloquent Minister of Finance.

MR. SPROULE said he was glad to take part in the discussion of this very important question, which had been discussed on every platform in the country for months. The country had anticipated with pleasure the operation of the new tariff as a means to a much needed increased prosperity. The Conservatives could congratulate themselves upon having convinced such a large majority of the electors of the importance of supporting this policy. It was their duty to still support it till the country obtained practical experience of its advantages, and thus sustain the able men whose foresight had enabled them to provide for the needs of the country. What were the benefits expected from this National Policy? His answer was—prosperity; which assumed that it did not exist at present. That prosperity meant employment for all able to work. How was the National Policy going to accomplish this result? The primary object of legislation should be, first, to secure peace and harmony; secondly, to have, if possible, the country organised; thirdly, to have the people employed in every possible way, securing the largest return for their labour, and fourthly, to secure for the people the very best markets. How were these objects to be accomplished? At present, at least \$60,000,000 worth of manufactured goods entered into this country yearly, from England, the United States and other countries, that might as well be manufactured here. The manufacture of \$60,000,000 worth of goods, gave employment to 460,000 people, whom we evidently supported in other countries, for

they were working for us. This policy, if properly carried out, would induce those operatives to come and settle amongst us. Such a policy would also attract hither capitalists whose expenditure would further enhance the production of this country, and retain in it large numbers who yearly emigrated. The better market would be secured by the expenditures of those 460,000 hands, who would each consume about one dollar's worth of agricultural products a week, or about \$23,000,000 worth a year. One of our main difficulties at present, was the want of a good market for farm products. The farmer, if he could not get \$1 a bushel for wheat, which, at the prices of the commodities he bought, did not pay him, or if he could not profitably raise oats to sell under 30c. to 40c. a bushel, he could get only 20c. to 30c., higher prices, through increased home consumption of those products, would constitute to that class a valuable improvement. They could, with greater advantage, support these if they were in Canada, than they could support the same number of people in England, France and Germany, now benefitting by the purchase of their manufactures. At present, Canadians had to send their products away to them, to pay for their commodities which had to be carried from 1,000 to 4,000 miles to their market. If they could induce those foreigners to settle in the Dominion, its markets would be enlarged and improved for all. What classes would be benefitted by the National Policy? All classes; first, and most important would be the labourer; next would be the manufacturers who were not prosperous at present, no matter what was said to the contrary, and who should not have to shorten hours, discharge hands, and close their establishments, thereby locking up capital. The National Policy would give them, also, a larger market. If foreigners, then, saw fit to throw goods on the Canadian market, they would be compelled, at least, to pay duties towards the support of the Government. Many had contended that it was not necessary to protect the manufacturers, but if they would reflect for a moment, and ask themselves why were bonuses offered by villages, towns and cities, as an inducement to any person or

company that would locate amongst them, and build and keep running establishments that would employ a certain number of hands annually, was it not expected that some substantial good would accrue to the place from the expenditure of that money? They would not offer large sums for the establishment of those manufactories among them, did they expect no benefit from them. Their employés would extend the market for farm and other home products. If that was a good policy in individual cases, and they found Reformers and Conservatives alike adopting it, how much more so was it as a national scheme, which would encourage the investment of much larger capital in Canada, besides bringing other benefits. Farmers and all others would receive higher prices, and enjoy more encouraging prospects for the future. Farmers' prices were so low to-day that lumbermen who used to raise their own supplies, grains included, had abandoned farming. An eminent lumberman, who employed, five or six years ago, 15 or 20 hands, raising supplies, had stopped this work, saying he could buy his oats much cheaper from the Americans than he could grow them. If it did not pay the lumberman to cultivate his land, and raise oats for his own use, how would it pay the farmer to raise them, and sell at such prices? As the farmers were the large majority of the people, it was highly important to secure them a better return for their labour, because, by benefitting the majority, they benefitted the whole. The National Policy would benefit the lumbermen also, as a larger demand for their lumber, and higher prices, would prove a substantial protection. If they could induce 460,000 people to settle here, a much larger amount of lumber would be used at home. Professional men also would be the gainers, as they went up or down as did the labouring classes. If the farmer and labourer received more profits and pay, all other classes must benefit correspondingly. He was convinced that every class in the community would derive advantage from this policy. There would be a diversity of employment, one set of toilers working into the hands of another. He believed that one-third of the population should be engaged in agricultural pursuits, and their pro-

ductions would about supply the wants of the whole; one-third should be employed in manufacturing, and they would manufacture enough for the whole, and the remaining third would be represented by professional and all other unemployed classes. If the people were divided in their pursuits in this wise, they would be mutually working for each other and into each other's hands. The farmers, by home consumption, if their market was protected, would always be sure of remunerative prices for their products, as the supply would not be above the demand. The manufacturer, likewise, would still be sure of a steady market at home for his productions, and the balance of the population would also share in the benefits that must accrue from this established equilibrium between supply and demand. Two-thirds of the people were at farming, and, as a natural consequence, there was a large surplus of their productions, for which the want of a suitable market was felt in every part of Ontario. In his (Mr. Sproule's) section, two or three years ago, oats, largely raised there, were worth from 35c. to 48c. a bushel; the farmers considered that from 35c. to 50c. paid them. But, while their own oats were selling at 48c., an unexpectedly large consignment arrived from Chicago, bringing down the price to 25c. a bushel; every farmer there thus lost the difference between 48c. and 25c. The same argument would apply to wheat, of which Canada did not raise much more than she wanted. In 1876, they exported a little over 8,000,000 bushels, and had to import 5,000,000, which gave them only 3,500,000 more than they consumed. Yet these 5,000,000 took the place of the same quantity of Canadian wheat, and for which they had to find a market outside. Again, they exported 479,000 barrels of flour, and imported 314,000, which showed that they only produced a little more than they needed for the wants of this country. They shipped 7,000,000 bushels of barley, and brought in but 302,000. Almost the whole of their exports of barley went to the United States, and, while the Americans sent here 302,000 bushels, without paying anything into the Canadian Treasury, for the advantage of our market, we had to pay a very large consideration for the Ameri-

can market. As to the question of who paid the duty, he would say, it was regulated as follows: There were circumstances under which the consumer paid the duty, and there were circumstances under which the producer paid the duty. As an illustration, he would state that, some years ago, in their part of the country, Toronto was the only commercial centre. They had not then the advantage of the railroads, and upon the highways there was, every few miles, a toll-gate; every farmer who sent his produce to market had to pay the toll upon his load before he could reach the market; Oswego was the market for the barley of the Canadian farmer, but, before he could reach that market, he had to pay a duty of 15c. a bushel, which might be regarded as an imposition similar to the toll required formerly of farmers sending their produce to Toronto. The producer, in this instance, had to pay 15c. per bushel duty, and he did not realise any more than the man who raised his barley in the immediate vicinity of the market, and who paid no toll. An illustration had recently been given in a newspaper, in which a farmer owned land upon both sides of the line. That farmer raised barley, and, while he received 85c. per bushel for the barley he raised on the American side, he only made 70c. for that which he raised on the Canadian side, the other 15c. being required to pay the toll. This was a case in which the producer paid the duty. But, in regard to articles which they could not manufacture in this country, which they had to purchase abroad, and upon which they had to pay duty, the consumer had to pay the duty. He did not think they had to go far from home for ample proof of this, that a protective policy would assist a young country. They need only look to the United States. He remembered that, when a resident of that country, in 1865 and 1866, at the close of the American war, he paid \$85 for an overcoat, \$30 for a pair of pants, and \$15 for a pair of boots. Under a high protective tariff, these goods, which, in 1866, could be made in Canada for one quarter the money that they cost in the United States, were now being sold for a lower price than they could be sold in this country. He maintained that the tariff

which had been imposed, in this instance, by the Government would speedily bring down the cost of products to the price they were at the time the tariff was made, and eventually reduce the price. An hon. gentleman had spoken of the impoverished condition of the United States from 1873 to 1876, as compared with the condition of Canada. He thought any gentleman who had taken the trouble to look over the statistics of the trade of the two countries would see that the reverse was the case. The United States were really in a much more prosperous condition from 1873 to 1876 than Canada was. From 1873 up to the present time, the debt of Canada had increased from \$129,000,000 to \$177,000,000. This was not an evidence that they were doing well. While the debt of Canada was increased to that large amount, the United States paid off \$191,000,000 of their debt, an amount greater than the whole debt of the Dominion of Canada. They also found that, in the United States, large deposits were made from year to year in the savings banks of that country, while no less a sum than \$166,000 was drawn out of our savings banks, which showed that we were not in a prosperous condition. At the same time they found the Americans had invested in their savings banks some \$42,000,000, and it was a striking fact that this money came from the people that would naturally experience the result of bad times. The comparison, it would be seen, was favourable to the United States, a country where industries had been fostered by a high protective tariff. The hon. member for Lambton had said that the majority of the members of this House had obtained their seats by false pretences. He desired to ask the hon. gentleman what were the false pretences? Was not the vote taken, fairly and squarely, on the basis of Protection? The verdict of the people was unmistakably in favour of the party now occupying the Treasury benches, and those gentlemen had redeemed their pledges to the country to the fullest extent. A short time ago, it was proclaimed from the housetops that the Government had not the manly courage to carry out the promises they had made to the country. That policy,

MR. SPROULE.

however, had been carried out and announced to the world, and now hon. gentlemen came forward and said they had gained their positions by false pretences. If there had been any false pretences, he could assure hon. gentlemen he failed to see where they had been made. The hon. the late Finance Minister said the supporters of the National Policy were but reflecting the views of their supporters in this country. Well, if they had all been in possession of the noted shield of his hon. friend, they would make better reflectors. He also said they would have raised the revenue needed without adding one penny to the burdens of the people. In answer, he would say that it had been evident for years back that something would have to be done, and some method adopted to raise the revenue, as it was continually falling off. But no effort was made in this direction, and it was generally conceded that the late Government had not the ability. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had said that a great deal of the antipathy, in and out of the House, against the late Government arose from ignorance. But what would they say, if they reflected for a moment, and gave hon. gentlemen credit for what they desired, that, amongst them, were to be found some of the noblest creations of the human intellect; that, concentrated in them, was to be found the vast accomplishments and the brilliant fancy of Cicero, the withering fire of Juvenal, the plastic imagination of Dante, the humour of Cervantes, the comprehension of Bacon, the wit of Butler, and the supreme and universal excellence of Shakespeare; and yet, after all this intelligence, be compelled to admit that they had not the ability to legislate in the interest of the country, and had to resign their charge to others, who, they were pleased to say, were now doing their duty, and doing it nobly.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was *considered* in Committee of the Whole, *reported*, *read the third time* and *passed* :—

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole and reported:—

Bill (No. 12) To authorise the Welland Railway Company to convert their six per cent. debenture bonds into five per cent. debenture stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Drew.)

Bill (No. 20) To amend the Act 41 Victoria, chapter 29, intituled: "An Act to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company."—(Mr. Scriver.)

The following Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, amended, reported, and the amendments agreed to:—

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and to extend the time for the completion of the said railway.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the debate on the resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise.

MR. STRANGE said, whatever diffidence he might have in addressing this House for the first time, he had no hesitation in recording his opinion on the resolutions now under the consideration of the House, for he held that a question which was going to mark for all time a new departure in the history of the political economy of Canada should be so approached that every member who was sent here should define his position in reference to it. He might here state, at the outset, that he was not a hard and fast Protectionist. He believed in the theory of Free-trade, but certainly not in the practice of Free-trade as it had hitherto been applied to Canada. It was imperatively essential for the pros-

perity of every country that manufactures should be established in it; and, further, it was the duty of every Government to establish and foster the incipient manufactures, especially in the case of a young country like Canada, in order that those manufacturers might be enabled to hold their own against the competition of older and more settled countries until they were able to walk alone. He further held, that in the case of different countries competing with one another in products and manufactures common to each, it was the duty of every Government to place equal restrictions on all trades and products, so that the traders and producers of one country might be met with the same privileges and restrictions as the traders and producers of those other countries who were competing with them. This he conceived to be the theory of reciprocal tariff. This was his conception of perfect free trade. While he was listening to the Budget speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, it seemed to him that the same principles had influenced him in framing that Budget, and, on scrutinising it, as far as he had been able hitherto, he found that the Finance Minister had endeavoured so to place and graduate the duties that the infant manufactures of this country should be encouraged, and that he had so further graduated those duties that, in that one branch alone in which our producers were already established, he placed that branch of our products on a basis of reciprocal tariff, or as near a reciprocal tariff as possible, with our only competitor the United States. He believed that was a sound policy, and that in the course of a few years we would find that policy of reciprocal tariff would be introduced into England, in which country the tide of public opinion was already setting in that direction. A short time ago, no less a person than Mr. Walter, the proprietor of the London Times, and a member of the House of Commons of England, in a speech made at Newbury, advocated this departure in political economy. It had already been broached in several of the English Chambers of Commerce, and he felt proud, as a resident of this young country, to think that our people had had the courage to consider this problem, and to endeavour to

solve it, before even England had taken hold of it. He felt proud to think that she had been the first in this new departure. He believed that this new tariff was as near perfection as possible. Some modifications might be necessary now, and time and experience might show the necessity of modifying it to a greater extent hereafter; but the spirit and genius of this tariff were such as to commend it to the minds of all men who were endeavouring to raise the depressed industries of this country into activity, and enable it, by the increase of wealth which would flow from the adoption of this tariff, to take that front rank among nations which its geographical position and vast area entitled it to. The objections alleged to this tariff were, first, that it was going to impose burdens of taxation on the people. He believed those burdens existed only in the minds of those determined not to see anything beyond the old trade theories. Our manufactures, once established, would compete with one another, and supply Canada with all those goods which could be created here at much cheaper rates than we were at present paying for them. It had been urged, on several occasions, that the manufacturers would form rings. He did not believe a word of it. If this country were only a Province the size of Ontario such a thing would not be possible; but, when they looked at its enormous extent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, when they consider the enterprise of the people, every opening for employment being eagerly seized, it would be immediately seen that, if rings were formed in one place, new manufacturing would spring up in another, which would soon put an end to those rings. They were told that this tariff, while putting a tax on breadstuffs, would not benefit the farmers. He had the honour to represent a farming constituency, and rejoiced to think that the farmers there had not the same belief as those who differed from them with regard to this tariff. They believed they had been unduly handicapped in the race with our American cousins, who had been able to supply the Canadian market free of duty, and could thus force their surplus produce on our markets. The farmers had been smarting under this, and in his constituency they had

risen in their might, determined to put a stop to it. Since he had entered the House this afternoon, he had received a local paper from his constituency, by which it appeared that, since the introduction of this new tariff, oats there had risen 6c. a bushel, and pease 4c. a bushel. If this was not protection to the Canadian farmers, he would like to know what was? Beyond the question of competition, the farmers had come to the conclusion that they should have their own market. If they had a home market, it would be under their own control, and they could judge the most fitting time in which to place their products on it, and be enabled to prosper much more than before this tariff came into existence. They were told that the tariff was one of retaliation. In his opinion it was a tariff of equality, of justice, of right, but not a tariff of retaliation. If our friends across the border chose to shut us out of their markets, surely we had the privilege of treating them in like manner. We had no desire, in promoting this tariff, to offend our neighbours, but merely to defend our own interests. We could not take a better example of the feeling of the American people towards our tariff than the opinion of the *New York Herald*, which, in its issue this morning, called upon Congress to hasten to promote a reciprocity treaty with Canada, because, once the people of Canada had enjoyed the sweets of Protection, reciprocity, as far as the Americans were concerned, would be farther off than ever. Then they were told that this tariff was a disloyal one. He addressed this House as an Englishman. He was a Canadian by adoption, but an Englishman in spirit. As far as he was able to ascertain the spirit of the English people, they were anxious and willing to see this vast colony, of which they were justly proud, succeed, even if we had, in our own interests, to put a stop to purchasing our goods from England. No English Government would venture to prevent the adoption of this tariff on the ground of its injuring England. The English people, without exception, took great interest in our success, and, with the exception of a few manufacturers, would bid us Godspeed on the royal road to wealth. The country had been

told that this question was merely a clap-net question, invented by the Premier in order to gain the last elections. He had contended that point on every hustings, and the best answer he could now give to it was to point to the Budget, which proved that the Premier was in earnest when he said he would protect the interests of the country. He should like to glance for a moment at a few of the results which, in his humble opinion, would flow from the adoption of this tariff. It would give an immense impetus to our trade, of every description. In Toronto, new manufactories were already being started, and, in the course of a few years, the population thereby would be increased a fourth more than it would have been under the old tariff. It would give an immense impetus to labour; our labouring men would not be compelled to work merely on farms, as at present. Beyond farm work, for the past few years, there had been very little work for the mechanic or labouring man in Canada. If this were the only beneficial result from the adoption of this tariff, the country should hail it with delight. By developing new industries it would open up new avenues of ambition to our young men, and prevent them from going abroad to seek occupations denied them at home. By keeping in this country the profits which formerly went abroad, our wealth would increase beyond our most sanguine expectations. We would then be able to redeem our bonds now held by foreign countries, and, if anything could promote the credit of a country, it was the fact of its bonds being held by its inhabitants. It would afford, also, the greatest impetus to immigration by opening up centres of civilisation, and, if anything could help to build up our great North-West, it was this great policy. He believed we had a glorious future before us, and he would conclude by quoting a few lines from a poem on Canada, which had been written by an old resident of his constituency in 1852, and which seemed to him to describe our future in words most appropriate and happy. Apostrophising Canada, the poet said:

"I see thee, not at natal hour,
But ages hence, in sovereign power—
When the fleet iron-horse shall roar
From Nootka Sound to Labrador;

When thy rich belt, with commerce spanned,
Shall send its wealth from land to land,
And millions shall find happy homes
Where now the untamed buffalo roams;
When teeming cities, villas fair,
And all the arts of peace are there;
When college, school and churches' spires,
All glitter in solstitial fires;
And mountain, mine and spreading plain
Diffuse their wealth from main to main,
And jarring races, fused in one,
Rejoice in name—Canadian."

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he noticed, from the tone of the discussion so far, that they were drifting into the very same line of argument as was pursued in this House during last Session. No doubt this was unavoidable, partially from the influx of a large number of new members, and partially from the necessity forced upon them by the great changes in this tariff to traverse the whole field, and discuss all the important issues which it involved. He was delighted with the comfort which the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) seemed to take in the position he occupied in that sunny Italian clime which he said prevailed on the Government side of the House. He could assure the hon. gentleman, who was a young member, and who further claimed considerable indulgence because of his modesty and diffidence, that there were on the Government side of the House, besides the comforts of the sunny Italian clime, embarrassments and responsibilities, which, perhaps, he would not fully realise until the dawn of the next election. He (Mr. Ross) had the pleasure and comfort of having sat on both sides of the House, and he fancied that, when his hon. friend changed his position, as he would have occasion to do, because Governments did not live for ever, and enjoyed the comforts which the members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition enjoyed, he would say that there were in Opposition many comforts of which he never dreamt in his Italian bowers. His hon. friend had taken the line which had previously been often taken in this House and in the country in endeavouring to prove that Canada needed Protection, namely, that the manufacturing industries of the country were very seriously depressed, and that, in this Canada, of which they were all so proud,

there was no prosperity like that which existed in the United States. He very much doubted the wisdom of hon. gentlemen in thus pursuing constantly and persistently the policy of decrying the standing and credit of their own country. He would not, for one moment, wish to impugn the loyalty of any hon. gentleman in this House; but, putting it purely as a matter of policy, he must say that it was not only unwise, impolitic, and injudicious, but it must prove detrimental to the best interests of the country to have the sentiment go abroad, from day to day, through the press and across the Atlantic, to be read on 'Change in New York, London, and Liverpool, that this country was not as prosperous as the United States. What would be the effect upon immigration? His hon. friend from North York (Mr. Strange) dwelt, in his remarks, upon the necessity of immigration. How could we expect an influx of immigrants from any country when the sentiment was constantly reiterated that Canada was depressed and the United States prosperous? No greater offence—he had almost said crime—could be committed by any man against the commercial prosperity of his country than by constantly decrying her standing and making invidious comparisons between her and the country south of us. What arguments did he produce to show that Canada was not as prosperous as the United States? He (Mr. Ross) would give one fact in connection with the manufacturing industries of the United States. Last year, that country imported nearly \$12,000,000 worth of manufactured goods more from Great Britain than she exported to the whole world. That proved that, notwithstanding what protection might have done to give the people of the United States a home market, they were now importing from Great Britain a greater amount of manufactured goods than they were able to export to the whole world. He found that, last year, the total exports from the United States represented only \$15.80 per head of the population; whilst the exports from Canada, notwithstanding the depressed condition she occupied in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, amounted to \$18.90 per head, or over \$3 per head more than the United

States. He found, further, that, in manufactured goods, we occupied a very favourable position, as compared with the United States. In 1876, the exports of manufactured goods from the United States amounted to \$1.79 per head, while the exports from Canada amounted to \$1.60 per head. Another ground taken by his hon. friend opposite was, that the *London Times* approved the course pursued by the present Administration; therefore, it was a proper one. His hon. friend had probably not seen, at that time, the more extended article from the *London Times*, which appeared later in the evening.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton): I did not say that the *Times* approved of the course of the Government; what I said was, that the *Times* had said that, as we had chosen to take this course, we must be left to our own way of doing it.

MR. ROSS: Very well, the *London Times* approves, so far, at least, as to leaving us to have our own way. My hon. friend went so far as to say that the *London Times* was a sensible paper, and reflected public opinion in England.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton): I said expressed public opinion.

MR. ROSS said he would read a few lines from that article to which he had referred:

"The action of the Canadian Government is very pitiable. The *Times* cannot approve of the tariff. It thinks it unwise, and is thoroughly convinced that it will disappoint the Canadians, proving an injury instead of a benefit to them. The conduct of the Canadian Government is like that of a man who, unable to do all the work he wishes with both hands and legs free, thinks he can increase the fruits of his labours by fastening up one leg and tying one hand behind his back. • • • The tariff is as unwise as possible. The admission that the Government has fulfilled its pledges is the amplest condemnation of the tariff. There is no branch of industry that will not be crippled by it. The agriculturists will get a less return for the commodities they produce, and will have no recompense for the loss of trade with the United States. The duties on teas and sugars will involve an enormous cost in its collection, and the necessity of guarding against smuggling along so extensive a frontier. Since the Canadians wish to have this tariff, they must take it and go their own way, but the result is none the less deplorable."

MR. ROSS

Of course the London *Times* was a sensible paper. His hon. friend seemed to be exceedingly pleased with the prospective increased prosperity which this tariff would bring to Hamilton, and expected the people of that city would cordially welcome this tariff. He (Mr. Ross) proposed to give a few reasons why he was opposed to the resolutions brought down by the hon. the Finance Minister. In the first place, he was opposed to this tariff because it was revolutionary in its character. In 1876, when the late Finance Minister brought down his Budget proposing to increase the duties from 15 to 17½ per cent., great objection was taken by the hon. gentlemen who were then sitting on the Opposition side of the House, to the change proposed. It was said that an increased tariff would disorganise business, that it would demoralise industry. The Minister of Public Works stated that the tariff was of a Protectionist character, that it was the thin end of the wedge of Protection, and that it should be repudiated by the people of this country. And what had they now? Why, they had the whole wedge of Protection itself thrust in between every industry in this country; not a single industry was left unassailed. If it was proposed by this House either to contract or expand the bank circulation of this country by 10 or 15 per cent., no doubt the principal objection that would be made to such a change would be its effect upon the business of the country. But that would be a small change compared with the revolution which this tariff would effect. Our bank circulation was about \$30,000,000, but we had invested in various industries in Canada not less than \$80,000,000 or \$90,000,000. This vast sum would be affected either favourably or unfavourably by this tariff. The value of all our manufacturing interests would be either contracted or expanded. It was estimated that we manufactured, last year, about \$275,000,000 worth of goods. Would not this tariff affect, either injuriously or otherwise, this vast amount of money? Would not every industry represented in the country, even to the remotest corner, feel that, in one respect or another, they were needlessly interfered with? Or, to give details, we had \$2,480,000

invested in gas works, \$3,266,000 in the boot and shoe business; \$16,000,000 in saw mills; \$2,050,000 in the furniture business; \$10,000,000 in flour and grist mills; \$1,859,000 in carriage making, and \$2,158,000 in printing offices. Now, every one of these leading industries were to be tampered with. And not them alone, but every other industry, from the village blacksmith in the most remote rural retreat, to the lordly builder of ships and steamboats, all were interfered with, all came in for their share of meddling interference, all were compelled to re-arrange their business according to the will or whim of the Finance Minister. He (Mr. Ross) was willing to take the ground in relation to this question which was taken by the hon. the Minister of Public Works in 1876, namely, that any change in the business of the country, of a serious or revolutionary character, was to be avoided. He had another objection to this tariff; it discriminated against the importation of British goods. He was aware that hon. gentlemen opposite maintained that it was the duty of Canadians to take care of themselves. There was a great deal of force in that argument; he was willing to accept that, and to say, with the hon. gentleman from Hamilton, for instance, (Mr. Robertson) that it was our business to take care of ourselves; that, so far as our interests were concerned, it was the duty of every Canadian to legislate in such a manner as would best subserve the interests of the country. He thought that, in our present position, with our large population, with the evidences of national power which we possessed, we might safely commence now to legislate for ourselves. But legislating for ourselves did not mean that we were to legislate against Great Britain, or to discriminate against the Mother Country, that we should give more favourable terms in many respects to the Americans than to England. The great cry of the Protectionists used to be protection against importation from the United States. Judging from the manner in which this tariff was framed, he would suppose it was distinctly prepared with the view of protecting us against Great Britain. He would give one or two instances, among a great

many, in which this was done. In the article of cotton goods, of which we imported \$4,500,000 from England, and only \$2,500,000 from the United States, the tariff had been increased, as near as he could ascertain, from 35 to 42½ per cent. In the matter of tweeds, of which we imported one hundred times as much from Great Britain as from the United States, namely, \$936,000 worth from Great Britain, and \$9,507 worth from the United States, the tariff had been increased 22½ per cent. In the matter of flannels, of which we imported seven times as much from Great Britain as from the United States, the tariff had been increased to 32½ per cent. In the matter of woollen cloths, of which we imported six times as much from Great Britain as from the United States, the tariff had been increased to 22½ per cent. In the matter of other woollens, of which we imported forty times as much from Great Britain as from the United States, the tariff had been increased 40 per cent. Turning to the other side, they found, for instance that, in the matter of carriages, of which we imported \$83,299 worth from the United States, and only \$2,130 worth from Great Britain, the duty was only increased 7½ per cent. In miscellaneous iron ware, which included all the smaller manufactures of iron, we imported \$1,686,267 worth from the United States, and only \$161,378 worth from Great Britain, and yet the duty has been increased only 2½ per cent. In India-rubber manufactures, of which we imported \$188,540 worth from the United States, and only \$55,924 worth from Great Britain, the duty had been increased only 2½ per cent. Of machinery, we imported \$259,000 worth from the United States, and \$23,858 worth from Great Britain, yet the duty was increased only 2½ per cent.; of leather manufactures, we imported \$207,969 worth from the United States, and \$29,360 worth from Great Britain, yet the duty was increased only 2½ per cent. If this was not discriminating against Great Britain he did not know what was. If this was not framing a tariff distinctly to exclude British goods, what did it mean? He noticed in the resolutions brought down by the hon. the Finance Minister that it was proposed that, when the Americans reduced their duties on certain articles

going into the United States from Canada, the Governor in Council might reduce the duties on those articles coming from the United States into Canada. But was there any such provision in regard to goods coming from Great Britain? He could not find it in the tariff from one end to the other. He would almost suppose, reading that tariff in the light of British interests, British trade and British manufactures, that it had been framed by some designing Americans, with the view of crushing and destroying the commerce which was happily established between England and this country. He had another objection to this tariff—it was designed to serve another purpose than that of raising a revenue merely. He believed the primary duty of a Government, in levying a tariff, was to collect taxes which should affect, as little as possible, the market value of the goods themselves. In framing a revenue tariff, it was no part of the duty of the Government to protect manufactures *per se*. Protection to manufactures was an incident of the tariff. This tariff seemed to reverse the natural order; it was protection first, and revenue afterwards, if they could. Now, this was a wrong basis; the principle should be: revenue first, and then such protection as was incidental to the collection of that revenue. That was the English basis; but the present tariff was framed on the principle that we were going to create a war of interests, to array class against class, and the only result could be that those interests that were the most importunate and the most clamorous would receive the greatest share of the spoil. What had brought all these deputations which had thronged to the city from various parts of Canada within the past four or five weeks? Was it to assist the Minister of Finance? Why, not at all. It was only to prevent one class of the community getting the start of them in the framing of this tariff. The manufacturers of woollens and cloths found that the cotton manufacturers had sent a deputation here, and they must come and see, lest the cotton men should get ahead of them; and the iron manufacturer must also come and see that he got a fair share of the spoils. This arraying of class against class would have a most injurious effect upon the business

of the country. Each would look with suspicion upon the other; perhaps he imagined, perhaps he believed, that some one else was more particularly favoured in the tariff regulations than he was. What would be the effect of this upon the welfare and commerce of the country? The half of the population engaged in agricultural pursuits would assert that the other half, the manufacturing part, had an undue advantage over it. The agriculturist would regard every manufacturer as his enemy, as being favoured by the Government, whilst he was left out in the cold. He would complain because the fishermen, numbering some 50,000, were protected more than he was. The effect of this would undoubtedly be to array one class against the other, and we would be in the position of the Ishmaelite of old, our hands against everyone, and every man's hand against us. Some of those engaged in industrial pursuits must feel that their interests were jeopardised, that some others were more favoured than they were, that they would not share those Italian climes in which his hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) basked at the present moment. The consumer would feel, or fancy, that he was not as highly favoured as the producer; the poor would feel he was not as highly favoured as the rich, and the effect would be, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Large monopolies would be erected. A condition of society which no true Canadian could wish to see transferred to this country. No greater misfortune could possibly befall us, than to see huge monopolies erected, by which class interests could control the market in their own specialties, and thus compel the people, whether willing or not, to accept their terms. Facilities for the formation of "rings" and "corners," were thus afforded, and the wealthy capitalist, if unprincipled, would be practically master of the trade of the country. He believed that this tariff would have that effect. Again, he looked upon this tariff as a huge bribe to individuals, to class interests, to constituencies and to Provinces. He believed it was because this tariff contained that element that hon. gentlemen changed seats in this House last year. He fancied he heard hon. gentlemen using it in this

way. He would picture the *modus operandi* of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the use of this tariff. A supporter of the loyal Opposition would go to a farmer, and say to him, "Well, now, a large quantity of American produce is imported into this country, and is allowed to come in free. There are corn, oats, peas, etc., which come in free, whilst our grain is heavily taxed going into the United States. If we get into power, we will prohibit American grain coming into this country. A supporter of Mr. Mackenzie states that the importation of American grain does not materially affect the prices; the Liverpool market regulates the price of grain." But the Conservative says: "If I am elected, I am going to support a tariff which will prevent the importation of American grain." Of course, the farmer imagines there is something in this thing, and, by means of this process—a button-holing process—he is induced to look at the question from a selfish standpoint of view. He reasons that, perhaps, he will be able to get a little better price for his produce, and it gradually dawns upon him that, no matter what may be his political leanings, no matter whether the existing Government is honest or not, no matter whether Sir John A. Macdonald had administered to the best interests of the country or not, that he should support such a policy, and he casts his franchise at the feet of this false god erected there in his presence.

Some HON. GENTLEMEN: Oh.

Mr. ROSS said some hon. gentlemen said "oh, oh." He (Mr. Ross) would give them a little more, so that they might repeat their "oh, oh." Here was another instance of what might be done. An hon. gentleman opposite might go into one of the large furniture shops in Toronto, say, and see a large quantity of furniture. He might represent to the owner of the warehouse that the Canadian market was seriously affected by the importation of more furniture than was required in the Canadian market, and say: "When we get into power, we will tax imported furniture, particularly American furniture." He might show him the trade and navigation returns, show him the value of furniture imported into the country, and

say, "Well, if we can get control of the Canadian markets, the \$63,892 paid for duty will go directly to you." He goes on, step by step, appealing to the selfishness of the manufacturers, and gets him to believe that their policy is the best in his particular interest. This process was repeated from place to place, from one part of the Dominion to another. Appeals being made to the selfishness of the community, without taking into consideration at all the relative merits of the two great political parties. Selfishness overrode every consideration, and, in that way, votes were secured. What these appeals to the selfishness of class interests were, might be seen from the following quotation from a speech by the leader of the Government (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Hamilton, in 1877:—

"We will have a sufficient protection for every interest. We will give a sufficient protection for every industry, and will be governed by evidence, which we will carefully collect and gather, regarding every manufacture and every trade. We will make every manufacture, every industry, produce the evidence of what is necessary for the purpose of protecting them in their present struggle into maturity; and, gentlemen, that protection will be given them."

The same appeal was made to the agricultural interests at Park Hill, in 1878. Here it is:—

"In 1870, the manufacturers did not want to support protection to farmers, because they said it would raise the price of the agricultural products they got from the United States, and injure the manufacturing business. But they were told that they did not suppose the farmers were going to tax themselves to make the manufacturers rich, if the manufacturers did not do something for them. And the farmers were now advised, if you want to get protection for your products, you must get the manufacturers, the artisans, and the labourers to agree on one policy for the mutual benefit of all."

In the northern section of his (Mr. Ross's) county, where it was desirable that certain interests should be affected, an appeal was made to those interests. The workingmen were told that their wages would be increased, and that they would have constant employment. These appeals to class interests, these attempts to bribe—that was a very strong word, perhaps—these attempts to influence whole sections of the community by a direct appeal to their selfishness was the

Mr. Ross.

basis upon which this tariff was erected, and by which these hon. gentlemen placed themselves upon the Treasury benches. Those appeals were also made to Provinces. Nova Scotia was told, "We will put a duty upon your coal and iron, in order to advance those industries of your Province." Then they came up to Ontario and said: "We will put a duty on flour." Every appeal to these Provinces was based, not upon the political morality of parties—not upon the record of the two parties respectively, but upon bribes and promises. Individuals had been approached, constituencies approached, class interests appealed to, Provinces appealed to, in order that hon. gentlemen might be enabled to change their seats politically, and the hon. gentlemen had reaped their reward.

Mr. HAY: Sour grapes.

Mr. ROSS: 35 per cent. is an exceedingly convenient arrangement for that gentleman, at all events. He objected to this tariff on another ground, that was, that the Government tried to do more than any Government could do to champion the various industries of this country. Before any Government could frame a tariff properly they should thoroughly and completely understand every industry of the country. This Government proposed to say to every industry that they would regulate the prices of all articles of trade, and to say to each manufacturer they would take him under their care, that they could do so advantageously to him. He would suppose there was a meeting of the Cabinet in the other block. Present, say, all the members of the Cabinet. Deputations were in waiting. Those who were anxious for a duty on coal and iron stood up and stated their case, and said they would like to have protection from American coal and iron. Up rose the Minister of Public Works, who stated: "I understand the coal and iron trades; I have invested in coal myself; I know exactly what you want;" and he went on to expatiate on the advantage of developing the iron industry. He told the deputation he was extremely glad to see them, and said: "We will give you 50c. on coal and \$2 a ton on iron." They retired abundantly satisfied. Then in came the shipowners. They said: "We

want protection also against American competition; ships are built in the United States and sold in Canada; we want protection against American shipbuilders." The Minister of Finance rose and said: "Ship-building is a great industry in my country. New Brunswick owns a great many ships;" and immediately he drew on that vivid imagination he possessed. He fancied he saw Canadian ships in every sea, Canadian sails in every port, and he told the deputation how desirable it was to build up the commerce of Canada, and concluded by saying: "We will give you ten per cent. against American ships." The shipowners were satisfied. Then came representatives of every other industry to make their complaints, and their various industries were speedily adjusted. A deputation of farmers put in their claim. They wanted Protection also, and immediately concessions were made to them. In this way, the Government proposed to champion the interests of all these classes. That was a wrong principle upon which to base the tariff. Did they think that those deputations were anxious for the revenue? Not at all. They were down to see they got every possible advantage from the Government, and that their particular interests were protected. In this way, the great masses of the country were defrauded, in order that the manufacturer, the shipowner, the coal-miner and others might have their profits increased. He did not think that a tariff framed in the interest of special classes would be satisfactory to the people. They saw already what had been said of it in different parts of the country. He fancied that, when it came to be understood, when the people saw how heavily this tariff was going to press on the material interests of the country, the satisfaction which hon. gentlemen seemed to enjoy so much would be speedily dissipated. Another objection he had to this tariff was that it would tend to disarrange trade, by diverting capital from its present channel, or he might say, from the ordinary channel. The ground taken by Protectionists in defending this tariff was impossible, that was that it was going to create wealth. No Government under heaven could create wealth. A Government might destroy wealth, but it could

not create it. The basis of all wealth was labour, and labour was the basis of all the industrial prosperity of the people. This being true, how could they distribute wealth in such a way as to increase the industrial prosperity of the country? How could they take that capital, which he might say was raw material, and increase it, except in the ordinary way? How could they give larger profits to one industry than they could to another? It was merely by a distribution of the aggregate wealth of this country. One effect of this would be that some would get richer, while others would be impoverished, and the result would be universal dissatisfaction. What had been the effect in the United States, where this policy had been adopted? There was a great deal of iron used in the United States of which they imported a large portion from Great Britain. The effect of a duty on pig-iron tended largely to develop that industry in Pennsylvania. Immediately a want was created, and, in obedience to natural law, men with capital rushed in to supply the demand. And what was the result? The business was soon overdone—the huge monopoly thus created toppled over, and now they saw as the disastrous effect that \$100,000,000 had been sunk in Pennsylvania alone; they saw it in the coal-blast furnaces now closed in the deserted villages of those districts, and in their operatives seeking employment in the Western States. Under the Galt tariff on boots and shoes, a large amount of capital was invested in this industry. It was considered a valuable investment; but what was the effect? Capitalists so eagerly invested in this business that it was speedily overdone also, and the results that the country expected were, to a great extent, lost from the utter ruin of those who invested too largely in that industry. Such were the effects of over-stimulation by tariffs like this. Suppose the furniture business was over-stimulated, too many would embark in it, and the same with all the others; the effect in the industries of the country, in the long run, would be disastrous. Contrast that with the gradual growth of wealth in England, from the building up of her industries. True, there was great depression there at the present time, but any man who understood the

peculiar waves of depression that passed over the world at periodic times, would say they were due to the action of no Government. In the same way we in Canada, were passing through a period of depression, and the hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of honestly and fairly waiting till matters would adjust themselves by the natural laws of business, had rushed to the front with this tariff, and endeavoured to antedate the prosperity that must come so long as we possessed the elements of wealth. If we had the natural wealth, enterprise, and business capacity that he believed we possessed, there was no Government, whatever its legislative policy, unless such as they were now discussing, that could prevent that prosperity which Canada was entitled to, and which those elements of power and wealth would give to any country that possessed them. He objected also to this tariff, because it pressed unduly on the working classes; it imposed burdens on labour, without any equivalent. It professed to be a tariff of equivalents, to give every man as much as it took from him, and, as an hon. gentleman beside him said, a little more; that was, by some peculiar process he did not understand, the Government was going to enrich every man by giving him more than it took from everybody else. Where that great wealth, that inexhaustible El Dorado, was, he did not know. They said it was in the near future, and he hoped so; but, for the present, this tariff imposed burdens on the labouring classes without equivalent. They said that the workingman would receive it in higher wages. Had that been the result in the United States? The report of the Labour Commission of Massachusetts, for last year, showed that, in 1873, there were 7,900 tramps, and, in 1877, 57,910, proving that, in that great centre of industrial prosperity, there was not so much employment now as some years ago; and that same report stated there were 575,000 persons unemployed in the United States last year. This showed that their protective tariff did not procure the employment for the workmen claimed for it. Was our tariff designed to afford more wages? Look again at the United States. Protection had increased wages 60 per cent.,

MR. ROSS.

and the cost of living 92 per cent., a balance of 32 against the workingman. This was the kind of tariff that was going to enrich the workingman, increase his wages, and provide him constant employment. He would ask the hon. the Finance Minister what equivalent the workingman was to receive for paying 50c. per barrel more for his flour, and 50c. more a ton for his coal; 1c. per lb. extra on bacon and ham, or \$1.75 more on every blanket he might purchase; what for \$1.25 extra on every \$5 worth of cotton, or \$1 on every tweed suit worth \$15; or \$1.45 extra on every \$10 worth of flannels wanted? The workingman, considering how he could best invest his wages, would find the purchasing power of a dollar materially reduced, when he would be disposed to say to the Government: "You promised us wealth and there is poverty; riches, and now we have adversity." In some respects he might be better provided for. In Excise matters he had an equivalent, if any at all, but it was one to which he (Mr. Ross) objected. For dear bread and dear domestic comforts the Government proposed to give him cheap beer. If this was the tariff that the country wanted,—a cheap beer and dear bread tariff,—let the fact be made known, and if, at the end of five years, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches could go to the country successfully, then he must have misunderstood the intelligence of the people. This tariff was full of anomalies and contradictions, of which he would point out but a few. In the first place, in the matter of ship-building, there was a drawback in all the materials entering into its construction, except cordage. Thus, ship-building was practically free. If anything should be exempt, it was ships. Commerce should be as free and unfettered as possible, but locomotives and cars, built for the very same purpose, namely for the carrying trade, were taxed 25 per cent. Were they going to advance the interests of commerce in one direction, and cripple them in another? They, in Ontario, did not, like some hon. gentlemen opposite, live by the seaside; were they to pay additional freight and rates for produce and passenger travel, while those by the seaside were to go duty free? This was a discrimination against the great bulk of the

Province of Ontario, as compared with the Maritime Provinces; and while he would be sorry to claim anything for Ontario not offered the other Provinces, he objected decidedly to such discrimination. Then, again, in the matter of salt. What the fishermen used was to be duty free, while, for dairy purposes, it would pay from 8c. to 12c. per 100lb. The dairy interest last year represented some \$6,370,000. Why not admit salt duty free for the dairymen as well as the fishermen? Books of the lowest grade were charged 6c. per lb., and, of the highest, the same; thus, the productions of the best grade of intelligence, the work of the most intellectual authors would be taxed precisely the same as those of common materials and of the lowest authorship. Low-class American novels, on cheap, thin paper, would pay very little, while the well-printed and substantially bound books, by the best English authors, which would be morally and intellectually useful, must pay a high duty, the effect of which would be to discourage their importation. This, in the interest of the intellectual advancement of the country was a decidedly objectionable policy. Again, barley, of which they imported little, was taxed 15c. a bushel, while Indian corn, of which they brought in a large quantity, 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 bushels a year, had to pay only 7½c. Why this anomaly? He was not advocating a duty on any grain, but the propriety of consistency in this matter. If Ministers were going to keep out the small quantity by a high duty, why not the larger, also? Why discriminate in favour of barley as against corn? Brooms paid a duty of 25 per cent., but the individuals who had the energy and industrial skill to produce broom corn had no protection. There was a discrimination between the broom producer and the broom manufacturer. The duty on carriages, completed and finished, was only 25 per cent., while the carriage trimmings and other materials which entered into the construction of the carriage, were taxed from 30 to 35. The man who made the article and placed it at the shop door ready for the market was not so well protected as he who merely supplied the materials that entered into its composition. Cordage used in ships was taxed 10 per cent.,

but, used in anything else, 20. Here was discrimination between the ship-builder and lumberman, and other industrious operatives of Ontario who used large quantities of cordage. Common earthenware, an article that individuals of average means could purchase, was taxed 30 per cent., while fancy wares, China and porcelain would pay but 20. Then, furniture, imported, would carry a duty of 35 per cent., while cherry, hickory, oak, walnut and white-wood, chestnut, and such other woods as were common in Ontario, were admitted free. Here was a discriminating tariff against certain people again. The rich manufacturer, who could build his large warehouse, must be liberally protected, while the farmer, owning only 100 acres, producing those beautiful woods, must be subject to the competition of Indiana, Michigan and the Western States. If they were going to frame a tariff to protect all classes, let them do so honestly. Jewellery imported would pay 20 per cent., whereas common cottons and woollens, such as the people must have, were taxed from 40 to 60. The man of wealth might sport a gold watch and other articles of ornament or luxury, and pay but 20 per cent., while the poor man, who must clothe his family in cottons or woollens, paid 40 to 60. The leather manufactured, contributed 25 per cent, whereas the raw material was admitted free. This was an article of considerable value. The farmer had no protection against hides from the Western States, but the manufacturer of leather, wherever he might be, was amply provided for. Then the maltster was protected at 72c. per bushel on malt, while the barley, which the Canadian farmer grew, paid only 15c. per bushel. Was this tariff framed specially in the interests of the Gooderham and Wortsces, the Carlings *et alia*, or, as the leader of the Government promised throughout the country, in the interest of the great agricultural class. When he made that promise to the farmers in his (Mr. Ross's) own town, at the last elections, to obtain their support, they expected better things at his hands,—that he would protect their interests as fairly, fully, and liberally as the interests of the few maltsters and brewers. Then, again, pianos of the common kind, costing from \$200 to \$350 a piece, must

pay an increased duty of \$18, whereas the expensive ones costing from \$500 to \$600 had the duty increased on them only \$1. Here was discrimination again. If an honest yeoman wanted to adorn his parlour with a respectable looking piano, for which he gave \$400, down came the Custom-house officer, who wanted \$18 duty more than the old tariff; if a millionaire purchased a piano of a more expensive character, he only had to pay \$1 more duty than the old tariff. Then, the manufacturer of shingles was protected to the extent of 20 per cent., whilst the manufacturer of veneers, one of whom he had in his county, was not protected at all. Here was a raw material protected to the extent of 20 per cent., on one hand, while in the case of veneer, an industry that entered into the manufacture of furniture—which seemed to be under the peculiar patronage of hon. gentlemen opposite—must not be protected at all. Then a duty was placed upon school books and school slates. In the latter case a duty of 25 per cent. was imposed, and, in the former, 6c. per pound. Religious books, such as Bibles, hymn-books, etc., were taxed 5 per cent., while books, imported for the use of Sunday-schools, a literature of a very important character in this country, would have to pay a duty of 6c. per pound. By this tariff the Government went to a church and said: "Your religious books can come in free;" and then they went down into the basement, where the Sunday School was held, and said "We do not care so much about you, you are only children, and you must pay 6c. per pound upon the books you use." They had the most marvellous tariff that had ever been placed on the Statute-book of any country, a tariff that not only distinguished between grades of intellect and grades of religious instruction, but which also distinguished between the wool which grew upon the farm, and between the kinds of grain which the farm produced. He noticed that wool was admitted into the country free, whilst spades, hoes, rakes, and the shears with which the farmer clipped his wool paid a duty of 30 per cent. The manufacturer who made these articles was protected liberally. Perhaps some hon. gentleman could tell him why these industrial institutions received 30 per cent. protection, whilst wool, an important in-

dustry in this country, was not protected. Did his hon. friend the leader of the Government tell the agriculturists of Ontario the kind of protection he would give them? Here was a palpable increase which every farmer would feel in regard to every implement he would use on his farm. The wool industry had no protection. The manufacturer of soaps was protected 2c. per pound, whereas the manufacturer of pearl ash was not protected at all. Here was an industry which prevailed in his town, and which was of some little importance—the potash industry. On the other side of the street they had a soap factory, and this industry was protected from 1c. to 2c. per pound. Was there any fairness in that? Was it fair that, because one man invested his money in one business, and another in another, a discrimination should be made between them. Such a tariff was most oppressive in its discriminations. It had been conceived in iniquity, and brought forth in sin. It was a tariff that discriminated between the rich and the poor; and it was a tariff which would bring destruction on those who had introduced it. He objected to this tariff, because he believed it was going to be very expensive, not only in the sense that it would increase the costs of the goods to the consumer, but because it was going to be expensive in the mode of collecting the revenue. The Finance Minister, in bringing down the Budget, said it would be necessary to employ a number of experts to examine the goods imported into this country, so that their value might be appraised, and the country saved from being defrauded. This meant a positive increase in the collection of Customs hereafter. It meant his hon. friend would have to dismiss a number of Custom-house officers, and appoint others who had had a peculiar training in order to do this business. It meant more than that, an increase of the number of Custom-house officers of the present grade. When a bill of goods came to the Custom-house, consisting of cottons, silks, velveteens, etc., in order to calculate the Customs dues, they would be compelled to measure every article. Then the invoice would have to be looked into in order to levy the *ad valorem*. Thus there would be a large increase in the labours of the

Custom-house officers. A large increase would be necessitated in the Custom-house staff, and for that reason he objected to the tariff as being expensive. He objected to it in the next place, because he believed that it would lead the people of this country to depend upon the Government instead of upon themselves. This would be an untold calamity. They could not make this a prosperous or powerful country unless they cultivated the independence and self-reliance of the people. It was that quality which made England great. It was that which had been the main factor in her supremacy over the sea, and that had made her mistress of the destinies of the world. If they placed their people in a position of quasi-dependence on the Government, they were teaching them not to look to skill in their work ; not to look to machinery and inventions for the advancement of their industries, but to go in deputations to the Government and ask for protection against competition. That would be a most deplorable condition of affairs. It would enable the Government to use the tariff as a vast political machine by which all these industries could have their revenue increased as the price of political allegiance. It would enable the Government to go to men in all our cities and towns, and tell them, when there was any depression in their business, that they would give them increased protection, but that, at the same time, they must remember them at the elections. Such a state of things would be demoralising, not only from a business, but from a moral point of view. It would also be exceedingly disastrous to this country from a social and progressive point of view. In the last place, he looked upon this tariff as endangering the continuity, the permanence, and the homogeneity of this Confederation. Did they not find there were complaints in the Eastern Provinces that the people of Ontario were better protected than they were? Were there not complaints in Ontario that the people of Nova Scotia were better protected than they in the West? Did they not find complaints coming from various parts of the country in this matter? If Confederation were to last, it could only be preserved by being substantially founded in

the affections of the people of this country. If the Government did, as he believed they had done, from the very existence of Confederation, keep up the strongly defined geographical boundaries which before existed, this discontent might become aggravated, and disastrous consequences result. He would be glad to see our trade relations harmonious, and our political relations the same. The condition of affairs in this country should be such that the best men in the Dominion would be received into the Cabinet, irrespective of the Province from which they came ; that, no matter whether each Province was represented in the Cabinet or not, such would be the feeling of unity and confidence prevailing throughout every section of the Dominion that everybody would find his interests amply protected, and all his peculiar privileges secure. This tariff would still more strongly develop the Provincial distinctiveness already existing, by enabling Ministers to place the favours granted to the interests of one Province, as a set-off against favours granted to another Province. No man who would wish to see all classes of this country bound together by the strongest ties by which the country alone could be made prosperous, could but deplore the Provincial distinctions which this tariff was bound to perpetuate. And, who could tell that this power of adjusting Provincial interests, wholly under the control of the Ministry of the day, as it would be, might not be used as a means for purchasing political support, and prolonging their power, even long after they had forfeited all other claims upon their followers? These were prognostications of evil which, he trusted, might never occur ; but, one thing was certain, all the elements for producing these evils were contained in the Tariff Bill just brought down, and our escape from them, if we escaped at all, would be owing to the patriotism of our people, and not to the wisdom or forethought of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches.

MR. BANNERMAN said they were told by gentlemen opposite that the National Policy was going to ruin the country. He maintained that it was impossible for the National Policy to

ruin the country, as gentlemen opposite, through their national policy, had done so already. They had been told that in the United States, and in other countries where they had tried Protection, the result had been most deplorable. Had Protection on the other side of the line resulted in that deplorable condition of things? The figures of the last five or six years showed that the balance of trade was in favour of the United States to the extent of \$200,000,000. He thought it was time they should legislate for themselves, and not for another country; it was time they looked to their own interests. It was contended that the lumber interest had not been protected. He was a lumberman, and he was proud to think that lumbermen looked to the general interests of the country and not to their own. In reference to the effect of Free-trade, the history of England was of considerable significance. Was there any country in the world that protected her industries the same as England did, till within forty or fifty years ago? The United States, to-day, was protective; but England, seventy-five years ago, was more protective than the United States to-day. England, to-day, might thank her protective tariff for the high state she held amongst the nations of the world, both as a manufacturing country and an agricultural country. They were told that no country could be progressive without a Free-trade policy. He, however, contended that every country that had been progressive had been progressive under a system of Protection. He defied hon. gentlemen opposite to show him one country or state, that had ever been progressive under a Free-trade system; and he could show them that every country that ever was progressive, was progressive from the protective system. Even their great authority, John Stuart Mill himself, said that a poor or a young country, if it ever tried to be successful, would require to give a certain amount of Protection, and, after the reprint came out, through the influence of his friends, those words were erased from that edition. That was the case, as far as Protection and Free-trade were concerned in England. England did not owe her greatness to-day to her Free-trade system. Her greatness, commercially and politi-

MR. BANNERMAN.

cally, was due to her former protective system. They were told that they should not, in their hour of need and trial, bring up this Free-trade system. All statesmen should look to the history of other countries to guide them in their hour of trial and need, and what did history teach us? Look at the life of one of the greatest statesmen that ever, probably for the last 200 years, appeared, the man who, after fighting everyone for seven years, and at the end of that period, finding his country to be a million less in population out of four millions, and what did we find? Did he open his ports to the ports of all countries, to the English, French and American industries? No, Sir, he closed all the ports in his country; and at the end of eight years, instead of being in an impoverished state, as the country was previous to closing the ports, it was, after the eight years of protection, pure and simple, by which no foreign manufactures were allowed to enter the country, it had regained its former prosperous condition. That was Frederick the Great of Prussia. Unfortunately, for us, during the past four years, we had a lot of Frederick the Little in the Administration, and could neither get protection nor anything else. He thought this country was perfectly satisfied with the tariff. He had received letters and telegrams from quite a number of people in reference to it, and, as a whole, they were perfectly satisfied, and of opinion that they had at the head of the Finance Department one who was not a Heaven-born Finance Minister, but who would give and take, who would accept advice from different people and look after the interests of the country—not one who would be entirely wrapped up in his own personality.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) said the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had commenced by administering a lecture to hon. members on his side of the House. The hon. member seemed to drift back to the days before 1874, when his party had no record of Administration of their own; but now that they had a record, there was a certain amount of audacity on the part of any hon. gentleman opposite in lecturing hon. members

on this side of the House as to their conduct. Those hon. gentlemen seemed to forget that they had been tried by the country and found wanting, that the last rotten plank of the platform on which they had stood had been swept away for ever on the evening of the 17th September by the rushing tide of popular opinion. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had charged this Administration and its supporters with depreciating the prosperity of the country, forgetting the days gone by, when his party, through their leading organs, fomented a rebellion in Manitoba, in order to injure the Ministers of the day, and when they used their influence through the English press to injure the Pacific Railway scheme with the capitalists of England. The hon. gentleman had referred to the deputations which for four or five weeks had been pouring in on the Finance Minister. He forgot, however, to mention the deputations which had waited on another Finance Minister, the Heaven-born Finance Minister, and which so alarmed him that he suddenly changed his policy, and, instead of bringing down the policy he had propounded, brought down a tariff which merely imposed $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. additional duties all round. The present Finance Minister had more courage. He took the advice of business men, judging for himself how far it was practicable to be followed, and, in the interests of the country at large, modified his tariff to suit the requirements of the different agricultural, commercial and manufacturing interests. The speech of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) was one which no man who loved his country would have made; its effect was to set class against class, Province against Province, the poor against the rich. When the hon. gentleman asked what benefit the poor or working man could get from the tariff, he (Mr. Patterson) could tell him what the workingman would get through it—six days' work in the week; he would get money to pay for his coal and flour, and would not be obliged, as, during the past five years, to go to the United States, where there were so many thousand tramps, as hon. gentlemen opposite asserted, to search for employment. He (Mr. Patterson) living in a border county, knew the truth of the matter. He

had seen the people leaving Canada because they could not get work here. To-day our workingmen would have to pay fifty cents extra on their coal, and other temporary increases on the manufactures out of their weeks' wages, but they would be sure of six days' work in the week, and have sufficient to pay for their homesteads in the suburbs of the cities or towns in which they might be employed, with a little surplus to put in the savings banks, for the future of their families. This matter had been fully discussed throughout Ontario. His county had been honoured with the presence of no less than three Cabinet Ministers who came there to enlighten the farmer; but, strange to say, the farmer refused to be enlightened by them, and he, who was, at one time, in their estimation, so intelligent and discriminating a man, had fallen from his high place in their esteem, and was now an ignorant man. He was waking up to the knowledge of his own case, and was said to be actuated by selfish motives. Circumstances had altered him, and he was now fully alive to his own interests. There never was a time in the history of Ontario or the Dominion, when the political issue was put upon so clear a basis as during the last elections. Personal and local issues sank into insignificance, and the great question of the day was: Would we have a Government who admitted they could do nothing to increase the prosperity of the country, or one that promised to try to do something to increase it? The verdict was in favour of having a Government which would, at least, make the experiment. The people were tired of the "flies on the wheel," and wanted men to turn the wheel. He had the pleasure of having the late Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Bothwell, traverse his county, expounding, in the different towns and villages of Essex, the benefits of the Free-trade policy, and the injuries which would result from the adoption of a Protective policy. He used to tell the people only half the story. It was our duty to protect ourselves against the American people, who were largely protected against us, and to prevent our country continuing to be a slaughter market for the Americans. With respect to the possibility of retali-

ation by the Americans, as suggested by the Opposition, he had too much respect for them to suppose they would resent our taking an imitative line of action which, in reality, was a compliment to their own intelligence. After having tried a comparatively Free-trade system, and not finding it answer, the Americans adopted a protective tariff, and since then had increased rapidly in population and wealth. They had also paid a large amount of their war debt, and, although suffering, in common with England, from distress, prosperity was again dawning on them, and there was not the slightest prospect of any change of policy being adopted by them. In all the American papers which criticised the tariff, not one offered the slightest hope that there was going to be a change in the tariff along their border. Their advice would be treated with due respect, but it was time Canadians should legislate for Canadian and not American interests. The hon. gentlemen opposite adverted to the system that made England wealthy. He (Mr. Patterson) had read up the subject and made himself thoroughly acquainted with it. He believed that England was a highly protected country until about forty years ago, that the first thing which made Free-trade popular in England was the cry of "cheap bread," which appealed to our humanity, and was, indirectly, a protection to the manufacturers. The wages which the people received were insufficient to support their families, and the manufacturers saw that, by getting the corn laws repealed, and the prices, therefore, of the absolute necessities reduced, they would not be under the immediate necessity of increasing the wages. Consequently, they selfishly advocated this cry for the repeal of the corn laws. The cry also appealed to the active sympathies of another, the wealthier class, who had no interest in manufactures, but a natural sympathy for distress. There were other reasons which influenced England in favour of Free-trade, but in his opinion the true reason was that the English manufacturers felt that, could they induce other nations to trade with them, on apparently equal terms, they, having the advantage of established manufactures, accumulated capital, the most improved machinery and abundant cheap labour, would, in

MR. PATTERSON.

reality, control the markets of the world. The Americans were among the first to grasp the situation as it really was, and now, not only they, but almost every civilised nation on the face of the globe had adopted a protective system. It must be remembered that for centuries England had built up her manufactures under a protective system, which gave her a long start in advance of any other nation in the world, when she began to enter into competition with them. When Canada was thus built up, when our trade communications were improved and our manufacturers had had the same opportunity of accumulating manufacturing facilities, then it would be time for Canada to talk about Free-trade or a revenue tariff. If we desired to offer some inducement to emigrants from the over-crowded countries of Europe, we must be able to offer them opportunities, but we could not do this unless we had manufactures. It had been said that all this would be of no benefit to the farmer. He thought, however, that, apart altogether from direct protection to the farmer, that class would greatly benefit from protection to the manufacturers, for this would build up thriving towns and cities, increase the number of consumers, and furnish them a permanent home market. He, for one, would like to see some items in this tariff changed. He thought $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on corn might have been 10 per cent. He believed they could grow corn enough in Ontario to supply the whole Dominion. It could be grown from the Detroit to the Niagara rivers, as abundantly as on the western prairies. In the county he had the honour to represent (Essex), there were 200,000 acres of uncultivated land, and, if sufficient encouragement were given to the farmers, they would cultivate that land, which could be purchased as cheaply as any agricultural land in Ontario; and they would thus remain in the Province, instead of seeking homes in the North-West. He also expected a duty on wool, and one on tobacco. In those Lake Erie townships, a fine quality of tobacco could be grown, and he had hoped the hon. the Finance Minister would have been able to devise some scheme by which the Excise could be taken off Canadian tobacco altogether. It was now very burdensome to the

growers, who were obliged to sell it to some person who had a license for keeping a bonded warehouse. The Excise duty ought to be removed, and a small Customs duty placed upon the imported leaf. He might mention other items, did he suppose he could have any influence with the hon. the Finance Minister. The item of wool was one upon which he did expect a certain amount of protection, and he could not understand why that article was left upon the free list. Broom corn was another. It might be a small matter to this House; but enough could be grown in those southwestern counties of Ontario to supply the Dominion. He urged upon the hon. the Finance Minister to take that article out of the free list and put it in the unenumerated list of 20 per cent. This would encourage a number of struggling and depressed industries which were now injured by competition with the same class across the border, who were in the enjoyment of protection at home. He (Mr. Patterson) would again urge upon the Finance Minister a reconsideration of the articles he had enumerated, especially corn, wool, tobacco and barrelled pork which ought to have an additional duty of \$1 per barrel. The general question was not one between Free-trade and Protection, as was pretended. When the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) did him the honour of coming down to Essex, last summer, he (Mr. Mackenzie) took the ground that the contest was between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff. The battle, then, had not been really between a protective tariff and Free-trade, as some hon. gentlemen pretended. Regarding this question in the abstract, he was neither a Protectionist nor a Free-trader, but he believed in every country adapting itself to the circumstances in which it found itself. On this point, he would give the opinion of Mr. Samuel Laing, an English writer on political economy :

"Political economy is not a universal science, of which the principles are applicable to all men, under all circumstances, and equally good and true for all nations; but every country has a political economy of its own, suitable to its own physical circumstances of position on the globe, climate, soil and products, and to the habits, character, and idiosyncrasy of its inhabitants, formed or modified by such circumstances."

This was a correct definition. For the last five years the wheels of industry had been stopped in Canada. Then they had a Finance Minister who declared that he did not feel himself in a position to do anything to alleviate the distress of the country; and the people, seeing they must choose between retaining in power a Government that endorsed the utterances of the late Finance Minister, or entrust the administration of affairs to the gentlemen lately in Opposition, had, by an overwhelming vote, decided to trust to the promises of the Conservative leaders; and, if they were to believe the newspapers from all parts of the country, and the letters they were constantly receiving, the country was satisfied that the Government had endeavoured to keep their promises. What grieved the hon. gentlemen opposite was that the Government had tried to keep their promises to the people of this country. For months they had been saying that the National Policy meant nothing, that it was a mere sham, something got up to delude the people. After a while, they changed their tactics, and told them there was going to be so much duty on this article, and so much on that, and so kept the commercial men of this country in a state of uncertainty. Now that the tariff had been proposed, they did not know how to take it, and were falling back upon the expedient of interviewing dealers in various articles of trade, and they repeated the clamours of Opposition papers that had published interviews with crockery merchants, and others, who did not know very much more about the matter than did the late hon. the Minister of Finance himself. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) laid down one proposition with which he quite agreed, namely, that the basis of all wealth was labour. That was the very principle upon which the late Opposition went to the country, the very principle laid down last Session in the resolution of the right hon. the leader of the Government. They desired to keep the labour in this country by building up our manufactures, by assisting our agricultural and mining industries, and by fostering a great inter-provincial trade. What was the object of Confederation? What was the object of uniting the different Provinces, if it were not to pro-

mote inter-provincial trade. He remembered that, in former days, when the people were beginning to discuss Confederation, the then real leader of the gentlemen opposite declared that he would build ten Intercolonial Railways rather than have Confederation a failure. But the sum necessary to build ten Intercolonial Railways would be far in excess of what would be needed to put our commerce and our manufacturing industries on a proper footing. He lived in the most southernly county in Canada, and the most westernly county in Ontario, and he was willing to go back and face his constituents to-morrow, after voting for a duty on coal. He would have been willing even to vote for a higher duty on soft coal, if doing so would bring about a direct trade between Western Ontario and Nova Scotia—the latter sending their coal, and the former returning flour, meal and other products. That matter had been fully discussed, and the farmers in Western Ontario were prepared to accept a duty on coal. It would scarcely affect the farmers of Ontario, and, if the duty on coal affected chiefly the people in towns and cities, that was precisely the class that would be best able to support it, by reason of the benefit they would derive from protected manufacturing industries established in their midst. It would be better for the workmen to pay the addition, should the price be raised on coal, a result which he doubted, and still remain in Canada and build up homes for themselves in their own country, than to emigrate to the Western States. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in their speeches on this subject, presented two contradictory propositions. One gave them a most melancholy picture of the future of the manufacturing classes, who would be ruined and impoverished in the course of a few years; another Opposition speaker would get up and tell them that it was the working classes who were going to be the chief sufferers. But they could not both suffer from the change proposed. If, by competition between manufacturers, prices were brought down, the working classes would benefit. The ultimate result of this policy would be to bring down prices even lower than they were now, under competition with United States manufactures. But, if it

were true that the non-producing class were going to be injured by the manufacturers, it must, at least, be admitted that the manufacturers would be benefited; on the other hand, if the manufacturing classes were going to be ruined and impoverished by over-competition, then the working classes must be benefited in the meantime by the reduced prices. He could not but believe that the supporters of both theories among the gentlemen opposite were equally aware of the fallacies to which they were giving utterance. The hon. gentleman from West Middlesex had charged the people of this country with bowing before false gods, with having been bribed wholesale by constituencies and by Provinces. He (Mr. Patterson) thought such a charge came with bad grace from the hon. gentleman. He believed the people of Canada had sufficient good sense to choose between a false policy and a sound one, and that they had so chosen; and he trusted and believed the future would prove that they had chosen wisely. He believed an era of prosperity was dawning upon them, although, in every organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite, they tried to persuade the people that the policy of the Government was going to retard the prosperity of this country, injure them abroad, and have a most depressing effect on their commerce. Still, he believed the good sense of the people of this Dominion would enable them to see through the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, as they had become accustomed to them. They had had for their stock in trade this cry of class against class, interest against interest, Province against Province. That had been the system by which they temporarily obtained power, under exceptional circumstances, and by a cry which deceived the people for the time being. He was satisfied that their day had passed, and that the people of this Dominion would not again be deceived by them, and hon. gentlemen opposite would have to rise to something higher and nobler than the old system of national prejudices, seeking to set the Province of Ontario against the other Provinces. He thought they would show a truer spirit of patriotism if, instead of endeavouring to throw obstacles in the way of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury

benches, instead of trying to prevent them from making an effort to resuscitate the prosperity of the country, they would join in endeavouring to assist them in every possible way to achieve the happy results that were so ardently anticipated from this policy.

MR. COCKBURN (Muskoka) said he did not propose to weary the House with any platitudes, or repetitions of stump speeches that had been delivered during the past summer. He merely wished to glance at the situation which now presented itself before the people of the country, and more especially before the members of this House. He would say, at the outset, that he thought the Liberal party had fought out the contest in the last election in a most patriotic way. They looked at the questions before them from a Dominion standpoint, whilst the other party set one section against another, made certain promises to one section and a different promise to another. An unsuccessful effort has been made to fulfil a promise to the western section, but the promise to the eastern one was deliberately broken. The celebrated telegram sent to Mr. Boyd stated that the tariff was not to be increased. He (Mr. Cockburn) thought there had been an increase all round. He put it on this basis—enumerated articles, which, under the old tariff, paid a duty of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., now paid 20 per cent. Was that not an increase of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.? He was free to admit that the Finance Minister had laboured diligently to prepare the tariff so as to meet the requirements and give satisfaction to all parts of the country, but he had not accomplished it. He felt inclined to sympathise with the hon. gentleman, were it not for the inconsistent course he had taken, as it must only lead to failure. So far as he had been able to ascertain, not a single interest, except the woollen industry, had been satisfied. He had a letter from a gentleman in the iron foundry business, which said that the National Policy would entail an injury of \$1,000 a year on him, without any remuneration. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) spoke about farmers not objecting to a duty on coal; but he must remember that farmers had

cord wood for sale; therefore, it was to their interest to have a duty on coal. They knew that several counties had been carried by that cry. Farmers would now have to pay more duty on woollen goods. If they wanted a pair of blankets—say a pair, the imported price of which was \$3, they would now have to pay $67\frac{1}{2}$ c. duty more than formerly, and got no protection for the wool they raised. Also, all sorts of cotton, including bags, would pay a higher duty than formerly. Of course, the farmer was told he would receive larger prices for his products, but that was another of the fallacies. He rose chiefly for the purpose of saying something in behalf of the great lumber interest of the country. It formed one-third of the exports of the Dominion. The exports of lumber, which, some years ago, amounted to \$28,000,000, had gone down to \$20,000,000; this shrinkage told severely upon the country. It was not necessary to tell hon. gentlemen what the lumber trade had done for this country. It was estimated there was \$75,000,000 invested in the lumber trade, and there were 60,000 labourers employed in it, and 300,000 people depending on it. All these people were interested in getting their provisions at as reasonable prices as possible. He would, before sitting down, give a synopsis of the quantity of materials used in this business. In 1873, the revenue derived from this trade, in Ontario, was more than \$900,000; in Quebec, it was over \$400,000; New Brunswick, about \$100,000. Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island did not amount to very much in the way of revenue. In British Columbia one cent per acre paid both ground rent and stumpage, and in Manitoba the lands were controlled by the Dominion. It had been said that the lumber industry was not an enduring source of revenue, that it was not like grain crops. He thought it was as much an enduring source of revenue as the coal interest, because, when it was dug out, the coal did not grow again, whereas the small pines were coming on, and it was to him a source of great satisfaction to know that, in the Province of Nova Scotia, they had a supply of coal sufficient for centuries. The lumbering business was not so much exhausted as some per-

sons stated it to be, and, taking spruce trees for instance, it was known that good logs for sawing could be raised from seed in fifty years, and that the present spruce groves could be advantageously cut over every seven years. Therefore, if the coal interest was to be fostered, the lumber industry should also be favourably considered. He hoped the United States Government would see their way to remove the duty off coal, so that the people of Nova Scotia could supply the convenient markets of the Eastern States. He did not believe that 50c. a ton would enable them to lay down coal in opposition to the United States, and a supporter of the Government, the member for Pictou, had said so. He would give some statistics in regard to lumber. He contended that the lumber business was a manufacturing business, though some persons classed lumber as raw material. It was a business which required first-class machinery and skillful labour. In carrying on the lumber business, in the Ottawa valley alone, some 35,926 barrels of flour were required, 31,850 barrels of pork, and 925,387 pounds of tea. He did not give this statement for the purpose of saying what duty was being paid upon these goods, as the duties on some of them were not going to be increased; but to give an idea of the magnitude of the business in one section of the country alone. 21,357 bushels of beans were consumed; 7,000 bars of soap; 1,028,571 bushels of oats; 17,500 tons of hay; \$34,664 worth of axes; besides chains, ropes, files, \$11,665 worth; saws, \$30,600 worth; sleighs, etc., amounting to a large sum. The hardware portion of these would now pay 30 per cent. instead of 17½, the former duty. On blankets, there was an enormous increase of duty, also, and the immense number of axes used, 34,664 last year, would henceforth pay 30 per cent., as would also chains and everything else of this nature, imported to a large extent. He noticed that the cordage used for ships was to pay but 10 per cent., but that used by the lumbermen, 20 per cent. He, himself, ran a short line of small steamers on the lakes, in the lumber district, and did not see why he should get cordage at 10 per cent., while his neighbour the lumberman paid 20.

MR. COCKBURN.

Where was the fair play there? Besides, the machinery used in the cotton manufacture, not made in Canada, entered duty free, while that used in saw mills would pay 20 per cent. Was there any fairness in that provision? There were parts of machines, heavy forgings and the like, that would have to be brought from abroad. Cotton and other raw materials of manufactures would be free, while lumber and its manufactures would pay 20 per cent. This very large lumber industry had not been fairly treated, because it had not been clamorous. None had suffered more; it had suffered even much more than many other manufactures. He knew some iron manufacturers who said they did not want to see more protection; what they dreaded most was home competition and over-production. While the lumbermen were left out in the cold, they were charged a heavy increase of duties on some commodities, an increase of 22½ on woollens, which formerly carried but 12½ per cent. He appealed to the House if this lumbering industry had been properly treated. Men in other trades, who came here with carpet-bag in hand, and took up their quarters alongside the Finance Minister, to be able to press him on all occasions, succeeded in getting what they wanted. Not so with the lumbermen, though their business ought to be fostered; yet they only asked fair play among other industries. A great many new settlers in the rear districts were benefitted by their employment and purchases, and they mutually benefitted each other, though in some isolated cases there might be a clashing of interest felt from the restrictive lumber regulations inaugurated by the first Government of Ontario. Another burden on the lumbermen would be the duty on bacon, much of which was imported; the new duty, 2c. per lb., was double the old. Besides, these new duties would weigh heavily on the new settlers, who would find it took much more of their produce to purchase the articles they needed, and that the purchasing power of a dollar was greatly reduced. Though they had been the unsuccessful party at the elections, they would fight the battle out fairly. They did not array section against section. He had, in a distant section of his Province (Ontario), spoken

as considerably of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and of their rights and interests, as he would have done in the House. He had prophesied that this National Policy would not be entered upon, and now confessed his mistake; but he would risk another prophecy—that it would not work, or succeed, and he felt that prediction would be realised, though he hoped not. He trusted that the Finance Minister would see his way to remove some of the anomalies injuriously affecting the lumberman and settler, and thus do justice to this large and deserving interest. He was very sorry that an hon. gentleman like the Finance Minister, who enjoyed such a reputation in the country, should have lent himself to such an unjust policy.

MR. CASEY said that, as some hon. gentlemen yet desired to speak, and as the hour was late, he would move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was sorry the hon. member for Chateauguay was not present, as he had a suggestion to make with respect to sitting on Saturday, 22nd inst., and not on Monday, 24th.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said they could not sit on Saturday, but would sit on Monday, and at the close adjourn till Wednesday, when this debate would be resumed. The Government would ask Thursday for the rest of the Session.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Five minutes after
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 24th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NORTH SYDNEY HARBOUR BILL.

(*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton.*)

FIRST READING PROPOSED.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) moved for leave to introduce a Bill re-

specting the harbour of North Sydney, Nova Scotia. He said the object of the Bill was to enable the Harbour Master at North Sydney to collect tolls, which tolls should be devoted to the improvement of the harbour and the removal of the bar which was gradually forming at the mouth of the harbour.

MR. MACKENZIE said the Bill was either a private one and should have been introduced on petition, or it was a public Bill, and should have been introduced by resolution.

MR. SPEAKER said he was afraid this Bill should have been introduced upon resolution, and suggested the hon. member should withdraw it.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn.*

DUAL REPRESENTATION ABOLITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Ouimet.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. OUMIET introduced a Bill (No. 62) To repeal an Act passed in the 36th year of Her Majesty's Reign, chapter 2, intituled: "An Act to render Members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included, or which may hereafter be included, within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada."

Bill read the first time.

ADJOURNMENT FOR ANNUNCIATION DAY.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

"That when the House adjourns this day it shall stand adjourned till Wednesday next."

Motion agreed to.

THE TARIFF DEBATE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

"That the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Tilley for the second reading of Resolutions, relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, be the first

Order of the Day on Wednesday next, and have precedence immediately after Routine and before Questions put by members."

MR. MACKENZIE objected to the motion being made now, as, notice having been given of it, it came in its regular order as a Government notice of motion. On a private members' day, a Minister had no more right, in regard to precedence, than a private member. He was prepared, before the House rose, to consider the motion, but he was not willing that the matter should be taken out of the hands of the House in this way.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said notices were always given for the introduction of Private Bills, but they were always introduced under the head of motions. He had mentioned this matter in the House on Friday night, and the proposal was accepted by the ex-Minister of Finance. The present course of the leader of the Opposition was a trick, and a very unworthy trick.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, if the hon. gentleman had made any arrangement with Mr. Cartwright, it was without his knowledge.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It was made across the floor in the presence of the whole House.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had heard that the hon. gentleman had proposed to take Wednesday, and he had stated that the Opposition would be disposed to consider anything that would facilitate business, and would consider the matter when it came up.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had stated that it would be well to finish the debate on the tariff, and, with that view, to continue it on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, and the member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) said it was perfectly fair to take Wednesday instead of Tuesday, but that the further proposition should be subject to consideration; but he decidedly assented to Wednesday being taken.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had not heard it.

MR. HESSON said the hon. member for Lambton was not present in his seat on the occasion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

MR. MACKENZIE insisted on his objection.

MR. SPEAKER said the practice was that the notices were put on the paper, amongst the notices of motion, in their order according to date. The notices for the introduction of Bills were not put on the routine paper, and Bills were introduced when motions were called.

MR. MACKENZIE said, if the arrangement was made with Mr. Cartwright, as the hon. gentleman said, there was no motion necessary. He should not dispute any arrangement made with any of his colleagues, but the hon. gentleman would see that he was quite right in enforcing the rights of private members. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) would have done the same had he been in his (Mr. Mackenzie's) place.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. member for Lambton had made motions in precisely the same way when he was leader of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said they were always moved on a Government day.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, if these notices were to go on the notice paper at the foot of the list, any member in the House could prevent the business going on by insisting on each item being called in its order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was simply putting upon the Order paper an agreement come to by both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER said he had nothing to do with the agreement, but he knew the practice to be what he stated. Very frequently, of course, such motions had been allowed by consent, or upon a Government day, but, if any objection was taken, he was afraid he must rule that the motion ought to wait for its turn.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 12) To authorise the Welland Railway Company to convert their six per

cent. mortgage bonds into five per cent. debenture stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 20) To amend the Act 41 Victoria, chapter 29, intituled: "An Act to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company."—(Mr. Scriver.)

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bill was *considered* in Committee of the Whole, and *reported*:—

Bill (No. 23) To incorporate the *Gazette* Printing Company.—(Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre.)

MOUNTED POLICE SUPPLIES.

QUESTION.

MR. SCHULTZ enquired, When tenders will be asked for the supplies for the Mounted Police, and whether advertisements for such tenders will be published in the principal newspapers of the Dominion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Tenders have already been asked for, and published in the principal newspapers for supplies to the Mounted Police, with the exception of the supplies to the extreme North-West, on the border, where supplies must for awhile be got from Montana.

EXPORT DUTY ON HEMLOCK BARK.

QUESTION.

MR. VALLÉE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to hinder the exportation of hemlock bark by imposing a duty on this product when exported to the United States.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is not the intention of the Government to do so.

MAIL SERVICE IN NORTH BRUCE.

QUESTION.

MR. GILLIES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the current year, to extend a tri-weekly mail to Lion's Head, Sauguené

Peninsula, in the North Riding of Bruce, instead of a weekly mail, as at present.

MR. LANGEVIN: I am not aware that the attention of the Department has been called to this matter since this Government has been in office. Nevertheless, I will enquire into it.

TIME OF MEETING OF PARLIAMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. FARROW enquired, Do the Government see their way open to call Parliament together in the future about the middle of January instead of February as now?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is the intention of the Government to call Parliament as early next winter as possible, but it is impossible to fix any day. That must be governed by public exigencies.

SETTLEMENT OF GOVERNMENT LAND AT GROSSE ISLE.

QUESTION.

MR. LANDRY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to let out for farming purposes the 150 or 200 acres of land they hold at Grosse Isle, or to put it under cultivation so as to prevent the farm from growing up in alder and other brush.

MR. POPE (Compton): The Government intend to look into the matter. They propose to make a re-organisation of the Grosse Isle ground.

EXPENSES OF CUSTOMS OFFICES.

QUESTION.

MR. KRANZ enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to re-adjust the expenses of the various Customs offices so that the expenses of their services shall be in proportion to the nature of their duties and to the amount of business performed by them.

MR. BOWELL: It is the policy of the Department to adjust the expenses of the various Customs offices with a due regard to the service.

DUTIES ON GOODS *EX* "CASPIAN."

QUESTION.

MR. CHARLTON enquired, Whether any importers were allowed to enter invoices of goods received per steamship *Caspian* on the 17th inst., and clear their invoices at the rates of duty in force prior to the 14th inst., and before the goods covered by paid invoices were landed in Canada.

MR. BOWELL: No importer has been allowed by the Department to enter goods per *Caspian*, landed on the 17th March, at the rates of duties in force on the 14th March, nor has the Department any knowledge of any such permission having been given by any of its officers.

COAL ROLLING-STOCK ON EASTERN
EXTENSION RAILWAY,
NOVA SCOTIA.

QUESTION.

MR. DOULL enquired, Whether the Government are prepared to guarantee to the Coal Mining Association of Pictou county, that the Eastern Extension Railway shall be fitted with sufficient coal rolling stock, not only to keep the Companies from losing their present business, but also to meet the increasing trade, as shewn in the memorial of the Coal Mining Association, of the 17th February, 1879, to the Minister of Public Works.

MR. TUPPER: The Government have no authority from Parliament to give any guarantee, but will do all in their power to promote the transport of coal by the parties named.

POST OFFICES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

QUESTIONS.

MR. MCINNES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish, this year, a post-office on the North Arm of the Fraser River, British Columbia.

MR. LANGEVIN: The application for this service has been sent to the Inspector for report.

MR. BOWELL.

MR. MCINNES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect, this year, a new post-office in the city of Westminster, British Columbia.

MR. TUPPER: It is not the intention of the Government to erect a new post-office in this city this year, but they will endeavour to provide additional accommodation in that locality for the postal service.

SALMON HATCHERY IN BRITISH
COLUMBIA.

QUESTION.

MR. MCINNES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a salmon hatchery this year on the Fraser River, British Columbia; and if not, why not.

MR. POPE (P. E. I.): It is not the intention of the Government to do so.

MAIL SERVICES IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

QUESTION.

MR. CONNELL enquired, Whether application has been made by the New Brunswick Railway Company, or by petition of the inhabitants of the counties of York, Carleton and Victoria, for a postal car and clerk to start daily from Woodstock to Fredericton, and Woodstock to Grand Falls, through the counties of York, Carleton and Victoria, to afford proper facility for the distribution of mail matter to Woodstock, Fredericton and Grand Falls, etc., now so much needed; and also, whether or not the Government will provide for such service.

MR. LANGEVIN: I am not aware that this application has been made; but, knowing the importance of the service, I have directed that enquiry be made, in order to see what this service may cost, and determine afterwards whether it be such that we might allow the services as required by the hon. gentleman.

MR. RYLAND'S CLAIM FOR INTEREST.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. CARON, in the absence of Mr. COURSOL, moved for copies of all papers,

correspondence, etc., relative to the claim of Mr. Ryland, for interest due him on the Canadian moiety of Chief Justice Carter's award; together with the report of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake), in January or February, 1877, suggesting that the Local Governments of Quebec and Ontario should be called upon conjointly, to pay the amount claimed, if such report is in its character a public and not a confidential paper.

Motion agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. JOHN RIVER AT
WOODSTOCK.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. CONNELL moved for copies of all correspondence, papers and plans in connection with a bridge placed across the River St. John, N.B., at Woodstock, county of Carleton, which interferes with the navigation; also, a bridge erected across same river at Andover, county of Victoria.

MR. TUPPER said there was no objection to the correspondence being brought down, although it was not complete. Certain steamboat proprietors had demanded certain work to be done to avoid interruptions to navigation. The attention of the late Government was drawn to the matter, and the parties asking the bridges were obliged to put in a draw, under instruction of the engineer of the Government. The necessity for the use of the draw was suspended by the parties who owned the railway purchasing boats, and the navigation, therefore, of the river by these boats was not carried out. In consequence, provision was not made to operate the draw, although the draws were put in for the purpose. Parties were now engaged in constructing a steamer to navigate that portion of the river, and the Government had called on the railway company who owned the bridge to put in the necessary facilities for operating the draw. It would be a serious question as to whether parties, after the bridge had been constructed and the necessary provision made for the draw by the Government Engineer, could be called upon to alter the whole construction of the bridge.

MR. MACKENZIE said the stream or current took such a course at that point that it would be difficult to get greater width between the piers than at present existed. The late Government took a good deal of pains to ascertain the exact state of the river at various stages, and everything that could be desired was done. Mr. Perley's report would show that.

MR. DOMVILLE: I do not think the Government had the power to give the crossing,

MR. MACKENZIE: We happen to differ about that.

MR. DOMVILLE said that in 1876 an Act was passed to provide for the crossing of navigable rivers, at which time he had pointed out that it was not right to allow railroad companies or others to bridge such rivers as the St. John, and thus impede navigation. In consequence of his representations, an amendment was inserted, the sixth section providing that no order should be made under it to authorise the crossing of the Rivers St. Lawrence and St. John. The attention of the late Government was distinctly called to the crossing of the St. John, and if they allowed any railroad to bridge the river in such a way as to impede navigation at that time or since, they neglected their duty, undoubtedly.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman was labouring under a misapprehension; the St. Lawrence and St. John were both excluded from the Navigation Act of 1875, but they did not deny themselves the power of treating the St. John as a navigable river, communicating with the sea, and they had ample power, under the British North America Act, without any special Act, to deal with the matter. It was not under that special Act they proceeded, but under the general authority given by the Constitution.

MR. DOMVILLE said he admitted that, under the British North America Act, they had the power to bridge such rivers, if the Governor-in-Council gave the privilege, but under certain restrictions as to draw-bridges and swing-bridges; but, if, after the attention of the Government was called to this mat-

ter, in 1876, they allowed any company to bridge the St. John, without using swing bridges, they were to blame.

MR. MACKENZIE said they saw to that requirement being respected.

MR. DOMVILLE: You could not have done that.

MR. TUPPER said, as he understood the requirement, there was to be a draw in every bridge across those rivers. In the case of the St. John, the clause requiring this draw was not executed because steamboats ceased to navigate the river; but now they had resumed its navigation, the Government had called attention to the necessity of complying with the law in this respect.

Motion agreed to.

COAL CARS ON THE GOVERNMENT RAILWAY IN NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for a copy of a monthly return of the number of coal cars checked for being over weight upon the Government Railway in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, between 1st July, 1878, and 1st March, 1879; also a return showing the quantity of coal sold by the Government to their employes and others along the line of railway in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; the different prices paid for the same by these persons, and the original contract price. He said that the regulation weight for coal cars passing over the Government railway in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was 20,000lb., yet certain coal car companies in those Provinces systematically infringed this regulation, and were, in so doing, assisted by the officials. During the last week of February last, one company sent from Pictou to Truro cars weighing 22,550lb. each, and another cars of 22,800lb., or an average of 2,700lb. over-weight, this being passed by the railway officials. One part of his motion was devoted to that subject, the other dealing with the sale of coal to the officials and their friends, to the loss of the railway. Then, again, the Department furnished coal to those officials without

MR. DOMVILLE.

weight or measure, the result being not only a loss to the revenue and Government, as regarded the amount supplied, but in the matter of freight. It was hardly fair that a Government railway should become a vendor of coal, and also carry it for nothing at a loss to the public, and to the injury of the companies in competition with it, which paid revenue to the Government.

MR. TUPPER said that, after the hon. gentleman put his question on the paper, he had made enquiries of the Department of Public Works, and had found that no cars had been checked for over-weight, so that it was impossible to make a return on the subject. He had directed the gentleman in charge of the Intercolonial Railway to give the subject his attention, and see that no cars were over-weighted, or carried more coal than authorised, or for which the carriage was paid. In regard to the second part of the motion, it had been the habit of the Railway Department for some years past to allow the employes of the railway to obtain coal purchased by the Department, carriage free; but, so soon as this matter was brought to his attention, he at once ordered the discontinuance of the practice.

MR. MCKAY said the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) was slightly mistaken as to the cars being overloaded and charged at less weight than they really carried. The railway officials at Truro, to his own knowledge, when they discovered the cars were overloaded, or suspected the fact, always weighed them, and charged proportionately for the amount over weight. He had been, himself, charged in this way. It was not the practice to overload the cars. He had never known an instance of the stationmaster's omitting to charge for over-weight.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said he had been requested by a gentleman largely interested in the coal trade to bring this matter before the Department. He knew not how long the irregularities had lasted, but it was asserted that the parties mentioned had used that privilege for some time—the over-loaded cars had

not been checked, and certain parties had been favoured by the officials of the railroad.

Motion *agreed to*.

PORT STANLEY REVENUE.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. CASEY moved for copies of all statements in reference to the collection and expenditure of the revenues of the Port Stanley Harbour, showing, in detail, the tolls collected on all articles, and in what localities, and for what works expenditure has been incurred, made by the Great Western Railway Company, under the terms of their lease of that harbour, and all reports of Government Engineers in regard to the condition of that harbour, and the manner in which the Company has fulfilled its obligations under its lease, since the date of the last return. He said that the harbour of Port Stanley was held under a lease from the Government by the Great Western Railway, on condition that they made annual returns of all the tolls collected from the shipping in the harbour and the articles bonded there, and also of the expenditure of this revenue, with details of the special services for which it had been incurred. No returns had been made to the House for some years, and the people in the neighbourhood felt anxious to know whether the terms of the lease had been properly carried out. Complaints had been made to him that the company expended that revenue in a manner to improve their own property, rather than that of the harbour. The harbour, though at the mouth of the stream, technically extended up to a certain bridge, and it was stated that the company had been expending funds above instead of below the bridge, in that part of the harbour leased from the Government.

MR. TUPPER said he had no objection to the motion. A survey of the harbour had been made, and a report upon its condition was being prepared, but he did not know when it could be brought down; it would be as soon as made.

MR. CASEY said it would be interesting to know the particular articles on

which the tolls were collected. It was desired to know whether the company collected tolls on the large amount of coal imported for their own use. The chief object of the motion was to ascertain the method and place of expenditure of the tolls—whether it had been incurred for their own or the public benefit.

Motion *agreed to*.

QUARTZ MINING MACHINERY IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) moved for copies of all letters and telegrams received by the Minister of Customs, during the year 1878, from parties in British Columbia, in regard to the admission during that year into the said Province of machinery for quartz mining, on the condition of security being given that the duties thereon would be paid within twelve months; together with copies of all instructions forwarded by the Minister of Customs in regard to the same subject to the Collector of Customs at Victoria, British Columbia. He said his object was to obtain some information as to the causes which had led to the violation of the promise made last year, by the hon. the Minister of Customs, and through which several mining companies in British Columbia had suffered loss and inconvenience. The House, no doubt, was aware that, for the last 20 years, one of the principal industries in British Columbia had been gold mining; but that mining had been carried on, so far, mainly in relation to the alluvial washings of the rivers, and deposits found in the beds of ancient streams. During the last two years, finding that these washings were gradually becoming exhausted, the attention of the miners had been directed to quartz-mining. Several companies were formed last year and the year before, for the purpose of carrying out this great object, and, for that purpose, ordered machinery from California. It was impracticable then to acquire that machinery from any portion of Canada, on account of the heavy expense of freight; besides, the machinery specially adapted for quartz-mining was made a specialty in San

Francisco; patterns could be obtained there, not procurable in the Dominion. During last Session, a delegation, consisting of Senators and members from British Columbia, along with a gentleman from Victoria, interested in quartz-mining, waited upon the late Minister of Customs, requesting him to use his influence to obtain the remission of the duties upon this machinery imported into British Columbia during 1878. That hon. Minister answered that compliance was beyond his power, but that he would submit the matter to the Treasury Board and that, in the meantime, all the companies that would import machinery during the year could import it free of duty for one year by giving bonds that the duties that might be charged should be paid at the expiration of that period, should the Treasury Board not consent to the request made. Shortly after that meeting, he (Mr. Thompson) had received a telegram addressed to himself and the hon. member for Yale, from a quartz-mining company, stating that they were about ordering machinery for a large mill from San Francisco, and requesting them to use their endeavours to obtain the admission of the same free of duty. In company with Mr. Dewdney he then waited on the Minister of Customs, who told them he had already given them his reply on this subject, and that they need not trouble themselves any more, as instructions had been sent to the Collector of Customs at Victoria, ordering him to admit all machinery for quartz-mining companies, imported during 1878, free, on the understanding that those companies gave bonds for the payment of the duty in twelve months. On the strength of this assurance from the Minister, the company with which he was connected, and to which he had particular reference, ordered machinery from San Francisco. The machinery arrived at Burrard Inlet in the early part of August. The company had then given instructions to their agents to receive this machinery, pay the freight, give bonds for the duty, and have it forwarded up the Fraser River by steamboat to the head of navigation. On its arrival there, the machinery could not be landed. The Deputy Collector of Customs would not allow it to be landed till the

MR. THOMPSON.

duty was paid. The secretary of the company waited upon him (Mr. Thompson) and told him that the answer he had given as coming from the Minister of Customs had been violated. He (Mr. Thompson) immediately telegraphed to Mr. Hamly, Collector at Victoria, stating that the Minister of Customs had given him this assurance, desiring to know why the machinery could not be landed. To this he received the following reply:—

“VICTORIA, Aug. 13, 1878.

“To J. S. Thompson.

“Machinery is now at Burrard Inlet, and can not go forward to Cariboo till duty paid. No authority from Ottawa for taking bond.

“W. HAMLY.”

The consequence of this was that the company was obliged to telegraph to parties in Victoria in order to find the money with which to pay the duty, as they had made no preparation for immediate payment, and also to pay demurrage to the vessel, which was detained several days. The secretary of the company wrote to him that the amount of duties, demurrage, and exchange, amounted to \$1,758.75, and for telegrams in connection with the business, \$35.67. He (Mr. Thompson) at once telegraphed the Minister of Customs, and he followed that telegram by a letter, in which he gave the details of the whole affair. To neither letter nor telegram did he receive a reply. He desired that the papers should be brought down, in order that he might ascertain whether it was the late Minister of Customs or the Collector of Customs at Victoria, who had been telling him a deliberate falsehood.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said, in reference to this matter, a deputation from both the Senate and the House of Commons members for British Columbia, came to him last year, asking that they might have the privilege of entering this machinery free. He (Mr. Burpee) told them the Government could not allow it in free, and they pressed him for time in which to pay the duty. He submitted the matter to his colleagues, and they concluded to give them 12 months, provided they gave the Government ample security for the duties. The Government sent, almost immediately, the instructions in regard to the conditions on which they

might enter this machinery. They told the collector to take a sufficient security that the duties be paid within a year. They heard no more about the matter for some time, and the papers would show that applications were made for the purpose of obtaining the surety. They refused to give the surety, contending that they expected to get the machinery in free. The application referred to two companies only, and he had not heard of more that expected this privilege. The privilege would have been granted had they carried out the conditions by giving the required security for 12 months. With reference to the letter and telegram not answered, they would be handed to the Commissioner, and he would be expected to answer them. He was satisfied that the Department acted cautiously in the matter, and the privilege would have been granted had the bonds been given.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could quite understand the explanation of his hon. friend in regard to the letter and telegram not being answered. He transferred it, as usual, to his officer; and, if his officer omitted to answer the letter, there was no intention of discourtesy. He could quite understand, as his hon. friend had stated, why this machinery was not allowed to enter, because the necessary bond had not been given. The only discrepancy which existed between the statement of his hon. friend from Cariboo (Mr. Thompson) and the late Minister of Customs, was in reference to the telegram which had just been read.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said that, when the papers came down, they would be able to form a better judgment of the case. The encouragement that he offered these companies was strictly carried out.

MR. DEWDNEY said that the information which had been given by the hon. gentleman with regard to one of the companies was correct. The company with which he was specially interested had, as the late Minister of Customs had said, refused to give the bonds, and consequently the machinery would not be admitted. They requested to be allowed to take it out on the payment of a duty of 10½ per cent. They were not per-

mitted to do that; they were compelled to pay the full duty of 17½ per cent., and did so under protest. This, however, did not account for the fact that Mr. Hamly had telegraphed that no instructions were sent in reference to the hon. member for Cariboo county.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was quite evident that the instructions had been sent to the collector. They had the evidence that one company had refused to give the bonds, and that, if they had given the bonds, they would have been allowed to enter the machinery. It was quite clear, therefore, that the instructions had been received by the collector.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said that the explanation given by the late Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee) in regard to the number of companies which it was anticipated would import machinery, was very nearly correct. He (Mr. Thompson) had stated that there would be at least two companies, and probably three—the “Enterprise,” the “Cariboo,” and the “British Columbia.” It was evident, from the information which had been given to the House and from the telegram of Mr. Hamly, that there was a screw loose somewhere. Either Mr. Hamly must have told a deliberate falsehood when he sent the telegram, or the late Minister of Customs must be labouring under a misapprehension.

Motion agreed to.

IMPROVEMENTS IN OLD BIC HARBOUR.

MOTION FOR PETITIONS.

MR. FISET moved for copies of all petitions presented, since 1875, by the freeholders of the parish of Bic, and other persons of that locality, in relation to the improvements to be made in the harbour commonly called “Old Bic,” and of all correspondence between the Government and any other person on the same subject.

Motion agreed to.

AMET ISLAND BREAKWATER, NOVA SCOTIA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. MCKAY moved for copies of all correspondence, reports of engineers and

their estimates of materials required, and cost of relaying the stone breakwater around Amet Island, in the Province of Nova Scotia; also, copies of all specifications and tenders for the works, and all papers and documents relating thereto.

Motion agreed to.

WOOD TENDERS FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. LANDRY moved for a statement showing—1. The names and number of persons who tendered, in the county of Rimouski, for the furnishing of 1,000 cords, and over, of wood for the Intercolonial Railway, during the last general elections; 2. The amount of each tender; 3. The date of each tender; 4. The date fixed for opening the tenders; 5. The names of the contractors; 6. The prices at which the contracts were awarded; 7. Whether the contractors themselves or through other persons, furnished wood before the opening of the tenders, and what quantity; where, to whom and by whom; 8. All correspondence and documents relating to the subject.

Motion agreed to.

HARBOUR OF REFUGE AT RIMOUSKI.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. LANDRY moved for copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council and documents whatsoever, respecting the non-appropriation by the late Administration of the sum of \$250,000, voted in 1874, and in previous Sessions, by the Parliament of Canada, for a harbour of refuge at Rimouski, in the county of Rimouski; and respecting the substitution for that amount of a sum of \$30,000 for repairs in the wharf at Rimouski, by the late Administration.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN EXHIBIT AT PARIS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. ROBITAILLE, in the absence of **MR. STEPHENSON**, moved for copies of the names of all persons employed by the Dominion Government in the years 1877, 1878 and 1879, in connection with the

MR. MCKAY.

Canadian exhibit at Paris; the amounts paid to each individual so employed, together with a statement of all expenses and payments made, and claims presented and not yet settled, on account of the before-mentioned Exposition; also, statement in detail of the personal expenses of the Commissioner and Secretaries during the time they have been employed on such service.

Motion agreed to.

APPROPRIATION OF FISHERY AWARD.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for copies of all memorials or correspondence addressed by the Local Governments of Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to the Dominion Government, upon the question of the appropriation of the fishery award, and the answers thereto. He said this question had already been before the House, and discussed at length, on a motion made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., and at that time the House was told by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there was no correspondence whatever. He (Mr. Robertson) asked, at that time, what he thought was a civil question, of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; but, perhaps, because he was one of the younger members of the House, he was not considered worth noticing. Since that discussion took place, the matter had come up in the Senate, and that body had been informed by the Hon. Mr. Campbell that correspondence existed, and that it should be brought down. He had also noticed that, in a discussion which took place on this matter in the Nova Scotia Legislature, the Provincial Secretary had stated that it was brought to the attention of members of the Dominion Government during their visit to Halifax in November last, and that a memorial was then presented to the Government. The matter had attracted considerable attention in the Legislature, and they had Mr. Holmes's positive statement that a correspondence was going on between the two Governments. He made this motion in order to ascertain what course was being pursued by the Governments of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward

Island. He was also informed that, prior to the general election, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries promised to obtain a fair portion of this award for Prince Edward Island. He was surprised to notice, from his action in Parliament, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was endeavouring to conceal these documents. He (Mr. Robertson) had reason to believe that the Government of Prince Edward Island had presented a strong claim for a portion of the award. He believed that the people of the Maritime Provinces were justly entitled to a fair proportion of that money.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he did not expect anything else from the hon. gentleman from Shelburne than the statement that there was an attempt, on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to conceal the correspondence. He (Mr. Pope) stated, a few evenings ago, when the question was first asked, that no correspondence had been received, and there was none then before the Government. It had been received about that time, however, and he had stated, in his place, that, as soon as it could be copied, it would be laid on the table. There was no desire or intention, on the part of the Government, to conceal or withhold the information. It would be at once laid upon the table of the House, and the hon. gentleman would then be relieved of his anxiety.

Motion agreed to.

**SUPPLIES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
MARINE AND FISHERIES BY
MITCHELL AND COMPANY.**

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH moved for copies of all accounts and bills, showing, in detail, with prices, the goods, including vessels, coals, oil, and all other supplies furnished to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by the late firm of Messrs. Mitchell & Co., Montreal, from the first day of January, 1870, to the first day of January, 1874; also, a statement showing the number of vessels chartered from or through the said Mitchell & Co., the dates of such charters, the amount paid and to whom, and the size of the vessels; also, a statement

showing the whole amount of money paid by the said Department to the said Mitchell & Co. during the said period.

MR. PLUMB said it was singular that a motion of this kind should be brought forward by the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when that gentleman had been in office for four or five years. If he (Sir Albert J. Smith) knew that anything of a suspicious character had occurred in the Department of the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries while that Minister (Mr. Mitchell) was a member of this House, why did he not then ask for an explanation, so that Mr. Mitchell could have answered for himself? He (Mr. Plumb) remembered perfectly well that during the whole of the administration of the gallant knight of the Department of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he always addressed Mr. Mitchell as his friend, and sought and deferred to his advice, and he repeated, if anything of a suspicious character regarding Mr. Mitchell's management of his Department was within the knowledge of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the latter gentleman had been remiss in his duty in not demanding an earlier explanation, when Mr. Mitchell would have been in the House and could have defended himself.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he made no statement against his predecessor in office, although he might have some knowledge of the matter. For the present, he only asked that the papers be laid before the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman ought to give some reason for asking for these papers. Why ask for papers that were before himself in his capacity of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, from November, 1873, until September, 1878? Why did he not look at the papers then? Why did he not get the information then he asks for now, or, if he got it then, why ask for it now? The reason is evident, that, during the time he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Peter Mitchell was a member of this House, and the hon. gentleman would not have ventured to make this motion in his presence.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Let this go to the country. If the hon. the Prime Minister means that this information shall not be furnished to the House, let him say so. He has the power, of course, to act in the most arbitrary manner. I think there are strong public reasons why this information should be furnished to the House, and I think, when the papers come down, that this House and the country will be satisfied that there were strong public reasons for demanding them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You ought to have brought this matter forward when you had the opportunity.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH asked if it followed that when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he ought to have made an attack upon his predecessor. That did not follow. He was not obliged to do that, though he might have been remiss in his duty, and this information ought to have been furnished the country before. He had not pursued the same course as hon. gentlemen opposite had pursued in making *ex parte* attacks. They had made an attack upon him and brought correspondence before the House in relation to the dismissal of a man named Hodgins from a lighthouse, and the appointment of a man named Huff in his place. Hon. gentleman had sprung this charge upon him without any warning, and, worse than that, a material portion of the correspondence was suppressed altogether.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Hodgins case had nothing to do with this; nothing whatever.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he simply referred to it to show how he had been treated by gentlemen on the other side. Every time he had made a motion in this House for papers, he had been attacked. However, if he was out of order, he would bow to the decision of the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If it relates to a previous debate, it is out of order.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he was quite content the papers should come before the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he did not think he could pursue a more courteous course than the one he had followed. He did not reflect upon Mr. Mitchell, or say that there was anything in the papers that would affect him. It, when these papers came down, his conduct should be vindicated, well and good; but he thought the House and the country would be better satisfied in having the papers brought down and knowing all the facts.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was sorry the hon. gentleman had made his motion for these papers in this way. To people in New Brunswick, it looked like persecution. When Mr. Mitchell was in this House, the hon. gentleman never dared to make insinuations against him. Gentlemen opposite had taken the trouble to hunt up the bills of wine on board of the Government steamers, when Mr. Mitchell was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and used such papers, all through the elections, for the purpose of damaging Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell had sat by the hon. member for five years and had generously helped him in administering his Department. When he (Sir A. J. Smith) was at a loss to act, there was no one more ready to help the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It might serve well in the interests of the public service that these papers should be called for, but, if there was any reason to call for them now, the same reason existed when the hon. gentleman was in power. Why had he not brought them down then? It would, he believed, sound very bad in New Brunswick and, although the hon. member had endeavoured, so far, to keep in the good graces of the people of New Brunswick, he thought that every man who had a spirit of fairness would deprecate such a course as this.

SIR A. J. SMITH: Hear, hear.

MR. DOMVILLE said the hon. gentleman said "hear, hear." Why the Hon. Peter Mitchell had been here the other day, but he (Sir A. J. Smith) had not attempted to see him, although Mr. Mitchell had looked for that hon. gentleman himself, and he could not come across him. He was sorry that this matter had been brought up in the way it had.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said he felt called upon to make a few remarks. A few days ago the hon. member for Westmoreland moved for documents, having relation to a certain transaction which took place years ago, under a previous Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The order was passed, although the hon. member who moved for the papers, either while he was himself Minister, or after he ceased to be Minister, had copies of all these papers made and given, or forwarded to him at Dorchester, and must now have them in his possession.

MR. ANGLIN called the hon. gentleman to order. He said the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith) had been prevented from speaking in regard to other papers, and he (Mr. Anglin) insisted that neither the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, nor any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House should be allowed to speak to papers not before the House.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said that these papers were in the possession of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries—

Some HON. GENTLEMEN : Order.

MR. SPEAKER : I would like to know what papers the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is alluding to ?

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH : They have no reference to the question before the House.

MR. KIRKPATRICK : They are the papers before the House.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries had these papers under his charge during the five years he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and, if there was anything in them, or any transaction in connection with them which should be made known to Parliament and the country, it was his plain duty to have, as head of the Department, laid them before the House ; besides, it would have been much more brave in a brave and gallant Knight—who had received his honours and his knighthood for valuable services, said to have been rendered in connection with the fishery award, under the

Washington Treaty, but which work had been principally done by his predecessor, the Hon. Peter Mitchell—had he brought down these papers when his predecessor, the Hon. Peter Mitchell, was on the floor of the House, and in a position to give any explanation or information required. He (Mr. Pope) was sorry to again have to refer to the *Glendon*—that vessel which the hon. gentleman had the misfortune to buy.

MR. ANGLIN : I again call the hon. gentleman to order.

MR. POPE said he had some information which was not before the House. Perhaps the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) and the member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) did not like to hear it.

MR. ANGLIN : I again call the hon. gentleman to order.

MR. SPEAKER : Except the House, as it did the other day, decides to open the general question of management, I shall have to ask the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to confine himself to the question before the House.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said, as the hon. gentleman did not like the House to get further information with regard to the *Glendon* and other vessels, of course he would take another opportunity of giving some information to the House on this subject. He would only say that he knew nothing about the transaction referred to in the question before the House ; but all necessary information would be given to the hon. gentleman.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he did not wish to take up the time of the House.

Some HON. GENTLEMEN : Order.

SIR A. J. SMITH said the hon. gentleman had thrown out an insinuation.

Some HON. GENTLEMEN : Order.

MR. SPEAKER : According to the rules of the House, a reply is allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion. Of course, a reply is not allowed to an hon. member moving an Order of

the Day or an amendment, but, when it is a substantive motion such as this, a reply is allowed.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he wished to answer a statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that he (Sir A. J. Smith) had not done his duty while at the head of that Department—in fact had almost charged him with malversation. All he asked for was the correspondence in this matter.

MR. POPE: No correspondence has ever been received.

SIR A. J. SMITH said he would ask his successor if he (Sir A. J. Smith) had not sent across the floor of the House for correspondence, portions of which he (Mr. Pope) had read in his place, and if he had not sent him only a garbled portion of it; he had not sent him the material points at all.

MR. POPE: I sent you all I read.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he wanted the whole of the correspondence. He only wanted fair play. He was willing that every transaction of his, while Minister of Marine and Fisheries, should undergo the fullest enquiry. He was prepared to offer his successor the opportunity of choosing any transaction he could lay his finger on, and of appointing in Committee to investigate that or any other transaction connected with his (Sir Albert J. Smith's) management of that Department. It was untrue that he had neglected his duty. He appealed to the hon. gentleman to show any contract or any other work which he had neglected, and he appealed to the records to show if his conduct, as head of that Department, had not satisfied, not only the members on his side of the House, but members on the other side. •

MR. BOWELL said the impression left on the House by the remarks of the hon. gentleman was that, having asked for certain papers, a garbled report had been sent down to him.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he had not intended to make any such statement. His successor had read certain papers which he (Sir Albert J. Smith) had asked him for.

MR. SPEAKER.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. gentleman had no right to refer to a private conversation which had taken place between his successor and himself. The impression left on his (Mr. Bowell's) mind was that the Government had brought papers in a garbled state, and he thought the hon. gentleman had endeavoured to convey the impression that the Government had refused to give papers that had been asked for in connection with this question.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he did not wish to leave any such impression. He had asked one of the pages to get the correspondence.

MR. POPE: The hon. gentleman said garbled correspondence.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I desired to have the whole correspondence.

MR. POPE said he was not asked for the whole correspondence, and he had sent to the hon. gentleman, by the page, all the correspondence quoted by him (Mr. Pope).

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he would ask the hon. gentleman if he had not said to him (Mr. Pope) that he was under the impression that there was further correspondence. He had a recollection that there was more correspondence, and it was unfair to send only a portion of the correspondence, after he had asked for the whole of it.

MR. POPE said that the hon. gentleman had not done anything of the kind. He had the hon. gentleman's note asking for the papers.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said what he wanted was the whole of the correspondence, and he would appeal to the hon. the First Minister to say if the hon. gentleman had acted fairly in not sending him the whole of the correspondence.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it appeared that the hon. gentleman sent across to his hon. friend for certain papers, and he had sent all the papers he had.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: All that he had here.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY DAMAGES.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. DOMVILLE moved for a statement of damages to cattle and goods on the Intercolonial Railway, paid during 1878, showing date when such claim was first made; the disposition made of it at the time, the date of payment and why paid, and the date of claim made.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT PRESQU'ISLE HARBOUR.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. KEELER moved for copies of all papers, reports, correspondence, and documents relating to the dismissal of George B. Simpson, and the appointment of William H. Sherwood, as keeper of the main lighthouse at Presqu'Isle harbour, in the county of Northumberland, Ontario; also, statement of amount of salary and other allowances, such as use of land, firewood, etc., to the said Sherwood. He said he could throw a little light on the question, lately so much agitated, as to which party introduced the system of dismissing officials for insufficient or political reasons. In the riding which he had the honour to represent, this system commenced in 1874, as the case of which this motion treated would show. George B. Simpson, lighthouse keeper, was dismissed for, as he had good reason to believe, the sole purpose of finding a place for one of the supporters of his (Mr. Keeler's) predecessor in Parliament. No reasons whatever were given for his dismissal; no complaint of any kind was preferred against him; on the contrary, he bore an excellent reputation, and discharged his duties faithfully and conscientiously. He was dismissed early in 1874, and William H. Sherwood, a very warm supporter of the late member, was appointed in his place. He asked for these papers for the purpose of ascertaining precisely how this matter was brought about.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO MARITIME COURT.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) moved for copy of a return showing the number of cases disposed of by the Maritime Court

of Ontario up to 1st March, 1879, with the amounts adjudged in each case, the amount of marshal's fees in each, the amount of fees received by the clerk in each; also, the amounts for which the vessels were appraised in each case, and the amounts they brought on sale. He said that, in the interest of the public, it was highly desirable that attention should be drawn to the unsatisfactory working of the Maritime Court. Considerable dissatisfaction existed in Ontario among owners of vessels, in consequence of the great expense attached to proceedings in the Court. Complaints were made that vessel property was being eaten up in costs and disbursements. In one particular case, among those that had been brought under his notice, the marshal's fees amounted to \$183.31; the proctor's costs to \$269.27; and, after paying a salvage claim, \$670, there was \$15 left to be divided among the captain and crew, whose whole season's wages was lost. He did not think it was the intention of the promoters of the Maritime Court that that should be the result. He was glad to learn that the Government had appointed surrogates at certain points, and believed it would have the effect of reducing the costs; but he regretted to find that, in the appointments made, the Government had not seen fit to appoint a surrogate in the county of Essex, which was a most important point upon the chain of lakes. It would be very desirable, indeed, to have a surrogate, clerk, and deputy-marshal appointed there. It would be a great convenience and saving of expense to those interested in business which had to be transacted before the Court. He (Mr. Patterson) trusted that the decentralisation of the Court would have the effect of reducing the expenses entailed upon litigants.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN VESSELS BOUND FOR LAKE MICHIGAN.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. KILVERT moved for copies of all correspondence between the Governments of the United States and Canada, in relation to Canadian vessels bound for Lake Michigan reporting at Port Huron, instead of at Sheboygan, as is the

practice at present under the existing regulations of the United States Customs. He said he desired to bring before the notice of the House and the Government the great disadvantage under which Canadian vessels, navigating the upper lakes, laboured with regard to these regulations of the United States Customs. They were obliged to report at Duncan city, at the foot of Sheboygan Bay, which was considered by mariners very difficult and dangerous to approach, and, in stress of weather, vessels could not safely enter there. There were many affidavits in the Custom-house in Chicago and other places, showing the difficulties in complying with these regulations. Sailing vessels were obliged to drop anchor near this bay, while the captain and portion of the crew had to go ashore three or four miles distant in small boats to make their reports to the Customs authorities in Sheboygan Bay. This caused considerable delay and risk of life. Steamboats were also put to great disadvantage. In order to get into this harbour, in which there were no public lights, they had to pass through a cut in the flats, only 100 feet wide, three-fourths of a mile long, which was in an incomplete state, and they ran great danger of colliding with sailing vessels. It was thought, if the Government would make proper representations to the United States authorities, these restrictions would be removed. The Northern Transportation Company were allowed to report at Port Huron. Canadian vessels should be allowed to report there also. The Northern Transportation Company had to pass through Canadian territory, plying between Ogdensburg and Chicago. He had the honour of presenting a petition from a large number of those interested to the House early this Session, asking the Government to take steps in this matter. In order to show how Canadian ships were handicapped in endeavoring to compete with United States vessels for the carrying trade of the West, he might refer to the tonnage tax of 30c. per ton on Canadian vessels, and, by the new measures adopted in this country, they had a larger tonnage to pay than the United States vessels. True, United States vessels had to pay the same tax in trading with Canadian ports, but managed to evade it. For instance, vessels carrying grain from

MR. KILVERT.

Chicago to Kingston got their clearance from Chicago to Cape Vincent *via* Kingston, and, as the vessel was being unloaded at Kingston, the captain took the ferry-boat to Cape Vincent, and reported his vessel, and got his clearance back to Chicago. As Protection seemed to be the order of the day, the Canadian shipping should get their share of it, and he hoped the Government would bring this matter before the notice of the United States authorities in order to relieve Canadian vessels from these restrictions which now bore so heavily on them.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSFER OF MILITARY PROPERTIES.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. STRANGE moved for copies of all papers and documents relative to the sale or transfer of the barracks at Fredericton, New Brunswick; also, for all papers and documents relative to the lease of certain military properties for the purpose of constructing a graving dock at Quebec; also, for all papers and documents relating to the transfer of certain military properties at Toronto for the purpose of erecting buildings for the Provincial Exhibition.

Motion agreed to.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

DREDGING OF THE NORTH RIVER.

MOTION FOR REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. CHRISTIE moved for copy of all reports or correspondence which may have taken place between the Government and their engineer or others, relating to the dredging of the North River to St. Andrew's, and showing the reasons why that work, which was begun several years ago, has not been prosecuted to completion. He said he desired to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the importance of improving the navigation of the North River, and completing the work done there several years ago, previous to Con-

federation; and to point out the fact that a portion of the waters of that river had been diverted from its natural channel by the Government, for the purpose of feeding the Carillon Canal, and in that the interests of some of his constituents had been sacrificed for the benefit of the Ottawa trade. He did not complain of that, because it was necessary, and done in the public interests, but he did think that the sandbar and boulders that obstructed the navigation during low water should have been removed, as it could have been done at a very trifling expenditure; and that appeared to have been the view and intention of the Government, for they found that the work was begun, a certain amount of dredging was done, but, for reasons of which he was not aware—but which he hoped the papers for which he had asked would show,—the work was not completed, and it was supposed that \$2,000 would be sufficient for that purpose. St. Andrew's was a flourishing village, and did a considerable trade with the surrounding country, and it would be an immense advantage to its inhabitants to have uninterrupted navigation, and be able to bring in their goods and ship farm produce at all times during the period of navigation. It would be remembered that, when he brought up this matter during last Session, the hon. the ex-Minister of Public Works promised to look into it, and he hoped the present Administration would carry out that promise, and that the work would be done. He would suggest that the resident Government engineer at Carillon should be instructed to report as to the advisability, or otherwise, of dredging the North River, its cost, and how far the work would be lessened by the completion of Carillon Dam. Of course, if the dam was completed, it would no longer be necessary to tap the North River for canal purposes. And even that would be a great advantage to his constituents, and was an additional reason why the Carillon works should be vigorously prosecuted to completion. Mr. Bell, the engineer referred to, had lived in that section of the country for several years, and, from his intimate knowledge of the North River and Carillon works, was eminently qualified to give the desired information.

Motion agreed to.

REFUNDS BY THE INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. HESSON moved for a detailed statement of all sums of money refunded by the Department of Inland Revenue, and to whom paid, during the years 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878; and copies of all papers and correspondence in connection with the same. He said that his object was to elicit information with regard to certain payments of money, amounting, he was told, to some \$3,000 or \$4,000, to certain parties in his own riding. A certain party had been fined some \$500 during the Administration of the hon. Premier, and various efforts had been made to recover it, but, when the late Administration came into power, application was made again, and, he (Mr. Hesson) was credibly informed that some \$3,000, or over, had been returned, while other parties, who were Conservatives, had been refused; he believed this was the reward for political support given by that gentleman to the late Administration.

Motion agreed to.

VOLUNTEERS FOR THE RUSSIAN WAR.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BUNSTER moved for a copy of a return showing the names, rank and regiment of all officers of the Active Militia who offered their services during the time it was thought likely war would take place between Great Britain and Russia; also, the names of those who volunteered not of the Regular Militia. He said that many Canadians were not aware of the assistance offered the Mother Country by patriotic volunteers, and other citizens, when she was considered likely to become involved in trouble with Russia, during the recent war with Turkey; and, notwithstanding that similar offers were made by other portions of the Empire, he had no doubt but that the offers from Canada exercised a great influence in bringing to a speedy termination that war.

MR. ROBINSON said he doubted very much, although he was not an active member of the Militia Force, the policy of such a motion as this

What was the motive that had actuated his hon. friend from British Columbia in proposing that motion? Did he wish that the names of those militia officers who had volunteered for this service should be brought down in a return to this House, in contradistinction to the names of those who did not volunteer? Well, while he (Mr. Robinson) appreciated the spirit which had induced certain officers of the militia to volunteer for the service in question, he appreciated equally strongly and well, the spirit that induced the other officers not to volunteer. There were reasons which those who did not volunteer could give, perhaps, for their course, quite as satisfactory to the public and this House, and which would put them before the public in, perhaps, as good and favourable a light as the hon. mover would place those to whom his motion applied. He would like to ask some of his hon. friends who took an active part in militia matters, such as the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Skinner), the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), the hon. gentleman from North Hastings (Mr. Howell), and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Strange), what they thought of this motion. There was nothing that should be treated with greater delicacy, by public men, than the militia honour of this country. He hoped that the hon. the Minister of Militia would think of this motion as he did, that it was nothing but trifling with the militia honour of Canada, and that he would oppose such a motion. He granted willingly that there were few men in this House who would less willingly act harshly towards those officers who did not volunteer than would the mover of this motion, but, in his (Mr. Robinson's) opinion, the motion was calculated to provoke ill-will and a bad spirit among the gallant men of the militia in this country.

MR. MASSON said he did not see how the Government could oppose this motion. He thought that the men who offered their services to England gave proof of great patriotism, and that it would not reflect upon the patriotism or good qualities of those who did not think their services would be required. The country was entitled to know the names of those who volunteered on that occasion.

MR. ROBINSON.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was this much to observe in support of the views of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Robinson), that many of the addresses were somewhat irregular. Many wrote to himself (Mr. Mackenzie) desiring to be informed if the services of Canadian officers or regiments would be accepted, as they would, in that case, place their services at the disposal of the Government. The matter did not progress so far as to render it necessary to reply to the letters of such gentlemen as were found in his Department. The record would be incomplete, as probably one-half the names of those who offered their services would never be known. While he had not the slightest objection to the address passing, he took that opportunity of stating what he knew to be the fact on this subject.

MR. MASSON said he was greatly surprised to see the names of so many patriots as having offered their services to England—some offering to raise battalions and others companies for her service.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) said he belonged to a battalion whose colonel offered their services, and he wanted to see how many more were as loyal as the men of Haldimand.

MR. BUNSTER said he was glad the hon. the Minister of Militia made no objection to his motion. He thought it was due to the gallant gentlemen who volunteered their services to make their names public. There were several in British Columbia also. He remembered that, in Victoria, they were threatened by a Russian cruiser, but they were not afraid, as they had the flag that braved a thousand years on one of Her Majesty's ships there to protect them at any moment. They had a right to remember those men and their action at such a time.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF INDIAN AGENTS.

MOTION FOR ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

MR. MACKENZIE, in the absence of Mr. MILLS, moved for copies of all memoranda and Orders in Council relating to the dismissal of Indian Agents

and Indian Superintendents; the appointment of agents and superintendents, and the appointment or dismissal of any other persons temporarily or permanently connected with service of the Indian branch of the Department of the Interior for Manitoba or the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to.

WARDEN OF ST. JOHN PENITENTIARY.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. MACKENZIE, in the absence of Mr. BURPEE (St. John), moved for copies of any correspondence from the Warden of St. John Penitentiary, or any person in his behalf, relating to the Inspector, Mr. Moylan's, report of the investigation of the case of Mr. Ketchum, the Warden.

Motion agreed to.

INCREASE OF SALARY OF NANAIMO CUSTOMS OFFICER.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. BUNSTER moved for a copy of all correspondence relative to an increase of salary to be paid to Thomas G. Peck, Customs officer, Nanaimo. He said he regretted the Minister of Customs was not in his place, in order that he might have received some information on this matter. This officer received the paltry sum of \$800 a year, and did more work than any other eight officers in the Province. He considered that this officer had been treated in a very shabby manner; an increase of salary had been promised him for the last four years. Last year this officer collected \$89,000 revenue, and this amount he was continually increasing. He trusted that the House would appreciate the injustice that had been done this officer, and give him a reasonable salary. He was assured that, when they saw the correspondence, they would grant the required increase of salary.

Motion agreed to.

EMPLOYÉS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. CHARLTON moved for a statement showing the ages, names, present

salaries and length of service of each officer and permanent clerk in the Department of the Clerk of the House; also, the ages, names and salaries or daily pay, with date of employment and date when pay commenced, of the Sessional or extra clerks at present employed, or who may have been employed during the present Session, in the service of the House; also, a statement by the Sergeant-at-arms showing the ages, names, salary or daily pay and length of service of messengers and pages in his Department, now employed, or who may have been employed during the present Session.

Motion agreed to.

AMERICAN DUTY ON FISH CANS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. OGDEN moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America, relating to the duty imposed by the Government of the United States on tin cans containing lobsters, salmon, and other fresh fish, which, under the Washington Treaty, should not be imposed. He said that, in moving for these papers, his object was principally to bring to the notice of the Government the great injustice that had been done to persons interested in the industry of canning fresh fish. He thought that, under the Washington Treaty, all fresh fish should be admitted into the United States free of duty. The United States Government had imposed a duty of 1½c. per pound can in violation of the Washington Treaty. He believed that a similar motion was made in 1876, but no steps were taken to bring the matter before the House in its proper course. In the Dominion of Canada, all descriptions of fish were admitted free of duty. Last year, they imported into the Dominion fish to the amount of 1,418,606 1 lb. cans. The exports from the Dominion had been 5,420,000 cans, so the imports from the United States had been about one-fourth of our whole exports to all parts of the world. This was an important industry, and one well worthy of protection, as it gave employment to thousands of people in the Maritime Provinces and gave rise to the circulation of

a large amount of money. In consequence of the American duty, the price of lobsters, in the United States, was 18c. per dozen higher than in England or in the Dominion. In this way, the Americans protected their own market, and were enabled to throw their surplus stock on the Canadian market. He also desired to call attention to the fact that block tin and lead, which were largely used in the manufacture of these canned fish, were being admitted free of duty into the United States, while the present Government were about to impose a duty of 10 per cent. on this material coming into this country. In this manner, the Americans were protected against our own manufacture to the extent of a 10 per cent. duty. He wished to call the attention of the Government to the fact that they must do one of two things. This might be strong language, but they must either induce the United States Government to take off this duty, or else they must impose a similar duty. He was in favour of Protection, but he did not want a one-sided tariff. If the United States Government would admit our canned fish free of duty, he was willing that we should admit theirs. He thought it was a great injustice to protect the industries of the United States and starve out our own. When the matter was brought up previously, the ex-Premier stated that, if the exporters of canned fish had only paid the duty under protest, then the Government would have been able to take the matter into consideration. He was happy now to say that many cases of goods had been shipped to the United States, and the duty paid under protest; there could, consequently, be no excuse now for not going on with the matter. The industry was now a languishing one, and it was necessary for the Government to take the matter up in order to restore it to a flourishing condition. He hoped that the Government would not delay in this matter. He was in favour of the imposition of a retaliatory tariff, and, if the people of Ontario preferred purchasing their canned fish from the United States, they must contribute to the revenue over \$21,000 per annum.

MR. KILLAM said he desired to ask a question in reference to the Order in

MR. OGDEN.

Council which had recently appeared, preventing the catching of lobsters between the 15th August and the 1st April. He wanted to know why, in the fall and winter seasons, persons who lived on the coast were not to be allowed to catch lobsters—the most wholesome food at that period of the year. He was satisfied that this Order in Council had arisen from misapprehension, and that the hon. gentleman would see fit to modify it. The winter was not the spawning season, and the flesh was perfectly firm. He had no doubt that the reason for the passing of the Order was the desire to prevent the catching of lobsters for canning purposes. If this were so, it would be an easy matter to modify the order.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said it was not the intention to prevent the few from catching lobsters with a line, but it was desired to prevent their wholesale destruction. The Order in Council had been passed for the purpose of preserving lobsters in the future. The Order had not been passed for the purpose of preventing catching for packing purposes. They would, however, endeavour to allow a sufficient number to be caught, for ordinary purposes, by special license.

MR. KILLAM said it would not do to have it done by special licenses. They knew that, in many places on the coast, lobsters were caught during the winter months, the Halifax market being then constantly supplied with them.

MR. POPE said the matter would be attended to.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said there was great diversity of opinion in Nova Scotia on this subject. Some packers in his county had sent remonstrances to the Government against this Order in Council. The fishermen all along the south coast were strongly opposed to it, because they said it deprived them of the privilege of fishing for over half the year. They considered it a great injustice. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Ogden), who was largely interested in this business, took a view of this subject that was not shared by many other packers. Doubtless the Government would adhere to this regulation for

the present year, but he trusted they would reconsider the matter, and be guided by the interests of the larger number, instead of consulting only a few individuals. With regard to the clause relating to this matter in the Treaty of Washington, it had been a matter of contention for some time. The late Government had made every effort to obtain the United States market for our packers, free of duty, but had failed. These privileges were certainly accorded us under the Treaty, and he trusted the present Government would take action in their behalf.

MR. OGDEN said that, about nine years ago, he began the lobster-packing business in Nova Scotia. It then took from one and-a-half to two lobsters to produce a pound of fish, that was, exclusive of shell. Now, during the summer months, it took two or three, and during the months of August, September, October, and November, it took from five to seven lobsters to produce one pound of fish, exclusive of shell. This showed that nine years ago lobsters were larger than they were now, and also that there had been a great destruction of fish. Last year, he packed, in his own establishments about 13,000 cases of four dozen lb. cans each. If he had packed in the summer months only, instead of the fall, he would have saved one and a quarter million lobsters, and filled the same quantity of cans, thus preventing the destruction of a great quantity of this valuable, luxurious fish. This great destruction could not last for ever; the supply in a few years would be exhausted. On the coast of Maine, the packers had been allowed to slaughter fish just as they pleased for a number of years, and at last they found the fisheries were becoming exhausted. The present year, the Legislature of Maine had passed an Act closing all the factories from the first day of August to the first of April of the next year. They did this because they saw that the fish would soon be exhausted unless some such action were taken. He thought every gentleman interested in the welfare of this country, would thank the Government for having taken steps in time to protect that valuable fishery. Of course, it would be hard for some persons to close the factories

during so large a part of the year. At the present time, the English market was overstocked. One packer had about \$30,000 worth unsold, and could not obtain their first cost. In the fall, the lobster was soft-shelled, sickly and delicate, having undergone the operation of spawning, and throwing off his shell. At such a time the fish was unhealthy and unfit for food, and should not be used as such. For this reason, the Government had taken the precaution of stopping all packing during the fall months. This action would not only prolong the fisheries, but it would benefit the fishermen. It might also have a tendency to raise the price of lobsters. He thought it was an oversight in the drawing up of the Order in Council, in not stating that it referred only to the canning of lobsters, because, if a poor man wanted to cook a lobster for his breakfast, he did not think he should be prevented from doing so. During the fall and summer months, some very fine lobsters were caught, but they were few and far between. Of course, where ten to twenty thousand lobsters were canned in one day in a factory, a great many were destroyed, which were unfit for use.

MR. HADDOW said he understood that the close season for taking lobsters was to be from the first of August to the first of April. He would ask the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if that applied to New Brunswick.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said that, on the north side of New Brunswick, after the 20th would be the close season.

MR. HADDOW said, so far as those who were engaged in packing lobsters were concerned, they might just as well double the protective tariff. It would be a most burdensome thing for the fishermen. It would be likely to so seriously interfere with business that the packing establishments would have to close. During last year, in one particular fishing establishment, they took as many fish in the month of September as in all the other months. A large packer down in Sheboygan, who belonged to his county, would be almost ruined if this was carried out. He hoped the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would con-

sider the matter, for if this regulation was adhered to, it would be ruinous to the packers in the northern part of New Brunswick.

MR. ROBITAILLE said it might be, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haddow) remarked, that some proprietors in this particular kind of fisheries would be ruined if they were prevented from exhausting and ruining the fisheries themselves. But, if they were allowed to go on as at present, they would equally be ruined in a short time, because the fisheries would become exhausted. Along the shores of his county, at least, the fish were smaller in size and less in quantity than they were a few years ago. He believed it was in the interest of the packers themselves that the season should be limited. He had no doubt that, whatever arrangement was made concerning lobster fishing, it would conduce, not only to the improvement of the size and the quantity of the fish, but, also, in the course of time, make the fortune of those who should be engaged in this fishing, under proper regulations.

MR. FLYNN said he believed the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in years gone by, had frequently invited the advice of persons who were supposed to have some knowledge of this business. After a good deal of talk with the Commissioner of Fisheries, it was agreed that what might suit as a close season in one portion, even of Nova Scotia, would not suit in another portion. What might suit as a close season west of Halifax, would not suit the eastern portion of the Province. Under the old Order in Council, existing up to the date of the recent order, they had a close season of seven months. It was considered by many that that length of time was a sufficient close season, and would protect the fisheries for many years to come. He represented a constituency in which a large lobster industry was carried on. The occupations of the fishermen ought to be considered. There were many men who devoted themselves exclusively to that business, and who made their living out of it for the twelve months. Under that Order in Council, they would be compelled to support themselves for the whole year by only three months' labour, that was, during

MR. HADDOW,

May, June and July. He believed no one was more anxious to protect that branch of industry than the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; but, at the same time, they must look upon the facts, and inflict no injury on the fishermen. He did not know on what information the Department had acted in promulgating this Order, but it should not have been entirely on that furnished by the packers, for they were interested. The market was over-stocked, and, perhaps, they were interested in closing the supply, at least for a time. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Ogden) had stated that their fish had diminished in size and quantity. He (Mr. Flynn) had heard no such complaints from the county he represented, where several packers were engaged in the business. He did not suppose anything he might say would have the slightest influence towards securing a change in this Order as regarded the close season, but he owed it to his constituents to make the representations he had made.

MR. SNOWBALL said the county he represented was also deeply interested in this matter. He agreed with other gentlemen that it was absolutely necessary for the lobster, as well as other fish, to have a close season, but the best time for the close season was greatly misunderstood in respect to all the fish that visited our shores. It was very clear that a close season for lobsters, that would suit on the coast of Maine or Nova Scotia, was not at all suitable for the northern coast of New Brunswick, or for any other coast further north. The fishermen, in whom he was interested, were engaged 250 miles further north than those engaged on the Nova Scotia coast, and their opinion was that, for them, the close season should run from the 1st of September, instead of the 20th of August. He was certain that a close season from the 20th of August was not a proper one for the northern coast of the county of Northumberland. The time the lobsters reached that coast was very much later in proportion, and the circumstances were entirely different from those on the coast of Nova Scotia, where they had fish all the year round. The difficulty for those further north came from the ice for a considerable

portion of the year. In the counties of Northumberland and Gloucester, and all through the Straits, where the shore was lined with ice for six months in the year, the fish did not come in as early in the season, and there was always an uncertainty as to what time the fish arrived on the coast. He thought that the matter was one that demanded closer investigation on the part of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was not to be supposed that perfection had been reached in that direction yet. Persons of more experience than they had now were required—some persons who were not enthusiasts on this subject of fish-breeding, as they looked at nothing but the protection of fish, without considering the fishermen, who subsisted by fishing. He thought it would be unjust to the northern section of his Province to allow the assertion to go undisputed that this close regulation was going to satisfy the people of that section.

MR. OGDEN said the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) had said he knew something about this business, and argued that fishermen would only have three months in the year to earn a living. He (Mr. Ogden) believed that the packers in Nova Scotia, and many in New Brunswick, and nearly all in Prince Edward Island, were united in endorsing the action of the Government in making this Order; because he knew that, if this Order had not been passed, nearly all the packers in Nova Scotia would have closed their factories on the 1st August. A very long season was not required, as the markets became over-stocked, and packers could not sell their products. Supposing fishermen were allowed to catch fish, what were they going to do with them? The fish could not be kept; they had to be used immediately, and they could only be taken care of by being canned. He had been in the business himself for twenty years, and knew what was required. If this Order in Council had not been passed this year, the people would have demanded it next year. He thought they could take pattern by the United States, where, wherever the fisheries had been destroyed, they had endeavoured to replenish them. It had been said that fishermen were

not able to make a living; but, as far as he was concerned, he would endeavour to find employment for many of his fishermen. He believed, if the slaughter that had been going on for the last ten years were allowed to continue, there would be no lobsters left. The packers had erected expensive establishments on the coast of Nova Scotia and elsewhere, and, but for this Order in Council, their property would now be valueless. If the fisheries were protected, they would be able to prosecute their business, but, if wholesale destruction of fish were allowed, they would have to go somewhere else to get even three months' employment. With respect to the Order in Council that was passed last year, there had been a close season of one month. He (Mr. Ogden) closed his factories according to the law, but, in the counties of Lunenburg and Halifax, the packers continued to pack, in defiance of the law. In Prince Edward Island, also, the whole of the factories ran full blast, and were winked at by the late Administration. He hoped the Government would enforce the Order in Council. He had a letter from the largest packer in New Brunswick, and he was perfectly satisfied with this law. In the northern part of New Brunswick, they could not pack lobsters much after the middle of September. He believed that this Order was absolutely necessary in the interests of packers as well as of the fishermen, who were to be the most benefitted by the present Order.

Motion agreed to.

DEEPENING L'ASSOMPTION RIVER.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. ROBITAILLE, in the absence of Mr. HURTEAU, moved for copies of all correspondence, reports and other documents, relating to the deepening of the River L'Assomption.

Motion agreed to.

AFFAIRS OF BANKS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANTIER, in the absence of Mr. GILL, moved for a return showing a comparative statement of the affairs of

every bank in the Dominion on the 31st of December of each year since 1867; the amount of money loaned by building societies and savings banks, their capital paid up, and the amount of deposits held by them, and also by Government savings banks on the same date, or the date nearest to it, and for the same period; the amount of all foreign loans negotiated since 1867; how much of such loans was applied towards paying up maturing bonds; how much applied towards new enterprises; and when the amounts of such loans were deposited in Canadian banks; the total amount so deposited and the average time it was left on deposit, and what rate of interest was paid thereon by such banks.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not think it was in the power of the Government to give any other returns than those the law compelled banks, insurance and loan companies to give. The Government could not enforce any other returns. The returns given by banks, insurance and loan companies, were given in accordance with the Statute, laid before the House, and then put in the Sessional Papers. If the hon. gentleman desired simply to get some official of the Department to arrange a classified return, there could be no objection; but it would take a very long time to do it, and, in fact, it was almost too much to ask the Department to do, because any hon. member could do it himself by taking up the Sessional Papers. The hon. member had better allow the motion to stand until the Minister of Finance was in his place.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had not observed other parts of the motion. This required the amount of money loaned by building societies. The House had no power whatever to give it, as they had obtained all the returns they were authorised to demand. They could only obtain these returns from companies chartered by the Government, and a very large proportion of building societies existed by virtue of Provincial authority. The other part of the motion—foreign loans—did not state by whom made. The presumption was, it referred to Governmental loans, and it was impossible for any Government to state how much was employed towards new enterprises, and how much in retiring

MR. LANTIER.

maturing bonds. He thought it better for the hon. gentleman to withdraw the motion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had only moved the motion in the absence of Mr. Gill, and would therefore not feel warranted in withdrawing it. He would suggest that the motion be allowed to stand until the hon. the Minister of Finance and Mr. Gill were in their places.

Motion postponed.

MARSH LANDS IN WELLAND.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. MCCALLUM moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government and the County Council of the county of Welland about the claims of the Government against the said county for marsh lands; also, copies of all reports and letters made by the Superintendent of the Welland Canal to any member of the Government on the said claims; also, statement showing basis of settlement on which reduction was made in said claims. He said he moved this in the interest of people in his county, living on lands that had been bought by the county of Welland from the Government. Two years ago the county of Welland sent a deputation here to wait on the Government and negotiate with them for the reduction in the price of the land. He understood that the arrangement was that, whatever abatement the Government made to them, it was to be expended by the county in draining the land, and he made this motion to ascertain whether the late Government had carried out this arrangement or not. It was well known that the county of Welland was wealthy, and always paid any indebtedness it might owe to anybody. The people who had settled on these lands had been suffering very much from the want of drainage. He would read a report by the Superintendent of the Welland Canal, who had been appointed by the Government to inquire into the matter:—

“SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE, WELLAND CANAL,

“ST. CATHARINES, JUNE 5, 1877.

“SIR,—In the matter of the claims of the Department of Public Works against the county of Welland, on account of marsh

lands, I have the honour herewith to enclose a letter from Mr. Page, Clerk of the county of Welland, and to state that I have examined certain books and papers in the office of the Clerk of the county of Welland, and that the statement of receipts and disbursements purporting to have been presented to you by the Commissioner on behalf of the county at Ottawa, appears to be correct. From the best information I can obtain (not having personally inspected the lands in question), I believe that, without further drainage, the unsold portion of the said lands is of no more value now than the price originally agreed upon between the Government and the county, viz., \$1 per acre. If properly drained, the lands would, no doubt, become valuable, but further large expenditure will be necessary to effect this object. In my report to the Secretary of Public Works (No. 183) of April 2nd, 1875, I thought then an abatement of some portion of the interest might be equitable. I now think, from the best information I can obtain, that an abatement of the whole of the interest, upon the condition that the amount of such abatement be expended in drainage upon said land, would be in the public interest.

"I have, etc.,

(Signed) "E. V. BODWELL,
"Supt. W. C.

"Hon. A. Mackenzie,
"Min. Pub. Works,
"Ottawa."

He hoped the Government, in settling with the county of Welland, had kept that in view, and had carried out these conditions; if not, they had done a great injustice to a large number of people settled on these lands. Of course, these papers, when brought down, would contain all the information desired, but, in the meantime, he felt very much alarmed about this matter. He was afraid the Government had acted in this matter in order to strengthen themselves, and in the interests of the member who then represented the county.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLIES FOR WELLAND CANAL.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) moved for a statement showing the quantities and prices of all supplies for the Welland Canal, from January 1st, 1871, to November 4th, 1878, showing what portion of such supplies were furnished by contract, based on public tenders, and the quantity supplied without such tenders; the names of parties supplying the same,

and the term for which such contracts were entered into.

Motion agreed to.

ALLAN MAIL CONTRACT.

MOTION FOR COPIES.

MR. DALY moved for copies of the contract with the Allan Steamship Company, for the fortnightly mail service between Halifax and Queenstown; and all correspondence during the past and present years relating to that service. He said he made this motion in connection with a subject which was of very great import, not only to Halifax in particular, and Nova Scotia generally, but also to the whole of the Maritime Provinces. On looking at the Estimates, he found that the Government had omitted to provide for the fortnightly mail service between Halifax and Cork, and that, in consequence of the usual subsidy being dropped, direct mail communication with the old world from Halifax was likely to cease. That service had hitherto been performed at a cost of \$20,000 for the half-year. He remembered the observations which had been made by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright), in his answer to the Budget speech, in the course of which he stated that the Minister of Finance was to be congratulated upon his courage in having dropped from the Estimates this item. The hon. gentleman also said that it was against his better judgment, or much to his disgust, that the late Government had retained that subsidy for the past year, and that he had no doubt that, had the late Government continued in power, it would not have appeared in the Estimates this year. He (Mr. Daly) did not feel so much inclined to congratulate the Government upon the course they had pursued, as to doubt the fairness and justice of the decision they had come to, in dropping this subsidy. Nova Scotians were justly proud of the memory of their countryman, Sir Samuel Cunard. Some forty years ago, in 1830, he became the pioneer of the Atlantic mail steam communication between Halifax and Great Britain. In that year, the first contract was entered into between the Government of Great Britain and the Nova Scotia Parliament, which gave

to the celebrated Cunard Company, a company which had since established for itself a reputation second to none in the mercantile marine of the world, a subsidy of £56,000 stg. for performing the service of carrying the mails from Great Britain to this country. From that day up to the present, Nova Scotia had been in the constant enjoyment of direct communication with the Mother Country, and it was now noticed, with extreme regret, that, to-day, no provision was made for the continuance of that service. He might be told that the Intercolonial Railway had done a great deal for Nova Scotia. It had to some extent, but, when he was told that it would, in the future, carry the mails from Rimouski, the weekly service being continued from that point, and that the Maritime Provinces would receive *via* Rimouski, weekly, the mails from Great Britain, he would reply that the Intercolonial Railway was built to improve and extend the facilities of their communications with the west, and not to afford an argument for the discontinuance of existing privileges. It might be said that the weekly service would supply all the wants of the Maritime Provinces, but that was not the question. Montreal and Toronto could avail themselves of the daily service from New York to Great Britain, which could not be so well utilised by the Maritime Provinces. The fortnightly service between Nova Scotia and Great Britain supplied a want which, in the Upper Provinces, had not been felt. If we were to have a great national Atlantic seaport, some encouragement should be extended to that service, and the privileges hitherto enjoyed should not be taken away or curtailed. The withdrawal of these steamers would be a blow to the great terminus of our railroad system in the East, it would lower the prestige of our national Atlantic seaport and injure our trade. The mail service to Bermuda and the West Indies would be affected by it, and Imperial interests in connection with direct communication from England with the naval and military authorities would be injuriously affected by the change. The service should not be brought to an abrupt termination. Notice of the intention to withdraw it should be given,

MR. DALY.

so that merchants might have timely opportunity to make other arrangements necessary for their trade. He looked upon this action of the Government as a retrograde movement, one which would cause the loss of the trade in passengers and goods which this service created. It was not unreasonable to expect that the Government would give, at least, some remuneration to the Company that might undertake to carry the mails fortnightly between Halifax and England. The Government should give some subsidy to any such company. He hoped due consideration would be given to this subject, and a sum of money voted for the purpose as in former years.

MR. LANGEVIN said there was no objection to the production of these papers. No doubt the hon. gentleman would find all the information he wanted. He was sorry the Government could not put down the item, but the hon. gentleman would see how difficult it would have been to increase the expenditure of the country this year, in the face of a deficit something like \$2,400,000.

Motion agreed to.

HALF-BREED RESERVATIONS IN MANITOBA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. MERNER moved for a return of copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, contracts, agreements, stipulations, or any other communications whatever, by which the Government have set apart reservations of the Public Lands of Manitoba for the benefit of the French or English half-breeds, or Indian population, who were residents previous to the time the Dominion held control of the North-West Territory, formerly held by the Hudson Bay Company; the dates at which said reservations were made, the extent of the said reservations, and the reasons why large tracts were unsettled, and are, nevertheless, locked up.

Motion agreed to.

GREEN ISLAND IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

MOTION FOR INSTRUCTIONS.

MR. STEPHENSON, in the absence of Mr. McCARTHY, moved for copies of

the instructions given to Mr. John Davidson, the Indian agent at Dundee, during the year 1878, and correspondence between said agent and the Department, and between said agent and one Alpheus Adams and James Jameson, and all other persons, respecting Green or Adams' Island, in the St. Lawrence, opposite Edwardsburg, and copies of the leases granted of islands in the St. Lawrence during said year.

Motion agreed to.

DISCHARGE OF THE LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT ST. ANNE'S.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. GRANDBOIS, in the absence of Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier), moved for copies of all papers and documents relating to the discharge of Antoine Deschamps, light-keeper of St. Anne's, in the county of Jacques Cartier, and to the appointment in his place of Antoine St. Denis, sen., and Joseph Pilon.

Motion agreed to.

PILOTS' FUND.

MOTION FOR PETITION.

MR. VALIN moved for copies of the petition of the pilots, presented to the Department of Marine, praying that the Pilots' Fund may be placed under the control of the Government, as it was formerly.

Motion agreed to.

SUPERANNUATION OF LANDING WAITER AT CHIPPEWA.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. STEPHENSON, in the absence of Mr. BUNTING, moved for copies of all correspondence, papers, and Orders in Council, respecting the superannuation of C. St. George Yarwood, landing-waiter at Chippewa, county of Welland.

Motion agreed to.

SUMS PAID J. B. DUSSEAULT, OF L'ISLET.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. LANDRY moved for a statement showing all sums paid from the year 1875

up to this date, to Mr. Jean Baptiste Dusseault, merchant, of L'Islet, in the county of L'Islet: 1. For acting as Inspector or Superintendent of Works at the building of the lighthouse at the wharf at Rivière Ouelle, or St. Denis, in the county of Kamouraska; 2. For acting as Inspector or Superintendent of Works at the building of a lighthouse on the rock called "Algernon Rock," in the River St. Lawrence; 3. For acting as Manager and Inspector of Works in repairing the wharf at L'Islet; specifying in each case the amount given to Mr. Arthur Dusseault, son of the said Jean Baptiste Dusseault; copies of all letters, reports, accounts, pay-list and correspondence between the said J. B. Dusseault and the Department of Public Works, or the engineers of that Department having charge of works to be done in the River St. Lawrence, and of all documents whatsoever relating to the aforesaid works; also, copies of a certain application made in 1870 by the said Jean Baptiste Dusseault to the Department of Public Works, asking for the position of caretaker of the wharf at L'Islet.

Motion agreed to.

RONDEAU HARBOUR.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. STEPHENSON moved for copies of all contracts entered into since 1874 for improvements or repairs to Rondeau Harbour of Refuge; together with copies of all correspondence with the Department of Public Works in connection therewith, and the amount of money paid for said improvements or repairs, and to whom paid.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES COURTS BILL.—[BILL 5.]

(*Mr. Mills.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading *read.*

MR. MILLS said, with regard to the North-West Territories, it was very difficult to state what law was in force. If it was all embraced in the Hudson Bay Company's claim and charter, it would be the Common Law and Statute Law of

England, such as existed in the time of Charles the Second. It was, therefore, important to remove all doubt with regard to the matter, and determine what rule of law should prevail in that country. It seemed to him there were two courses open: one to provide that the English Common and Statute Law, at the time of the transfer, or as much of it as was suitable to its circumstances, should be enforced in that country; or they might take the law of some of the Provinces and provide that, such as it was, at present, or when Confederation was established, it should be extended to those territories. The second course, he thought, would be the best to adopt; Provincial Law would be most readily accessible, and most easily understood. If they adopted the English Common or Criminal Law, they did not know exactly how it would fit into the Criminal Statute Law enacted at Ottawa, and in force in the Territories. What he proposed was to declare that the Criminal Law of Ontario, at the time of Confederation, should be the Criminal Law of the North-West Territories. Then, from the time of Confederation, they had their own Criminal Statutes, which had been enacted and which had been made the Criminal Law of that region, a complete embodiment of that law as it existed in Ontario and Quebec at Confederation, and such as it had been made by the various Criminal Statutes now in force in the Territories. So far as the Criminal Law was concerned, the provisions of this Bill would make the system complete, uniform, systematic and consistent throughout. With regard to the Civil Law, what seemed the very best course would be to declare that the Civil Law, such as it was made by the Common Law and Consolidated Statutes of Ontario, at the period here mentioned, 1st January, 1878, should be the law of that country. They knew that the Legislature of Ontario had consolidated the various provisions of the Statute Law as to property and civil rights, down to that period, in two volumes. It would be accessible to the people of that country, and there would be less difficulty in determining what the law of the territory really was than in any other way. He thought this was the simplest plan

MR. MILLS.

they could adopt to provide the people in our Territories, or who might go there, with a complete system of civil and criminal jurisprudence. He provided in the Bill, as respected matters of controversy relating to property and civil rights, that they should include what were known in Ontario as Equitable as well as Common Law rights; so that rules laid down by the Court of Equity with regard to the class of questions which fell within the domain of equity jurisprudence, such as frauds, whether actual or constructive, trusts, the administration of trust estates and the distribution of property, would be exactly the same in the Territories as in Ontario. They must adopt some rule of law and some system, and it was only fair to the people of the Territories to give them a system easily understood, and easily accessible to the Magistrates or Judges, and that might be within the reach of those who might undertake the practice of law in that country. In his opinion, there was no way in which that could be so readily accomplished as by declaring that the law of Ontario should be the rule with respect to property and civil rights, or so much of it as was applicable to that new country. The laws of Canada, passed from time to time, would continue to be extended to the Territories. The Governor in Council, also, by their ordinances, might modify the law occasionally. He thought that the Bill would give the people of the North-West a complete system of jurisprudence, being that of one of the Provinces, Ontario, from which there was likely to be the largest emigration. He thought, therefore, on every ground, both as regarded the convenience of the people to be affected, the simplicity of the system, and the fact that the majority of the settlers would be from Ontario, they should adopt the proposals of the Bill. The necessities were perfectly obvious, and the principles involved were easily understood. The people would thereby possess the Common, the Equitable and Statute Law of Ontario, as it had been construed and interpreted by as able a judiciary as was to be found on this side of the Atlantic.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said it was for the House to consider the necessity of this measure. At present the

North-West Territory was constituted under an Act passed by the late Government, under the direction of the hon. gentleman himself. Mr. Mills's system of laws and jurisprudence was then thought suitable to the character of the country and its population.

MR. MILLS: To what does the hon. gentleman refer?

MR. McDONALD: To the Acts of 1875 and 1877.

MR. MILLS: What provision?

MR. McDONALD said that the third clause of the Act of 1877 was what he meant. In the third section of chapter 7 of the Statutes of 1877, it was provided:

"The Lieutenant-Governor in Council, or the Lieutenant-Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly, as the case may be, shall have such powers to make ordinances for the Government of the North-West Territories as the Governor in Council may, from time to time, confer upon him; provided always that such powers shall not, at any time, be in excess of those conferred by the ninety-second section of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' upon the Legislatures of the several Provinces of the Dominion."

There was a clause conferring certain powers on the Government of the North-West, and it appeared to him that, under that Act, there was ample provision made for legislation. He did not say that the proposition of the hon. gentleman was objectionable; the only doubt he entertained was whether it was necessary to impose on a new and growing country, with conditions different from those contemplated when the laws of Quebec, for instance, were passed, the laws of the older Provinces. Laws which were wise and judicious in Quebec, Ontario, and Nova Scotia, might not be applicable to the conditions of the same people in that country. It was on that ground alone, as far as he was individually concerned, that he would hesitate to ask this Legislature to adopt a code of laws for the North-West, without the consultation of the people upon whom they sought to impose them.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman seemed to prefer legislation by Governor in Council to legislation in Parliament. If it was a proper thing to legislate, it

seemed to him the most suitable place for legislation was this Parliament. If the hon. gentleman looked at the provisions of the Bill he had just read, he would see that the Council could not exercise powers other than those relating to civil jurisdiction.

MR. McDONALD: Which Bill do you refer to?

MR. MILLS said he referred to the Bill the hon. gentleman had just read. The Provinces had not power to legislate on Criminal Law. That legislation must be here. The provision he suggested in this Bill was a very simple one, and one which got rid of the difficulty which existed. This Bill would enact, if it became law, that the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario should be the law of that country as supplementary to the Common Law and Equity jurisprudence as they had been interpreted by the Courts of Ontario. This would give the people of the Territories an opportunity of making a fair start by adopting the system of jurisprudence which obtained in one of the older Provinces. He selected the laws of Ontario because its laws were most available, and because the decision of its Courts were easily accessible to those who administered justice in the North-West. Especially was it desirable to adopt that course, when they considered that the great majority of the population were likely to be from the Province of Ontario. British Columbia, in adopting a system of jurisprudence, adopted the rule he had suggested in this Bill. This Bill provided that the Common Law of Ontario should be the law of that country, subject to such modifications as the Legislature might see proper to make. He thought it was unfair to the people of that country, and it was not fair to the people who were likely to go to that country, that this Bill should be rejected on the grounds put forward by the Minister of Justice. It was perfectly obvious the real reason had not been stated. There were other reasons which prevented the hon. gentleman from giving his support to the Bill.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought the hon. gentleman ought to mention the reasons which he believed

induced the hon. the Minister of Justice to withhold his support from the Bill.

MR. MILLS said the hon. the First Minister could have no difficulty in understanding what those reasons were. He was far too astute to require any explanation from him. It must be perfectly obvious to the hon. gentleman himself, and it would, perhaps, be more appropriate if he were to state the reason why this measure was now opposed, than that he (Mr. Mills) should point out the grounds on which that opposition was given.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman stated that the reason was perfectly obvious to him (Sir John A. Macdonald). He thought his hon. friend was as astute as he was, and he thought that, as the reason was so obvious, he should let the House know it.

MR. MILLS: But I am not opposed to it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he took a different view of the matter from the hon. gentleman opposite. He did not agree that no rule of decision obtained in the North-West as to the Civil or Criminal Law. It was quite clear, and he had laid down the doctrine very plainly in his speech, that it was a well-understood principle that, where a new country became possessed by another country, by conquest or otherwise, the law of the conquering country became paramount. He had no doubt that, when England acquired the great North-West by treaty, by discovery, or by both, the law of England, excepting the local municipal law, became the paramount law of that country. The same, no doubt, applied in regard to new discoveries in the South Seas; they might take Fiji, for instance. He had no doubt that, the moment English settlers going there landed, they were covered by the ægis of English law; and he had no doubt, until they had a law-making body of their own, that the general law of England applied to Fiji.

MR. MILLS: I am not disputing the fact, but I am disputing its applicability to the country.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the North-West country was acquired by England.

MR. MILLS: When?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that it was certainly a point upon which there might be a difference of opinion. England acquired that country by the right of occupancy and prior possession, and afterwards by civil treaties in which the disputed portions of the country were ceded to England. It was completely understood that the Hudson Bay Company had no special powers of legislation or of adjudication, and, by a Statute passed in the reign of George III, criminals could be sent down from the North-West and tried in Lower or Upper Canada, according to the laws of England; consequently the Imperial Parliament had decided what laws were applicable to that country. The hon. gentleman would remember, in some very celebrated cases, where parties were brought down from the North-West for murder, they were tried by the law of England, at that time, and not by any supposed law or infringement of law passed by the Hudson Bay Company under their charter. It seemed to him there was no necessity for this law. He did not think they should tinker with the matter. He did not see why the laws of Ontario should be made applicable to the North-West, any more than the laws of Quebec, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. It would be divided into Provinces as it became settled, and they could take up the law as they found it adapted to their several wants and necessities. It seemed to him that his hon. friend had not made out a case, especially in regard to the second clause relating to the fusion of law and equity. He would rather, in reference to this matter, take the law of the old Province of Quebec, which dealt at once with both principles of law and equity by the same course, by the same process, and under the same code. He thought the measure itself was rather premature, though it was a credit to his friend from Bothwell. On the whole, he thought it had better be allowed to stand, and give that country a little rest in legislation.

MR. MILLS said he thought the hon. gentleman would see that there was a

difference between the condition of the North-West Territories and the condition of Fiji. He had himself attempted to lay down the same rule, but he had also pointed out that there was this difference, that, in the acquisition of the territory of the North-West, we did not exactly know what law was in force there. It was perfectly true that the Common Law and the Statute Law of England were in force in all territories settled by an English population until they had some legislative jurisdiction of their own. There was a Legislature organized under the Hudson Bay Company more than thirty years ago in the North-West Territories, known as the Assiniboine Council.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : That only applied to the Assiniboia region. The property is marked on the map, and was as distinct as the Province of Manitoba is now.

MR. MILLS said a part of it was now within the North-West Territories. The territory acquired by Lord Selkirk was marked on the map as part of the Hudson Bay Territory. The legislative jurisdiction of the company was not confined within these limits, and, even if it was, it did not follow that the territory acquired from the Hudson Bay Company embraced this territory. Thus, it was obvious that the rule laid down by the hon. gentleman would not be uniform over the whole country. He (Mr. Mills) thought the hon. gentleman must see that such was the case; that, while the territory that was not acquired by the Hudson Bay Company, and where no legislative jurisdiction was established within the territory, would be under the jurisdiction of the English Common Law and the English Statute Law, down to the time when the legislative body was established, the territory legally under the jurisdiction of the Hudson Bay Company, and over which a Local Legislature did undertake to exercise authority, would be under an entirely different rule of law. The Statute Law of England, as it was modified by the legislation of the Council, as it existed at the time the Council acquired this authority, would be the rule within the territory over which the Council exercised jurisdiction, while another and different rule would pre-

vail in other parts of the territory. The First Minister would see that what was the rule of law when the matter came to be investigated within one section of that territory, might not be the rule of law within another section. It was, then, important that legislation should be had. There was not the slightest danger that the people would suffer from too much legislation in this matter, because they had the power of modifying or changing the law to suit themselves. Suppose some person committed a fraud upon another, in that country, how was he to be tried? What rule of law would be in force?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The Statute of Fraud will apply.

MR. MILLS : This is one of the cases where the Statute does not apply, unless it is specially provided for. There are English decisions in that sense.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : They are totally different systems.

MR. MILLS said, if the hon. gentleman's position was correct, the English rule of law and equity was in force in some form or other in that territory, except as to what was acquired from France. In Great Britain there had always been a distinction between law and equity, whether they were administered by the same Court, as at present, or by different Courts, as was formerly the case. There was some law relating to mistakes, in a portion of that territory, and there was some law in regard to specific performance. With regard to the administration of estates, what was the law to be? The hon. gentleman did not get rid of the objection he had raised against the Bill of too much law, by saying it should not become law, because some law or other in some period or other of English history was in force in every portion of that territory not acquired from France, whenever a population went there. But the question was whether it should be the law of one hundred years ago, or of twenty years ago, or whether it should be suited to the circumstances of a new country such as we found the law in Ontario to be, and that would depend on whether we legislated here or not. But

there could be no doubt whatever that it would be found that a uniform rule of law did not apply over the whole of that territory, because it was not all acquired at the same time, or under circumstances subjecting it to the same principle, and a part of it was under legislative jurisdiction for the last thirty years, while another portion never was. A part would have the English system of law and equity of ten, thirty or forty years ago, and another part would have the Statute Law, inasmuch as it was, down to the present moment, in force in the territory. This was a very unsatisfactory condition of things. There was a law in force in that territory upon every subject of property and rights, but what that law was it was impossible to say, and the hon. gentleman intended that it should continue to be an unknown law to the population of that country.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) said he could assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) that he had no motive in opposing the Bill he had brought before the House other than the one he had already expressed, namely, that the Bill, however wise it might be, was not useful for the territory for which it was intended. He would not discuss, after the hon. gentleman and the leader of the Government, the question whether the Common Law of England prevailed in that territory. In his own opinion, there could be little doubt on the question, but he was satisfied the Bill before the House was uncalled for, from the fact that the legislation already enacted by this Parliament, and the power by that legislation given to the Council of the North-West Territory, was quite sufficient to afford all the legal protection which the people of that country needed, until they were themselves in a position to enact the laws which they might think requisite and suitable to their condition and circumstances. The hon. gentleman was mistaken in asserting that there was no provision for the administration of criminal law in that country; on the contrary, the Statute of 1875, which was amended in 1877, directly authorised the Governor in Council there to re-enact, by proclamation, any Statute or part of a Statute of the Dominion of Canada, so that the Governor

MR. MILLS.

might import by proclamation all the laws of the Dominion which might be required in that territory. On that understanding, he presumed his hon. friend and the House would be satisfied that the powers of the Governor in Council were amply sufficient for the maintenance of the peace, the punishment of crime, and the good government of the country. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman admitted that, by the amendment of 1877, the Governor in Council of the North-West Territory, with the concurrence of the Governor in Council of the Dominion, might enact, by a simple ordinance, any law pertaining to civil rights which existed in the Dominion. That, in his opinion, was ample provision for the good government of the territory, and the security of the lives and property of the people, until they were in a position to legislate for themselves. He did not think it would be wise to impose upon a new country all the complex system of Common Law and Equity which existed in the older Provinces. At present, the law of that country, both civil and criminal, was, perhaps, cheaply and roughly administered, but was quite sufficient for all present needs.

Motion *negatived*.

SEIZURE OF THE "SARAH E. BRYANT."

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House *resumed* the adjourned debate on Mr. Robertson's (Hamilton) proposed motion for copy of a return of all reports, evidence, protests, documents and correspondence in reference to the seizure of the steam tug *Sarah E. Bryant*, of Buffalo, N.Y., by the Customs authorities at Dunnville, in or about the month of November, 1874, for an alleged breach of the Coasting and Revenue Laws, in going to the rescue of the crew and cargo of the wrecked American schooner *Augustus Ford*, of Oswego, U.S., and statement of the fine imposed, and by whose directions and by what authority the said seizure was made, and the said fine inflicted; and Mr. DeCosmos' motion in amendment thereto, that the said motion be amended, by adding thereto the following words:—"Also any correspondence between the United States and Canada,

respecting reciprocal legislation with reference to using wrecking-tugs in the waters of the respective countries."

MR. KIRKPATRICK said they had heard a great deal, the other night, with regard to unlicensed American tugs coming into our waters to aid vessels ashore or in distress in Canadian waters. It was said that our waters should be kept for the exclusive use of Canadian tugs. Most of the hon. gentlemen spoke of the upper lakes, Erie, Huron and Superior, while few of them touched upon Lake Ontario. He could say that he believed all Canadian tug-owners on that lake were in favour of reciprocity in this matter. They did not think that, when a vessel was in distress or in danger of being wrecked, and involving the loss of life and property, American tugs should "pass by on the other side"—should not be allowed to come to their assistance, and all this in order to throw the tug business into the hands of a few tug-owners in Canada. While we desired to protect our own waters, we should remember that vessels with very valuable cargoes, and more valuable lives, might be lost while they were sending for the assistance of Canadian tugs. The hon. gentleman from Lambton instanced the case of a vessel stranded on the shores of Lake Huron, where she was wrecked, and a great deal of loss ensued, because American tugs were not allowed to go near her. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) believed justice would be done to our Canadian tug-owners, and a great deal of valuable property would be saved if the measure referred to by the hon. the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries were allowed to become law. We should have reciprocity in this matter; our tugs should be allowed to go into American waters, and, when occasion arose, American tugs should be allowed to come into Canadian waters. He spoke upon this matter advisedly, having before him the opinion of the largest tug-owners, and the owners of the largest wrecking apparatus on Lake Ontario, and, perhaps, the most extensive proprietors of vessels on that lake. They were of opinion that there should be reciprocity in this matter, and that the order of the late Government was too stringent, inasmuch as it would not

allow, under any circumstances, American tugs to come to the rescue of Canadian property or lives, when our vessels were stranded upon the rocks. He trusted that some measure would be taken to do away with the stringency of that order.

MR. MCCALLUM said, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kirkpatrick) wanted to do away with the existing regulations, he had changed his tune within a short time. As far as reciprocity was concerned, he was sure Canadians were perfectly satisfied. If the Americans would give us access to the coasting trade of the United States, we would give them reciprocity in that respect.

MR. MACKENZIE: Coasting is a different subject altogether.

MR. MCCALLUM said he thought the two subjects were closely connected. No law could prevent anyone from going to save life and property on a vessel in distress; the law of nations permitted that. The present law, which his hon. friend complained of, did not prevent that, but it did prevent Americans from coasting in our waters. The Americans now wanted to get reciprocity in wrecking, because they were going to benefit by it 90 per cent. more than we would get in return. They were never willing to treat us fairly. If the hon. gentleman would look over this report moved for, when it came down, he would see that, when Canadians had saved the life and property of Americans at the risk of their lives, the Americans came afterwards and got the money. In the case in question, the tug was fined \$400, and the sum was afterwards reduced to \$100. They were fined for coasting, and we were only carrying out the law. He thought the order the Government had issued was a very proper one. We had now greatly increased our tariff, and, if that order was not carried out, there would be a great deal of smuggling into this country from the United States, under the plea of wrecking. He might state that the Government had taken considerable trouble to gather information on this subject, and to lay before the House the whole of the facts connected with the case. His hon. friend was speaking au-

thoritatively on this matter, but he (Mr. McCallum) questioned very much if his view of the matter would be found to be correct, when the whole evidence was before them. History told a different story altogether to what the hon. gentleman had told them. He thought Canadian tug-owners ought to be protected. American wreckers charged a certain price—a large price—on Lake Michigan, but, when they came into Canada, they offered to work cheaply. When this report was brought down, he was sure the House would agree with him that it was not either in the interest of life or property that we wanted reciprocity with the United States. As his hon. friend said, they had a different object—to make money. He would ask whether that was the case. He knew many of our tugs lying idle along the Canadian shore, and, when they offered their services where such services were required, they were told: "Oh, no. We have plenty of tugs of our own; we can go to Buffalo, and get boats there that belong to our own country." The principal information given on this subject by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson), and others, came from Mr. Dore, of Buffalo. But Mr. Dore was trying to bring grist to his own mill. He had all the different apparatus required for wrecking and diving, and, of course, wanted to make the most out of it he could. He (Mr. McCallum) remembered that, on one occasion, he required a wrecking pump, and he went to Mr. Dore to get one, but he would not give him one pump—he had to take two, and he was charged very high for them. Reciprocity to Mr. Dore meant an increase of business, and, therefore, he favoured it. The cry of humanity was raised in order to make money, and the hon. gentleman spoke about reciprocity, and stated that, since this order had been in force, life had been lost and vessels wrecked without assistance from Canadian tugs. He (Mr. McCallum) would like the hon. gentleman to name one instance, since this order came into force, when life or property had been lost for want of assistance, and, when they had American tugs at the steamer *Quebec*, they became wrecks themselves. But American tugs came over in defiance of the law. It would appear, from the course advocated

by some gentlemen in this matter, as if they wanted to play into the hands of American tug-owners. He, for one, would stand up for Canadian interests. He was ready to meet them half way if we got *quid pro quo*. He thought he was pretty well informed on this question, and he knew just as much as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) of the feeling of the people of the United States on this subject, and he believed it was impossible for us, supposing we did get reciprocity, to have access to the inland waters of the United States. The only way to reach the people of the United States was through their pockets. It was said we had no boats here. He begged to differ altogether with that assertion. There was only one boat in the whole of the inland waters of the United States, which was kept ready for wrecking, and we in Canada had a better one. The latter was kept in readiness for use at a moment's warning.

AN HON. GENTLEMAN: Where?

MR. MCCALLUM said at Windsor; and, further, they had eighteen or twenty tugs at Port Colborne and other places. There were such people in this country who wanted to play into the hands of the Americans. What reason had they to do so, unless receiving an equivalent? The Americans had not carried out that part of the Washington Treaty by which the State of New York was to give Canadians the use of the Erie Canal, when, in fact, by their Customs regulations, and other means, they entirely prevented Canadians using their canal, and yet they asked us for reciprocity. When our vessels went to the United States, they had to pay tonnage dues, though the Canadians did not charge them any. They put on what they called a war tax upon their own vessels, and they endeavoured to make Canadians pay a toll in order to support their Government. They charged 30c. on every ton of shipping going into the United States. He would like to know if this Government was going to meet them in the same way. He knew that, according to a treaty between Great Britain and the United States, the Government could not impose any taxation on American shipping more than on our

MR. MCCALLUM.

own; but they could impose some on their own shipping. If they had a Government in Ontario in accord with this Government, what he proposed could easily be accomplished. In the Province of Ontario, vessels were subject to municipal taxation. Now, if this Government would give the Local Government so much to exempt vessels from this municipal taxation, he thought we could put 30c. a ton on our own vessels, and on Americans too, without increasing our own taxes. He was ready to go that far. When this report was brought down, he would ask the Printing Committee to have it printed, so that it could be read by everybody, and it would give a fair indication of how this question stood.

MR. McCUAIG said that last year a new system of measurement was introduced, by which one of the vessels he was interested in was measured 801, and another 347, both being unfair measurements. The effect of this was, that in 1877, where they had paid \$104 for one of their vessels, they paid this year, \$319.20; and on another, \$148, whilst this year they had paid \$248.20. That was by the action of their own Government. The Marine and Fisheries Department had adopted the English system of measuring steamers on the upper saloon and state-rooms. He believed the system of measurement was unjust. He thought it very unfair to charge the Americans for that. When vessels were wrecked, the Government had to submit to the dictation of insurance inspectors. He knew that most of the apparatus employed in connection with these wrecks was owned by these inspectors, and, not unfrequently, when assistance was asked from them, they forced upon them a great many more articles than were required. He (Mr. McCuaig) had brought this matter before the Department of Marine and Fisheries some time ago, and asked that a Commissioner should be appointed, upon whom an owner could call when necessary, and who could keep a record of what was done, and give disinterested evidence in case of litigation. In reference to tugs, he thought that legislation should run in such a direction that vessels requiring assistance should be able to get the first steamer at hand.

The greater the competition that could be brought to bear, by allowing the steamers of the one country to assist the other, the better, he thought, it would be for both. He trusted some basis of reciprocity in this respect would be arrived at.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the hon. gentleman who spoke last had referred to an injustice in the remeasurement of certain steamers. There was no injustice in that. It was a measure of absolute necessity to effect justice in other directions. The hon. gentleman knew very well that steamers, built within the last few years, were measured in a different way from that in which they had been measured prior to that period, and the result was that those measured lately were paying a much larger proportion of canal tolls leviable on steamers passing through the canals, and it was in order that all steamers should pay on the same principle that the remeasurement was directed. Now, every steamer was measured on the same principle. He had no sympathy whatever with the extraordinary proposal made by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) that, because the American Government had imposed tonnage duties upon vessels entering their ports at 30c. a ton, the only way we could get satisfaction was to tax ourselves 30c. a ton. That was an extraordinary way of having revenge on the Americans. They used an indiscriminate tax against our vessels. He could understand the force of the hon. gentleman's proposal to tax all United States shipping 30c. per ton, if there was a discriminative tax in the United States against Canada. The hon. gentleman proposed that the few American vessels that came into Canada should be taxed 30c. per ton, but, in order to do that, our ships should be taxed also.

MR. McCALLUM: We give them an equivalent.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not want an equivalent in taxation; he wanted as little taxation as possible. But this proposition was quite in accordance with the preposterous notions that sometimes prevailed with hon. gentlemen on the other side.

MR. McCUAIG said, as far as his information extended, the system of measuring vessels was limited to the hull of the vessel. He had yet to learn it could be found in any other way. It was only last year the application of that rule was changed, when they took in the whole of the saloons of the steamer, the state-rooms, and the covering for the man at the helm. These did not form part of the tonnage of a vessel. The effect was that when a Canadian vessel entered into American ports, instead of having to pay \$104, she had to pay \$319.20. He was satisfied that, if the hon. gentleman's attention had been called to this before the new system of measurement was put into effect, he would have condemned it.

MR. MACKENZIE said, if he had been aware of the grounds of the hon. gentleman's complaint, he would have obtained more precise information. The Act providing for the measurement of vessels was passed by the previous Administration to his. The only complaint the hon. gentleman could fairly make was that a number of vessels were treated in the same way as others. He admitted that all measurements were made upon the same principle, whether the best or not, but, as long as all were treated alike, none had a right to complain. It might be that our vessels paid a much larger proportion of the tonnage dues than they formerly did. He did not see it was possible for any Government to avoid that in carrying into effect an enactment of a just character, which treated all persons alike.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. DeCosmos, that Sessional Paper 42 (not printed), 1877, respecting the Fisheries of British Columbia and the Report of the Inspector of Fisheries of British Columbia for 1878, etc., be laid before the House.

Motion agreed to.

BUILDING OF THE "NORTHERN LIGHT."

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Valin's proposed motion, for

MR. MACKENZIE.

copies of the tenders received for the building of the steambot *The Northern Light*; the names of the parties tendering, and the price agreed upon in the contract, and all the papers connected with her construction; the names of the inspectors employed during the construction of that vessel, and the salary paid to such inspectors; the amount expended for repairs effected on this boat since it began to run; and also, the sum paid to keep it running between Pictou and Georgetown up to the 1st January, 1879.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO MARITIME COURT ACT REPEAL BILL.—[BILL 34.]

(*Mr. McCuaig.*)

SECOND READING WITHDRAWN.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McCUAIG said it was his first attempt to endeavour to repeal an Act of such importance, but the whole Act was so objectionable and inapplicable to the wants of inland navigation, that its entire repeal was necessary. There had been no agitation in favour of the Bill. It was introduced last year by Mr. Blake, assisted by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and in itself was very short, and not intended to apply the whole of the maritime law of England to this country. Its working was very expensive, as had been demonstrated by the hon. member for Essex, who cited an instance where a steamer seized had been sold, and the costs of the Court had been sufficient to absorb the whole amount. The law was brought under his observation in this way. On the 20th February last, he was looking over the files of the *Globe* at Toronto. He noticed the steamer *Empress of India*, of which he was part owner, was advertised for sale; also, the advertisement appeared in the *Mail* and *Kingston News*. He telegraphed immediately to his office, and found that no protest of any kind, or any notice, whatever, had been given or demand made upon the owners for the alleged amount of claim. That property which cost \$40,000 or \$50,000 might have been sold without his knowledge, and a law under which this could be done should be repealed.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said the hon. gentleman had mentioned his name, and he would like to say a few words against the motion. The mover said there was no agitation for the establishment of this Court. He, perhaps, was not aware that for several years petitions were presented to the House by ship-owners, mariners, ship-chandlers and others interested in vessels, praying for the passage of an Act which would give a lien upon vessels to seamen for their wages, and to others having unsatisfied claims, and generally for the introduction of maritime law to the inland waters of Canada. In every country possessing a marine interest and vessels, a law of this nature had been enacted. The people of the United States, shrewd and very capable of managing their business, had a law of this nature, and seamen and persons supplying vessels with any commodity, enjoyed the right of action *in rem* against the vessel itself. That law seemed to act well. It appeared very unnatural that, while Canadian vessels in American ports were subjected to a law of this kind, American vessels in Canadian ports could go scot free. It was unjust that, at the end of the season, a person who had earned money from a quasi-owner of a mortgaged vessel, could be deprived of his just rights, or that American vessels could collide with others in Canadian waters and not be answerable for the damage resulting; or that foreign vessels could enter our ports and incur liabilities therein, with no remedy against them. These facts had so impressed the public mind that the late Government passed a remedial Act, which constituted a bright spot in its record. Mr. Blake rightly claimed credit and honour for this measure. It was not the law itself that gave rise to abuses, but, unfortunately, the rules under which it had been administered. He had heard of cases in which the whole value of a vessel was eaten up by costs; in one instance of a claim for \$10.73, the costs had run up to \$101, and he admitted such costs were outrageous. In one case he took upon himself to represent to the learned Judge that, if the practice of the Court permitted such legalised robbery to prevail, it must, in the end, arouse a feeling that would demand the abolition of the Court. The learned Judge replied that

he would sooner resign than allow the continuance of such a practice, whereupon he made a new rule.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
What Judge ?

MR. KIRKPATRICK : The Judge of the Maritime Court, Mr. McKenzie. Instead of repealing this law he (Mr. Kirkpatrick) believed it should be amended where necessary. It was only a year old, and the House would act more courteously to the late Government, and more in accordance with the practice of the country, to give the law a longer trial. If some amendments were introduced to provide against the abuses mentioned, the object of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) would be practically attained. He would, therefore, appeal to him in behalf of the large inland maritime interest, the great number of sailors and others concerned, to withdraw his motion, and ask the Minister of Justice to introduce some amendments to provide against the present abuses. Not only in regard to costs was there an abuse, but as to proceedings being taken without personal service of any papers, for the reason that the rules of the Court had been adopted in a haphazard manner from the old laws of the English Admiralty Court, which provided that the service of papers was to be effected by nailing up the process on the masts of the vessels. In Canada, the papers should be actually served upon the persons residing within the Province. If that and other defects were provided for, the objections of the hon. member for Prince Edward and other members would be overcome.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said that the object of the hon. member for Prince Edward could be obtained in only one way—by the repeal of the Act, of which he could never see the policy. He never could see why the owners of claims against vessels should be in a better position than men possessing claims against farmers and others. He was not aware that there were ever any petitions in favour of this Bill.

MR. KIRKPATRICK : There were lots of them.

MR. CAMERON said he recollected none from business men or sailors. The first time the question was brought up in Parliament, it was by the then member for Welland (Mr. Street), whose resolutions expressed the propriety of a law of this kind. After the death of Mr. Street, the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) made this question his pet, his baby, in fact, but he never succeeded in making his baby more than a bantling till the hon. member for Lambton took office. How he ever allowed the hon. gentleman's Bill to pass, was more than he (Mr. Cameron) could understand. The Bill always before met with a bad reception; all business men, especially those engaged in this interest, had been unanimously opposed to it. Nothing astonished him more than that the hon. gentleman should have succeeded in convincing the late Government that his Bill should pass. He (Mr. Cameron) thought that, instead of its being a bright spot on the record of the hon. member for Lambton, that it was about the only mistake he had made in office. He (Mr. Cameron) regretted it had been made, and hoped that hon. gentleman would see, from the experience of his own section, and the lake shore districts generally, which knew something of the working of the measure, that it had operated very badly indeed. The amount of the costs proved a very great objection. If the claim was only a few dollars, all the proceedings had to be taken in Toronto, and six months' litigation would result, at the end of which the vessel would be eaten up with costs. In addition, there was the difficulty that perhaps a foreign vessel would be 1,000 miles away from the port where a writ of seizure issued for a small claim, and the hands had to be idle, the vessel laid up, and large costs and expenses incurred in connection with the action. The greatest possible frauds were perpetrated under that law in the United States. Now, to his own knowledge, vessels had been sold in that country, in such actions, without the knowledge of their owners, who had thus been robbed. As they all knew, proceedings *in rem* might be taken without the knowledge of the owner, who could be deprived of his property without the opportunity of defending himself. Another reason why the law

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

ought to be repealed, if the hon. the First Minister had been correctly reported, was his statement that it was unconstitutional. He had declared it beyond the jurisdiction of this Parliament. If so, he should not allow it to remain on the Statute-book a moment. He (Mr. Cameron) believed that was a correct view, and that this law was not in the interest of the public. It was an injury to the trader and the vessel-owner, while not advantageous, so far as he could see, to those holding claims against vessels. On the contrary, it appeared a very serious injury to the owners of vessels. He hoped the motion of the hon. member for Prince Edward, in favour of a repeal, would pass.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) had observed that, if he thought this Act was *ultra vires*, he ought at once to move for its repeal. Now, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had his own opinion about it, but it might be wrong, and, when the late Government passed the Act, of which so eminent a lawyer as Mr. Blake must have approved, he spoke with great diffidence in saying it was *ultra vires*. It was now the law of the land, and he did not think he should set up his own opinion against it till the Courts had declared it *ultra vires*. He thought such an act would be one of unwarrantable self-confidence on his part. He must say, however, that he had always been opposed to the passage of this Act. He had presented very many petitions from captains and mariners on the lakes in favour of the establishment of this Court, but he never would support them, because he believed those parties would find such a Court a mistake. He was quite certain the shipowners would. The member from South Huron and others had found it oppressive, which it was, undoubtedly. Take, for example, the ferryboat crossing from Ottawa to Hull; it was liable to come under the provisions of the Maritime Court Act. A sailor, or any of the hands, got drunk, say, and was sent ashore, and immediately went to a lawyer in Hull or Ottawa, took out a process *in rem*, the ferry was stopped, and the owner, if he could not get security immediately to relieve the vessel, might

see the whole of this community annoyed and inconvenienced by the stoppage of the communication between both sides of the river. The same thing might occur on all the inland waters—the same principle applied to all. Any person with a claim against any of the vessels on their lakes and rivers, good or bad, just or unjust, could, by taking out a process *in rem*, seize and stop her, and, perhaps, ruin her owner, unless he happened to be on the spot with the security or money wanted. Now, he did not see there was any reason in the world why the shipping interest in the inland waters should be more protected than any other in this way. On a petition, and before the justice of a claim was established, he did not see why any one should seize a vessel, any more than that he should seize railway cars, and stop the train. He did not intend to discuss the question of jurisdiction. The final settlement of that question, so far as Parliament was concerned, must be left to the Courts. He assumed, for all purposes, that this Parliament had the power to pass such an Act. He would be quite willing to vote for the repeal of the law on his conviction; at the same time, it was a serious thing when Parliament, after discussion, had passed an Act, and Courts had been established under it, to repeal or alter the whole current of that law, and not give it a fair trial; and, therefore, he should ask his hon. friend the mover not to press his motion—to be satisfied with this discussion, and allow the country to see whether the Act was beneficial or prejudicial. His (Sir John A. Macdonald's) own opinion was that, the longer it remained on the Statute-book, the more unpopular it would become. He thought, if his hon. friend wished to put an end to legislation of this kind for ever, the better plan would be to allow the Statute to remain on the Statute-book for another year. When, during his representation of Kingston, an agitation was commenced for the establishment of a Maritime Court, he presented an infinity of petitions. He told his constituents, however, that it would be a great mistake, and there would speedily be petitions for the repeal of the Act. He believed so at the time, and they had a proof of this in the fact of his hon. friend, a ship-owner, being one of the first claim-

ants for the repeal of the Act. He hoped his hon. friend would not press the matter, and would allow the Bill to drop. This discussion would call the attention of the country in the maritime interest to the matter, and he thought his hon. friend would have no difficulty in carrying a Bill of this sort next year.

Mr. McCALLUM said he would not be doing his duty if he did not explain how this law worked in his part of the country, and particularly in regard to those living along the Welland Canal. Formerly, American vessels were not responsible for their debts. The American vessels got into debt as much as they possibly could, and people lost a good deal of money along the canal. His hon. friend had said it was a great hardship because a man could go ashore, get drunk, and leave his vessel. Now, he believed when they took men on board, they made them sign articles. He was engaged in the shipping business, and he never felt any difficulty in this respect. It was an advantage to know that a vessel was responsible for its debts; it enabled a captain to obtain supplies for his vessel; and, if he got into trouble, he could then get assistance. If he understood the law, the last lien was the first. He thought the law might be too expensive, but he disagreed with the hon. gentleman when he said it was going to give dissatisfaction. He hoped the hon. gentleman would withdraw his Bill so as to give it a trial for another year; and he hoped that, before the House rose, the existing law would be so amended as to give it a fair trial, and new rules made to keep down the costs to reasonable bounds.

Mr. McCUAIG contended that Parliament was bound, in every way, to encourage the industries of the country. In his opinion, the Bill struck at the very foundation of commercial credit. Nearly the whole of the shipping interest of the country was built upon credit. In this instance, they gave the shipbuilder \$50,000 for a vessel, a large proportion of which they paid. He held that the man who held the mortgage for the balance should have the first mortgage. Therefore, the Bill introduced struck at the very foundation of commercial credit. He had been thirty-five years in business, and had never been sued until

lately, when, if he had not discovered it, this property, worth \$50,000, would have been sold for an imaginary claim of \$20, the result of a dispute between the captain and the cook. He had consulted men of large experience and unquestioned intelligence, and they had been willing to stake their reputation upon the statement that the law was unconstitutional. He contended that there was too much circumlocution in the litigation necessitated in these cases. Why should he be forced into the Supreme Court for a debt of \$20? As it was, those connected with the shipping interest did not receive justice. He did not like to act contrary to the recommendation of the right hon. gentleman to withdraw the Bill, but it was a matter in which he was very much interested, and in which his credit was jeopardised. He did not know much about parliamentary practice, but he knew something about common sense, and he thought the evil should be remedied.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he sympathised with his hon. friend in all that he had said, and, therefore, he thought he might ask the hon. gentleman to allow the Bill to drop for the present Session.

Order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

THE TARIFF DEBATE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

"That the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Tilley for the second reading of resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, be the first Order of the Day on Wednesday next, and have precedence immediately after routine, and before questions put by members."

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 26th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MR. McCUAIG.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEES' REPORT.

EXTENSION OF TIME.

MR. LANGEVIN moved that the time for receiving reports from Committees on Private Bills be extended until the end of the Session, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion, that the resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th), be read the second time.

MR. CASEY said that, in making a few general remarks on the tariff now before the House, it would perhaps be necessary to take a retrospective glance at the circumstances which led to the change of Government. It was rather unfortunate for everyone concerned that the late Government should have assumed power in the face of a financial storm, which had been long foreseen and predicted, and, amongst others, by the hon. gentleman who had charge of the finances of the country in the late Government. Shortly after they took office, the storm burst, and the question at once arose: How should the storm be met? The modes which presented themselves to the late Government were either economy of expenditure or an addition to the revenue by means of increased taxation. The Government, at first, felt themselves bound to adopt the latter of these two means to a certain extent, but, having raised the revenue to a point at which they considered reasonable and fair, they determined to try the experiment of getting along without raising it any further. They had hopes that the crisis was nearly over, and that the revenue, which had been long declining, might begin to increase. They also believed that it was their duty to try and weather the storm by means of increased economy, without the imposition of additional taxation. He maintained that,

in face of the accusations which had been made against that Government, they had made a most praiseworthy effort to carry out this plan. In face of the vastly increased engagements left by their predecessors, they conducted the affairs of the country without materially increasing the expenditure, if they did not, indeed, actually decrease it. The expenditure of the country had been increased to the extent of something like \$10,000,000 in the five or six years before they took office. The late Government had kept the expenditure down, on the average, to about the same figures as in 1873, the last year of their predecessors. In some years, they had even brought it below that point. They began no new scheme at all expensive. They spent very little on any schemes, except such as were already in operation, and for which votes had been taken by their predecessors. But, notwithstanding all this, these gentlemen found, to their grief, that the storm was going to become more severe and longer continued than they had expected, and that the demands on revenue increased from year to year. He would not have blamed the late Government, supposing they had remained in power, if they had found it necessary, under the circumstances, to have somewhat increased the taxation of this country. He thought the country was prepared to submit to further taxation for revenue purposes, if it had been found absolutely necessary for the purpose of conducting the business of the country and preserving the country's credit. But he considered the Government were deserving of the greatest credit for endeavouring to carry out their experiment without resorting to this expedient. While he would have been willing, under the pressure of the country's necessity, to have supported an increased revenue tariff, he gave his assent to the doctrine announced by the late Finance Minister, that taxation, for other than revenue purposes, was legalised robbery. At the elections, he was successful in maintaining his position on the stand the Government had taken on that question. The country had pronounced differently upon it, but he still adhered to the principle that the confiscation of the property of one individual for the purpose of

assisting another was unjustifiable. He was proud, in spite of the defeat they had sustained, to still support that view. He was glad the Government went to the country on that theory, because it was not merely a party or personal issue, but a clear question of principle. He was much prouder in supporting these gentlemen in Opposition, and at the same time giving his support to that principle, than he would be in supporting them on the other side of the House, if they had retained their place there by any change of that principle. He desired, in the next place, to consider, for a moment, the great crisis which occurred on the 17th September. The people had been, undoubtedly, very badly situated, and there were those who were ready to advise them that their case was not without a remedy. Hon. gentlemen opposite told them that they had a remedy ready at hand and carefully prepared—logical, simple, and infallible. They all knew that the suffering were credulous, and they need not go any further for proof of this than to the successful operations of Ayer, Holloway, and Dr. Pierce. The remedy in this case was offered and accepted. The people were willing to try almost any experiment, believing that they could not possibly get into a worse condition than they were then in. His hon. friends opposite seemed inclined to laugh at the admission that the people believed that their condition could not be made worse. He did not think they would be inclined to laugh when they saw to what point that proposition led them. Hon. gentlemen at present sitting on the Treasury benches, who had been dismissed from office five years ago, under circumstances more contumelious than had ever attended the removal of any former Government in Canada, undertook to supply the remedy. So hopeless was the condition of the people that they were prepared to take advantage of an offer of assistance made even by these gentlemen, as a desperate experiment, in the hope that they would receive the promised relief. If hon. gentlemen liked that view of the question, they were welcome to it. They were taken by the people as a last resource. The support the hon. gentlemen received at the last election was not an admission on the

part of the electors of any change of conviction. These gentlemen, personally, were not looked upon as long tried and trusted public servants, who were allowed to return to office because their presence there was necessary to public safety. They were only allowed to go back, on account of the desperate nature of affairs, to try a forlorn hope. The opinion expressed by a gentleman who had accorded his support on different occasions to both parties was the correct one. He referred to Mr. Goldwin Smith, who distinctly stated that, notwithstanding the manner hon. gentlemen had acted in the past, the people, seeing that the party in power would not do what the country wanted, were ready to take advantage of even these doubtful individuals, and let them try the experiment of Protection. That was Mr. Goldwin Smith's view of the public sentiment, and he (Mr. Casey) thought they were taken as a last resource. The condemnation that had been pronounced on these gentlemen years before was not abrogated, but suspended. They were allowed to try the remedy they proposed. If they succeeded, they would receive praise and approbation, but, if they failed, they must be consigned to the limbo of useless and worn-out politicians. These were the conditions of the experiment. Now, they would look at the experiment itself as far as it had been conducted. Its actual development had been long delayed. The formation of the Cabinet was not such as to highly gratify those who supported Protectionist views. Instead of being composed of gentlemen who had been distinctively connected with Protection all their lives, it was composed, as nearly as possible, of the same gentlemen who had been guilty of the great "indiscretion" five years ago. It seemed to be the intention of the Premier to make it appear that the country had condoned acts they had formerly condemned. Mr. Phipps, who had spent his money in publishing some 80,000 pamphlets, advocating Protection on logical grounds—who was not a manufacturer, but a disinterested patriot, believing in Protection as a policy that would be beneficial to the country—was left out of the Government. And they took in, from the sea coast in the far east, an hon. gentleman who, so far from

MR. CASEY.

being a theoretical Protectionist, had always made it a boast that he was the champion Free-trader in that House. It seemed that the Government was not formed with a view to Protection, but with the view of exculpating the Government, and especially the hon. the Premier, from the condemnation they had formerly incurred. The people had been led to believe that the remedy was decided upon and the policy ready, but, so far from its being ready, it had to be concocted from the beginning. He did not blame the hon. the Finance Minister for taking so long to concoct that policy after he began it. He thought it was a task of the greatest difficulty, but he complained that the country was led to believe the remedy was ready, when it was not even begun. The task the Finance Minister had undertaken was one such as no other Finance Minister of Canada had ever entered upon before, and was impossible of execution. The hon. gentleman had undertaken to evolve a policy which, by a balance of taxation inflicted on the different classes of the community, would make all classes richer, which would expel foreign manufactures from the country, and, at the same time, yield a greater Customs revenue, which would bring justice out of a general confiscation. This was an impossible task, and one which the hon. gentleman himself knew he could not perform, and which the country should have known to be impossible. They could guess at the manner in which this policy had been concocted. The present Premier, when at Hamilton, had promised to find out what protection each interest wanted, and had said: "Gentlemen, that protection shall be given." This promise seemed to have been to some extent carried out. Each interest, without waiting to be asked, began to formulate its demands, and sent deputations to consult with the Finance Minister, and tell him what protection they needed. The hon. the Premier had promised these men that, if they allowed him to run the machinery of Government, he would work it in accordance with their views, no matter what the consequences might be. Accordingly, the orders of these deputations had to be obeyed. The engineer and his lieutenant

ant and followers were troubled with no uncomfortable idea of theory or correct systems of legislation on carrying out the objects of those to whom they were subservient. They registered their demands, and left to the hon. the Finance Minister the duty of making law out of these heterogeneous demands. His obedience appeared to have been mechanical; he said: "Yea, my Lord," to all who came to him, without considering whether their demands clashed with each other. The manufacturers of pig iron said: "Give us 10 per cent.," and he gave it; the manufacturers of agricultural implements said: "Give us 25 per cent.," and he gave it; and, when the two were compared, it was found the share of the spoils given to one was more than nullified by the share given to the other. The Premier would find it was very hard to serve many masters, that it was impossible to harmonise these conflicting demands; but he had brought the trouble on himself, and would have to extricate himself from it. What it interested the country to know was the fact that his policy was dictated to him by outside parties. The Government was as completely under the heel of these rings as New York had been under the heel of the celebrated Boss Tweed. That might appear a little strong, but, as Boss Tweed controlled New York, because he controlled the Legislature, so the Premier controlled this Legislature, and the rings and manufacturers controlled him. That was a state of things which he, for one, declared intolerable. It was never expected by those gentlemen, who forsook their old party lines, that the Government they elected would prostitute their power to the service of the manufacturers, and be dictated to by rings. He (Mr. Casey) must allude to a remark of the late Finance Minister (Mr. Cartwright), to the effect that the hon. the Finance Minister must have allowed some of the Government secrets to leak out to his friends, who benefitted by them to a large extent. He (Mr. Casey) held the hon. gentleman free from such imputation; the very nature of things rendered it improbable. So far from the hon. the Finance Minister telling the manufacturers what duties he was going to impose, the manufacturers told him what duties he must im-

pose. Long before the tariff was brought down, it had been stated, at a meeting of the milling interest, that a duty of 50c. would be put on flour; similar notice of other duties had been given by those concerned. These gentlemen were not to be blamed if they entered on speculations on the strength of the knowledge that they were going to make the Finance Minister impose certain duties. It would be noticed, from the tone of the Finance Minister's speech, that no interests had been taken into account except those of the producers chiefly of manufactured articles, though certain duties had been levied *pro forma* in the interest of the farmer. The interest of the producer had been taken primarily into account. Complaints had been made by some of these, even, that no notice had been taken of their interests, because they had not been audacious or cautious enough to have their views kept constantly before the Minister. The cigar makers complained that no increased protection had been given to them. The Finance Minister's answer to them was to the effect that they had not sent a deputation. Why had they not done so? Because they had been promised by the Premier and others, especially in Toronto, that attention would be paid to their wants, and they trusted the hon. gentlemen. They knew, too, that their association was represented by an agent who was always at the Minister's ear. There were several very large classes who not only had as good a right as others to have their interests respected, but were as able to make their rights respected, who had not been considered. He might mention the class of professional gentlemen who could not get any protection, as it was called, by means of increased taxes on anything. Then came the commercial men who distributed the imports and manufactures of the country amongst the consumers; and then came the class on which the whole fabric of our polity was placed—the farmers. The way in which the farmer had been treated reminded him of an old English caricature, respecting the King, the clergyman, doctor, lawyer, etc., in descending order, and at the bottom of the list, in the most undignified position of all, the farmer. The King was represented as saying, "I gov-

ern you all;" the Bishop, "I pray for you all," etc., through the list; but the farmer said "I have to pay for you all." That was the position in which the farmer stood to-day. A new class was created for which he would have to pay, a new shoddy aristocracy similar to that which had grown up across the border, and which was productive of more evil than all the blue-blooded aristocracies that ever existed. Two of these classes could not be protected, and the other, the farmer, only in certain respects, if at all. What had been done to fulfil the promise made to the farmer and the working and commercial classes? Although the prices of goods which they bought would be increased, they had been told that they would receive cash in hand which would more than recoup them. They were promised an immediate reward. Had they got it? The Finance Minister knew he could not give it to them. He had, for form sake, put a duty on wheat which could not benefit the farmers of Ontario. He also put a duty on barley, knowing that we did not import any barley. He had reduced the duty on malt, whereas a protection on malt might do the farmers some good by leading to the consumption of home barley. He had put a duty on oats, corn, and pease. He doubted if the duty on the latter would prove beneficial, though the duty on corn and oats might react on pease to some extent. Milk, butter, cheese and eggs, had not been changed. He was puzzled for some time to account for the fact that eggs had been left on the free list. The explanation suddenly occurred to him. The hon. the Premier, in a speech at Ottawa, told his hearers that all the Tory hens of Toronto had met in convention, and had agreed to lay larger eggs in future. On the strength of this promise, eggs were left on the free list. The same argument might be applied to butter and cheese, for his hon. friend had told his hearers that the Tory cows were going to give more milk than hitherto, and increased quantity of milk was as good as increased price. He was astonished that the Finance Minister had not pointed out why he did not give increased duties on these. With regard to pork, the increase was very small on that kind in which farmers were most interested, on account of the

MR. CASEY.

great quantity used in lumbering districts, mess pork, and which called for higher protection than hams and bacon. The farmer was not satisfied. He had had a note of warning sounded in his ears, and now sounded it to the Administration. He had lately received a letter from one of his constituents, who was master of the Grange in his county. He would read from the letter extracts which defined the position better than he could hope to do:

"This idea of protecting the farmer, whose produce seeks a foreign market, is too thin. If the manufacturers are to get a drawback, I shall demand a bonus for what wheat I have to export, or there will be a row. Tell Tilley I was about building a house this summer, but I fear that he has knocked it all over; he has raised the price of my nails, locks, glass, paint, shingles, and nearly every thing that I require, and, so far, nothing that I have to sell has raised in return. This is Protection to the farmer with a vengeance. Tell him I have a nice flock of sheep; I don't see that he intends to help me either with my mutton or wool. Is this what they promised us? Certainly not; the industry of the country was to be protected, therefore, they must put a duty on immigrants coming into this country. If you bring competition against me in the labourer you introduce, I shall be unable to get the wages you promised me. If it is Canada for the Canadians, you must put a heavy duty on foreign labourers. But, stop, I think you would be troubled much, for, if it becomes known that you have placed a tax on every article the poor man requires to keep his family, that you have made Canada a dear country to live in, that a shoddy aristocracy, in the shape of protected manufacturers, are springing up, that you have discriminated against British workmen—will sell gladly, but buy nothing from them—when these things become known, I don't think you'll need a very heavy duty to keep them away."

He would now refer to the feelings of the farmers on this subject. The tax on oats and oatmeal was said to be in the farmer's interest. He had a letter from an oatmeal manufacturer in his county, who stated the case as follows:—

Cost per barrel to the manufacturer of oatmeal at St. Thomas, providing oats were purchased at Chicago:—

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| Cost of 10 16-32 Am. bush. at 22c. | |
| per bush..... | \$2.31 |
| Tariff of 10 16-32 Am. bush. at 10c. | |
| per bush..... | 1 05 |
| Freight of 10 16-32 Am. bush. at 20c. | |
| per 100lb..... | 0 67 |
| Barrels 25 lb. a piece..... | 0 25 |

Cost of oats to make 1 barrel oatmeal \$4 28

Cost per barrel to the manufacturer of oatmeal at Chicago, delivered at St. Thomas :—

| | |
|---|--------|
| Cost of 10 16-32 Am. bush. at 22c. per bush. | \$2.31 |
| Tariff on 200lb. oatmeal at $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per lb. | 1.00 |
| Freight on 200lb. oatmeal at 20c. per 100lb. | 0.40 |
| Barrels at 25c. a-piece. | 0.25 |
| | \$3.96 |

Amount per barrel in favour of Chicago manufacturer. 0.32

The result was that the oatmeal manufactured in Chicago could be laid down in St. Thomas at 30c. per barrel less than it could be produced for on the spot. A Canadian miller was no better off than if he bought Canadian oats, and the Canadian miller would be run out by the American, without benefit to the farmer. Should it be said that the Canadian miller could export his manufactures, it might be answered that he would have to wait three or six months for a return for his capital. Men in trade stated that they found they would have to invest one-third more capital to carry on foreign trade, in which there would be a loss of interest. The tariff would force millers to keep a large stock on hand, to the loss of interest on large sums of money. With regard to other interests affected, a firm of agricultural implement manufacturers in his constituency had written him that, by this tariff, they would lose \$3,000 a year, thus adding \$20 to the cost of their threshing machines. They said that the farmer would not pay so much for his implements as should be asked, and, consequently, that business would diminish. A firm of carriage makers in his (Mr. Casey's) county (Elgin), had told him a similar story, that they would pay \$10 more for the material used at each forge, which would compel them to raise their prices. The agricultural implement makers, using or making machinery, chiefly of iron, would have to demand still higher prices than those using chiefly wood, which would tell severely on some of their customers. So it seemed that, in that constituency, neither the farmers nor manufacturers were pleased with this new tariff. A letter from a gentleman manufacturing wire-fencing also contained complaints, to the effect that the new duty on wire would add 30c. per rod to the cost of this fencing, and that, unless a re-

duction was made, his business must stop. It would seem, from all those cases that, besides his share of the increase of the cost of the general necessities of life, the farmer would have to pay special taxes, with which result those who dealt with him were particularly dissatisfied already. He desired, before closing, to call the attention of the House to the inconsistency between the promises and performances of Ministers with regard to the treatment of the consuming classes by this tariff. The hon. Premier had stated in the Amphitheatre at Toronto, in opening the Protection campaign, that he proposed taking the taxes off the necessities of life—the tea, coffee, sugar, silks and satins, things they could not manufacture at home—and putting them on articles that could be produced here. He said to the people that it made no difference to them on what they paid their taxes—that, if it was on articles not producible in Canada, the people would be none the worse off. The hon. gentleman did not tell them they would be nothing better, however; he promised they would thus protect the Canadian manufactures capable of being thereby largely benefitted. Had those promises been carried out? Did he take the duty off tea, sugar and coffee? The hon. gentleman, on that occasion, was posed by the question of some one in the audience: "I want to know how, by removing the taxes from the necessities of life, and putting them on manufactures to a prohibitory extent, you will be able to raise a revenue?" There were cries on that occasion that that was a plumper and a poser. He (Mr. Casey) thought it was still going to perplex the Government, and that it showed their policy was nonsensical and impracticable. The people were now saddled with duties both on necessities and manufactures, in violation of the Premier's distinct promise. He did not know whether it was his hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Tilley) who used to be a Free-trader, or the former champion Free-trader from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Pope), who had coerced the hon. Premier in this matter, or whether it was stern logic, that he found he had to back out of his professions; but, at all events, he had broken his promises and the people

would remember it. The present Finance Minister uttered the same promise, but his action contrasted with it most peculiarly. He had stated that the late Conservative Government stimulated manufacturing by taking the duties off raw material and machinery, and placing them on finished articles, but that the then existing Government had changed this policy. Well, had not that hon. Minister again put duties on machinery and certain classes of raw material as well? He (the Finance Minister) went on to say that the duties on sugar, tea, tobacco, spirits and other commodities, largely used by the poor man would be reduced, and a discrimination made as against the rich; but he (Mr Casey) thought that those articles, spirits inclusive, would be as heavily taxed as by the late tariff, and that the poor man's tobacco was not going to be specially favoured at the expense of the cigars of the rich. The Finance Minister had further stated that, if he had been in Parliament at the time of Mr. Cartwright's tariff, he would have opposed the raising of the 15 per cent. list to 17½ per cent, and he had now raised the same articles to even a higher point. He had stated that the question was: How should they raise the necessary revenue and protect the industries of Canada at the same time? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tilley) answered that he was not going to raise, but only readjust the tariff; that, to raise required income, on certain articles the tariff would be raised, but in certain others it would be reduced. Now, he had carried out the promise of raising duties, but he (Mr. Casey) found very few articles on which reductions had been made. Despite these promises, the general burdens had been augmented. The farmers, in whom he felt specially interested, as they formed the bulk of his constituents, had seen the taxes increased on every article they used, while on those they produced, and which perhaps needed protection, none was granted. For instance, he had had great difficulty in persuading a farmer to vote for him, at the last election, the man stating that the Conservatives had promised a duty on walnut lumber, in which he was interested; but, after some argument, at last he consented on general, patriotic grounds, to risk his

MR. CASEY.

own interests, and vote for him. But now he found that walnut was left exactly where it was, though the manufacturers using it had received protection. There was compensation, however, it might be said, in the prospect that a great many more would be employed in furniture manufacturing, to the advantage of the country. But it had been stated that the hon. member for Centre Toronto had, since the elections, dismissed 70 workmen, and that the time of others had been reduced, another proof that neither the producers of black walnut, nor the workers in it, would benefit by this tariff. The hon. Premier, who inaugurated it, had brought on an interminable war of classes, set over their heads a shoddy aristocracy, and placed it in antagonism to the vast consuming body of the people who had nothing to protect. He would thus create constant trouble for his Government, and a corrupt lobby of interests pulling against each other to obtain a tariff to suit their own respective needs. He would ultimately encounter the fatal hostility of the masses who did not belong to that shoddy aristocracy. The bulk of the farmers, who would be specially aggrieved by this tariff, were a long-suffering class, but not as some seemed to think, a gullible class. He (Mr. Casey) admitted that they had been deceived into voting for this National Policy, but, when they found that the gentlemen whom they supported had not come within a long distance of performing their promises, they would begin to see where their true interests lay. Though long-suffering, the farmer was cool and shrewd, where his interests were concerned; and the next time he appeared at the ballot-box, it would be found that the voice of the country and its common sense, and injured interests, would all find expression more loudly than the voice of the rings that had followed the hon. the Minister of Finance, and had tried his patience ever since his Budget speech. He (Mr. Casey) believed that, when the contest upon the question of a revenue or a protective tariff was entered upon, time would set the Liberal party right, and he was ready to trust to time, which would justify their principles, and give an opportunity to the particular class to which he had

referred of expressing their judgment with regard to the shameful neglect of their interests.

MR. IVES said he entered upon the discussion of this great question, which had heretofore occupied the minds of the best speakers elsewhere, and had also been ably and exhaustively discussed in this House, with becoming humility, and he prayed that, in his first essay to address the House, it would grant the indulgence usually accorded to new members. It had been written of a celebrated General, who had lost a great battle, on account of great blunders, that he was in the habit, later in life, of visiting the scene of that battle, and, in his mind, of fighting it over again, and that, so often did he do it, that he finally persuaded himself that he lost it, not owing to his own blunders, but to the blunders his victorious opponent had made. It seemed to him that the hon. gentlemen on the south, sunny or shady side of this House, by going back to the discussion of the great principles on which this tariff rested, and by taking issue with hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to its principles, and assuming that they were right, and that their opponents and the country were wrong, were following the line of conduct that that General pursued, and trying to satisfy themselves that their policy was really right, and that of the hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side was wrong. He could easily understand why hon. gentlemen in Opposition should discuss the details of this tariff, and say that on this item there was too much Protection, and on that too little—that in this respect there was injustice, and in that a greater injustice; but he did not understand, after the verdict rendered by the country on the 17th September last, the propriety of protracting, day after day, the discussion as to the fundamental principles on which this tariff rested. As the hon. gentleman who had just resumed his seat (Mr. Casey) had discussed the circumstances which led to this change of policy, so, perhaps, the House would pardon him for treating the question from a similar standpoint. In order to arrive at a correct understanding of this question, it was necessary to keep in view several matters, namely, the posi-

tion of our manufacturing industries in the years 1873 and 1874, when the Americans recovered from the effects of their Civil War; the condition of our manufacturers at that time; the causes of the great depression which settled like a dark cloud over this country about that time, affecting not only manufacturers, but everyone else; and, on enquiry, whether the present tariff could be expected to furnish any remedy for this great depression. Now, what were the circumstances under which the manufacturers were placed during the years 1873 and 1874? The origin of our manufacturing industries was the state of things in the United States after the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, and after the great rise in prices in that country, which was occasioned by the Civil War. Prior to that time, we had been in the habit of importing nearly the whole of our manufactured goods, and, owing to the fact that the Reciprocity Treaty gave us a market in the United States for our natural products, we were able at that time to get on tolerably well, because the proceeds of our natural productions were sufficient to enable us to purchase our manufactured goods. But, when the treaty was abrogated, and when the war had taken an army of artisans and made of them an army of soldiers, when the premium upon gold rose to a fabulous figure, it became impossible for the Americans to manufacture goods at prices at which we could afford to buy, and it then became necessary for our people to look about to see whether it was not possible for them to make those goods for themselves. In 1873, when the Americans had recovered from the effects of the war, when the premium on gold had gone down, when the soldiers had returned to the workshops, and when prices had settled to a point lower than they were before the war, our manufactures were in their infancy, they had been only two or three years in existence, and were not, consequently, in a very flourishing condition. Men had gone into manufacturing enterprises without sufficient experience to begin with, without sufficient capital, and they employed labour not sufficiently skilled. The market to which they had access was limited, and the result was that, when they began to feel the pressure of Am-

erican competition, they were not in a good position to withstand it. But, in addition to these causes, there began to be felt about that time, by all classes of the community, the depression in trade which, unfortunately, had continued up to the present time. People did not agree as to the causes of this depression, but there were some which were perfectly apparent, and of which he would mention two or three in order to explain the effect which the present tariff was likely to have in remedying the evils from which the country was now suffering. One of the greatest of these causes was the over-importation of goods of all kinds during the years 1872, 1873, 1874, and 1875. By looking at the figures, they would find that, during those four years, the average importation into the Dominion of Canada was \$123,000,000 each year; while, during the four years previous to 1872, the average was only \$78,000,000. The average during the three years subsequent to 1875, was about \$95,000,000 per year; therefore the average for the four years before 1872, and the three years after 1875, was \$85,500,000 worth of importations each year. The excess of importations for the four years after 1872 over the average for the seven years mentioned, amounted to no less than \$140,000,000. Now, he was aware that many gentlemen, particularly those who professed Liberal principles, advocated the idea that the balance of trade against a country meant nothing, and they pointed to the fact that the balance of trade for several years had been largely against Great Britain, and they argued that it was no indication of an unhealthy state of things for Canada that, for several years past, the balance of trade had been largely against us. But they failed to note the fact that the circumstances of the two countries in this respect were very different. England was a creditor country, whereas Canada was a debtor country. England was constantly receiving from all parts of the world millions and millions of dollars as interest on bonds and debentures, which she held all over the world. These immense sums received every year, far in excess of the balance of trade against her, enabled her to pay this balance, and, at the same time, add to her wealth. Our condition, un-

MR. IVES.

fortunately, was very different. We were paying, every year, millions to foreign countries, as interest upon the bonds and debentures forming our public debt; we were also paying interest on Provincial debts, on city and municipal debts, and even on private debts. Gentlemen would be surprised if they knew the very large amount of English capital invested in mortgages in Canada, and the interest on which was annually sent out of the country. Therefore, as a debtor country, the balance of trade against us was a very serious thing. It might be said that, during those four years, the exports from the country were largely in excess of those for the following three years. It was true that there was a small excess in the average of the four years before, over that of the three years after. He found that the average exports, for the four years ending with 1871, amounted to \$72,000,000; and the average for the three years, ending with 1878, amounted to \$79,000,000; and during the four years commencing with 1872, they amounted to \$85,000,000 per year. During those four years that we imported so largely, there was an excess of imports over exports of \$152,000,000, or \$38,000,000 per year. He contended that a very large portion of that \$38,000,000 per year had to be provided for here, and sent out of the country each year, and that an equally large amount was also sent out as interest on Provincial, municipal and private debts, and on the receipts of our great railway corporations for traffic, freight, and passengers; because, everything that our railways earned, over and above working expenses, was sent out of the country to foreign bondholders. The natural result of this great excess of importations was to produce a scarcity of money, and he attributed to this, as a prime cause, the shrinkage in value of property of all kinds that had occurred since that time. It was a well-known fact, at least in the section of country from which he came, that a debt of \$500 to-day was as large as a debt of \$1,000 was in 1873. Why was this? Because money was more scarce, and a dollar now represented a much greater value than it did then. Hon. gentlemen would pardon him for mentioning that he considered the Insolvent Act, in its working

in this country, had been another cause of the business difficulties we had experienced for the last few years, and was an aggravation of the great depression, which, however, we should doubtless have felt without it. He believed the Act, in its destruction of business morality, and of business credit and confidence, had very seriously augmented the evils growing out of excessive importation. A third cause of the depression, and which affected particularly manufacturers, was the limited market which they had had, and the fact that they had been compelled to suffer undue competition from foreign manufacturers. The position of matters during the last few years, so far as our manufacturers were concerned, was this: They had often heard about the Chinese wall that excluded them from the United States; that Chinese wall not only excluded them from the States, but it practically excluded them from every other country. A manufacturing industry must creep before it could walk; in other words, it must become strongly secure at home before it could push its products into foreign countries. The undue competition and limited market from which our manufacturers had suffered had prevented them from gathering the necessary strength to be able to seek foreign markets, and to compete with the United States in foreign countries. He believed one of the chief advantages that might be hoped for from the tariff, would be that, while securing the market of Canada to our manufacturers, it would, in time, from the accumulated capital and experience which they would acquire, enable them to meet the Americans in the markets of Mexico, the West Indies, and South America. He could not see why our manufacturers should not be able to compete successfully in those countries. We could not admit that our manufacturers possessed less natural ability, less natural shrewdness, than the Americans, and assuredly we ought to be able to compete successfully with them in those markets, which were open to us as they were to them. The effect of all these causes he had enumerated had been to close our manufactories, one after another. Of course, he was speaking generally, because there were exceptions to the rule. The closing of these manufactories had thrown

upon the labour market hundreds of labourers who had vainly sought for work in Canada, and finally had left for foreign countries. That exodus had reacted upon the agriculturist, because it reduced the population who would have consumed his products. Now we found that, when this state of things began to be realised, or, in the language of his hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), when the storm burst, various schemes were proposed on both sides of the House, and in the country, to remedy it. He was prepared to give honour to whom it was due, and he was prepared to admit that many gentlemen, distinguished in the Liberal ranks, were among the first to advocate the adoption of the very policy which the present Government had brought down to the House. In the Province of Quebec, when the Parti National was organised, the leaders put into their platform, as one of its cardinal planks, Protection to home industries. They found, also, that the Hon. Mr. Joly, the present leader of that party in Quebec, in a speech that he made at the time of his appointment as its leader, dilated upon that point, and, in language far more eloquent than he could hope to use, advocated the adoption of a National Policy—using those very words “National Policy”—as a cure for the evil from which they were then beginning to suffer. This policy was then also advocated by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), before he obtained a seat in this House, and when he was in the Quebec Legislature. At that time he made a speech in which, in the most eloquent and forcible language, he advocated the adoption of the very policy which the Government had brought down. But not only in the Province of Quebec did they find that the Liberal leaders were looking into the future, and discussing a cure for this evil, but in Ontario, also, there were some among the Liberal leaders who were far-sighted enough to detect the real remedy—he referred to the hon. members for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and South Brant (Mr. Paterson)—who, in eloquent speeches, well received and well sustained, and which he had read at the time, advocated the adoption of this policy as the great cure for the evils from which we had begun to suffer. He was

not aware that they had made a proposition to the House on this question. He presumed, if they had changed their opinions in regard to the matter, they could give very good reasons for doing so. That was the state of the country during the last Session of the last Parliament. He must say he thought that, about that time, the leader of the Conservative party and his friends, were drifting into the adoption of this principle. They went into it, not hastily but with considerable reluctance. They found that leading newspapers, advocating Conservative principles, had taken ground in favour of that policy. He had in his mind now a newspaper published in his county (Richmond), which had adopted that policy two or three years before. In the last Session, the Conservative leaders had adopted it, and, strange to say, the Liberal leaders who had previously advocated it had dropped it as if it were a dangerous thing to touch. A vote was taken in the last House, upon the resolution proposed by the then leader of the Opposition, and that resolution was the battle ground in September last before the people. His hon. friend who had spoken last said that the people were always credulous, and that suffering humanity was always ready to listen to any remedies that might be proposed. He thought that the people of this country, in accepting the remedy proposed by the resolution of the hon. the leader of this House, had not exercised any great degree of credulity. The people had adopted a policy which was perfectly successful in every country in which it had ever been adopted. Were they credulous, when they looked across the border into the United States, and found the great degree of prosperity which they had there, and when they saw the leading thinkers in the country ascribe that prosperity, in a large degree, to the adoption of this policy of protecting home industries? They looked across the water to France, Germany and Russia, and they found every industry protected. And, therefore, he did not agree with the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), that the people of this Dominion on the 17th September last had exercised a great deal of credulity in accepting the policy proposed by the Conservative

MR. IVES.

party. Well, the people had declared in favour of this policy, and, although they heard a few days ago insinuations that the great National Policy was a long time in coming down, and the insinuation that, when it was brought down, it would be found to be "a great cry and little wool," yet, when it had been brought down, they had not heard one single voice raised to say that it was not a complete fulfilment of all the pledges made to the country. They heard them say, "You are wrong, the people are wrong, the policy is wrong," but nowhere did they find anyone able to declare that it was not what the people asked for, or what had been promised them. The next question was what advantages they expected to be derived from this tariff? He had already stated that over-importation was the most prolific cause of the depression. The great advantage which he expected from this tariff was that it would decrease the volume of importation, and tend to restore a proper balance between our imports and exports. It would not only do that, but it would, at the same time, keep up the revenue of the country, because there was now imposed upon articles that were hitherto considered raw materials, or natural productions, a tax which, in his opinion, would counterbalance the loss to be sustained by reason of the higher duties placed upon manufactured goods. Therefore, he thought that, while it would have the effect of decreasing the volume of imported goods, it would, at the same time, produce the necessary amount of revenue; and, if it did decrease the volume of the imports, it must, in the same degree, increase the quantity of goods manufactured in the country, and to such an extent it would furnish labour for those without work, and materially increase the consuming population. It would benefit the farmers who had any products to sell. Decreasing the volume of importation, besides tending to restore the balance between imports and exports, would also make money more plentiful, and, in that way, increase the value of moveable and immoveable property. More than that, it would give sufficient strength to our manufacturers to enable them to keep their own markets, and, in time, he trusted, to push outside in competition with other

countries in the sale of manufactured articles. He would like to consider some general objections which had been raised against this tariff. The first one which every speaker on the Opposition side of the House had alluded to was, that it would increase taxation. He conceived that was almost unfair objection. He asked hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, if they had been retained in power, if they would not have increased the taxation of this country. They dared not say they would have gone on another year and added to the deficits that had occurred during the past three or four years. They would not have dared to imperil the credit of the country by allowing another deficit to occur. And, if the hon. the Minister of Finance thought this tariff was calculated to produce only the amount of revenue necessary, then this tariff was not going to increase the taxation of the country unduly, because it merely increased it to such an extent as any party in power would have been obliged to increase it. He was glad to hear the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) say that if their party had been returned to power, they would have had to increase the taxation. The very objection was one which every speaker on that side of the House had made, namely, that it was unjust to discriminate in the tariff in favour of certain industries. One would imagine from the way this objection had been raised by every speaker on that side of the House, that this was the first time in the history of this country that any discrimination had been made in the tariff; but was it not a fact that in the last tariff they had a free list, a 5 per cent. list, a 10 per cent. list, a 17½ per cent. list, and a 25 per cent. list? Was it any more unjust, to-day, in the re-organisation of this tariff, to discriminate, than it was when the last tariff was formed? Surely not. There would be discrimination made in almost every country. It appeared to him to be a weak objection against this tariff, that it seemed to discriminate in favour of certain classes of industries. If that were unjust, upon what principle did they tax luxuries higher than necessities? There was no defence for taxing luxuries higher than necessities. If his neighbour saw fit to buy woollen goods, and he wished

to buy silk, that was no reason he should be taxed higher than his neighbour. The same argument which was used by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, to make out a case of injustice in discriminating in favour of certain industries in this tariff, could be used against taxing luxuries higher than necessities. They were told that this tariff was a system of legalised robbery. He thought they did not propose, in this tariff, to do any robbery that would not redound to the advantage of the country, as a whole. This tariff was supposed to be a tariff of equivalents, a tariff in which certain advantages were to be reaped in one section of the country, by one class of the community, and certain other advantages by other sections and classes, and if the hon. the Finance Minister had attained these results, then there was no injustice in the tariff. But he would refer for one moment to another point. He would ask if there was not the same injustice to various sections of the country in spending public money, in building Government railways, deepening harbours, erecting lighthouses and improving canals? For instance, he lived in the Eastern Townships; what direct advantages could be derived by them in the building of the Intercolonial Railway, or from the building of lighthouses in the lower St. Lawrence? The people there were not fishermen or mariners, and did not need lighthouses. It made no difference to them whether the water was twenty or twenty-two feet on the flats of Lake St. Peter, but they were glad to see all these improvements, as they were in the interests of the general public. There was in that, if this reasoning were adopted, the same injustice that there was in discriminating in this tariff against certain sections for the good of the whole of the country. It could be defended on another ground, that was because it was necessary in the public interest. If they were in a state of war and the General commanding ordered the farmers to furnish means of transport, that would be justified by the public interest. Although they were not at war, the condition of the country was sufficiently serious to justify the Government controlling the destinies of this country in adopting any measure

which would bring relief. The next objection was that this tariff would create monopolies, and the hon. member for West Elgin said it would enhance the prices of manufactured goods. He would leave that to be answered by the hon. the late Minister of Finance, who had told them the other night that the tendency of the tariff would be to foster unhealthy competition amongst manufacturers; that there would be too many manufactured goods, and that the result would be that the prices would fall. If that were a fact, this tariff could not possibly be expected to increase the price of manufactured goods to the consumers of this country. He pointed, for instance, to the United States, where goods now were actually cheaper than they had formerly been able to make them. How was it that the Americans were able to send goods into this country and undersell our own manufacturers? It was not a fact that a protective tariff necessarily enhanced the prices of manufactured goods; but it did keep our own market for our own people, and that was what was proposed by this tariff. They were told that amongst the manufacturers in the United States a great deal of depression existed, in the face of the fact that they had paid hundreds of millions of dollars of their national debt, and that they had been pushing railway enterprises in every direction; and, notwithstanding the great general prosperity in that country, they were in the very unfortunate position of suffering from a depression of trade. He was free to admit that there had been over-production of manufactured goods in some branches there; but there was this difference between their depression and ours, that their depression was that of men who had eaten too much and overgorged themselves, whilst ours was of men half-famished. He thought our manufacturers would be glad for a little change for the luxury of over-production. Another objection was raised. It was said that this tariff would annoy the United States, and that it would be impossible for us ever to get reciprocity. He would ask what consideration they had ever received from the United States, which would induce them to consider American interests rather than their own in the formation of this tariff. It was a well-

known fact that, in the Reciprocity Treaty, the United States had the balance of the advantages. It was also true that when it suited their pleasure they abrogated it. It was true that, notwithstanding that our public men had met their commercial views at Boards of Trade, and other places, and advocated a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, notwithstanding that our Government had sent ambassadors almost begging a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, they had constantly refused. We never could get a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty so long as we gave the United States their own way, as we had done during the last few years. He could tell the hon. gentleman that he knew the character of the Americans, and if there was any one thing which would gain for us their respect, it was by framing a tariff which would serve our interests instead of theirs. There was nothing we could do which would be more likely to bring about a renewal of reciprocity than taking a stand upon a tariff which might be carried out in the interests of the Canadian people. They were told that this tariff would be received in an unfriendly manner by the Home Government. They were told that this tariff would be disastrous, and bring about a dissolution of the connection between this country and the Mother Country. He did not believe that. He did not believe that the feeling which the English people had for us was so mercenary as to be affected by a tariff framed in our own interests without discriminating against them. He believed that the feeling of loyalty which the people of this country entertained with regard to the people of Great Britain rested upon a safer foundation than the mere fact that they protected us and took care of us; and he believed that the English Government would be willing that Canada should change her fiscal policy in her own interest. If Canada did not do something in this direction, they could tell the English people that this country would not be worth having very much longer. He held that without this tariff the trade between the Canadian purchaser and the English merchant would dwindle down to nothing, and not be worth having. So much with regard to the general ob-

jections. He would only refer in detail to one matter, and that was the duty on flour. Until he had heard the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), he had been in some trouble with reference to the duty of 50c. per barrel on flour, from the fact that a large part of his constituency would have to buy flour for several years to come. But, when the member for West Elgin said that this would be no advantage to the farmer, as far as increasing the price of flour and wheat went, he was greatly reassured. He found in this tariff very great advantages for the people he had the honour to represent. They were very much interested in the growth and fostering of manufacturing industries. He believed this tariff would quadruple the number of manufactures in the Eastern Townships within the next four or five years. They were interested in the increase of the labour market and the bringing about a greater plentifulness of money. He could only state that, if the remark of the hon. member for West Elgin should turn out to be wrong, and that the price of flour should be increased by this tariff, he and his constituents were prepared to stand by it. They looked upon the whole policy as a wise one. He believed that everyone returned to vote for the National Policy should sustain it as a whole, notwithstanding that some of its features might not be as acceptable to him as he might desire. There was another reason why the people of the Province of Quebec should be willing to pay this flour tax. They were told, the other night, by the late Finance Minister, that the cause of these deficits was from the fact that the Dominion had assumed the debt of the Province of Quebec; and they were told that, had it not been for that, there would have been no necessity for more taxation—for this tax on flour. Then, if that were true, if the Dominion had not assumed the debt of the Province of Quebec, that Province would have been unable to build the new railroads which had been built, and two of which ran through the counties he represented. He could fearlessly say to his constituency, the Dominion assumed the debt of the Province of Quebec; that, without this, the subsidies to these railways could not have been given; that, without these subsidies, they would not

have been able to build these railroads; and now, in paying 50c. per barrel, they were paying for these railroads, which were rapidly developing the country.

MR. OLIVER said, before this very important subject was disposed of, it became his duty to make a few remarks upon it. It was not his intention on the present occasion to discuss the subject generally, but to take up certain points. Before he did so, however, he would like to refer to one or two remarks which had fallen from the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat. The last remark he made with reference to the trade of this country, was that, unless the tariff was passed, as it was then before the House, the trade of the country would not be worth anything at all to England. What was the object of passing the tariff? They had heard it repeated on every stump in the country that the object of the tariff was to enable us to manufacture all the goods we consumed and not import any from England. Consequently, the very passing of this Tariff Bill would be the destruction of the importation of manufactured goods from England, which was at the present time flowing into this market. The next statement made by the last speaker was that our depression was one of starvation, and that the depression in the United States was one of surfeit. The hon. gentleman commenced his remarks by stating that the cause of the depression in this country was over-importation, and he gave the House figures with reference to the importation of goods since Confederation took place. Now, the depression in the United States arose from the over-manufacturing of goods, and our depression, according to his statement, arose from an over-importation. He next argued, as a justification for certain industries not being protected, and others being protected, that it was upon the same principle that our public works were constructed. The importance of navigation to our country and of building of railroads and light-houses was felt by every man in this country. Would he state that the erection of these public works had not been of advantage in every section of the country? What was the state of the people of Western Canada before naviga-

tion was improved, and before the construction of the St. Lawrence canals and the railroads? It was one of starvation. They remained there, but could scarcely live. Since the construction of these public works the productions of the country realised more, because they were transported to the seaboard at a much reduced cost, and the importations were brought to the doors of the consumers at an infinitely cheaper rate. Every man in Canada, whether producer or consumer, was deeply interested in the construction and completion of the great public works of the country. They had been told by the hon. the Finance Minister that afternoon that he was going to move the House into Committee again, to make certain changes in the tariff he had brought down. They knew that throughout the length and breadth of the country, during the late campaign, there was no more fierce charge brought against the late Finance Minister than that he changed his propositions after having brought them down to the House. Now, his hon. friend the Finance Minister was going to do that for which the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) had been condemned. He had not brought down his resolutions perfect by any means. He supposed he was going to pursue the same course that was pursued on a former occasion, when the whole tariff brought down was changed in the course of two hours. If it was just to censure the late Minister for having changed his propositions, was it fair or just for the present Finance Minister to follow the same course? His hon. friend who had just taken his seat had stated that the result of the elections of the 17th of September settled the whole question as to Protection *versus* Revenue-tariff—that it was not worth while or fair to discuss the principles upon which this tariff was based. He knew he was a legal gentleman; he knew there were a great many legal gentlemen in the House, and, if they would search the Tariff Bill, and point out one correct principle upon which it was based, then he would say the hon. gentleman was correct. There was not a single correct principle in the whole Bill upon which the resolutions were based. He maintained that they had a perfect right; and he would tell

MR. OLIVER.

them in confidence that the electors of county he represented did not decide the question in this direction on the 17th of September. He would tell them in confidence that they decided by a majority that would count equal to some twenty on the other side of the House against the principle they were now considering. He had a large majority at his election, and he held that the people of North Oxford were just as intelligent as the people of the county the hon. the Finance Minister represented. They decided against this tariff and in favour of a revenue tariff by a handsome majority. So far as he was concerned, he had a perfect right to discuss this subject, and to endeavour to prevent the putting upon the Statute-book a wrong principle which it might take twenty years to remove. The hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat had made some remarks with regard to the balance of trade, but he would leave that subject, and take it up again before he closed his remarks. He had listened with astonishment to the hon. the Minister of Finance, who expressed the same view. He could understand hon. gentlemen who did not know the first principle that governed commercial transactions. He spoke of legal gentlemen on both sides of the House, and he would say to them that, if they looked at the balance of trade in their ledgers, they would find it to be largely in their favour. He was amused at the hon. the Finance Minister expressing the same idea. He would not, however, interfere with that subject until a later period of his remarks. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson), in discussing that subject, pictured the sunshine on that side of the House. He (Mr. Oliver), sitting there in the gloom, looked across the floor of the House, and noticed one gentleman, who represented perhaps the largest commercial constituency in the Province of Ontario. He saw him sit there with evident anxiety pictured on his face, until a certain article was mentioned, which received 35 per cent. protection. Then his whole countenance changed, and, in place of the anxious expression there, there was one of pleasure, and he could scarcely contain himself. He did not contain himself in the House. He went into the corridors to enjoy himself; but, after he received the letters

and telegrams which came in from different parts of the country he apprehended that the Finance Minister was not now in such a pleasant mood as when he came down with the propositions they were then considering. He apprehended the sunshine was being removed; and, as the gloom settled on that side of the House, the sun would begin to rise on the Opposition side. A good deal of weight of late had been laid upon the fact that the Americans were more prosperous than we. That might be or it might not be. The people of the United States said such was not the case. If they look up the sayings of important men on the other side of the line, they would find it said that the commercial condition of that country was, a very short time ago, most deplorable. There was one thing which he thought showed the condition of commercial transactions on the other side, and that was that they were investing millions in Government bonds in New York at four per cent. Now, supposing the Canadian Government were to issue bonds for the people of this country to purchase, could they get a single bond sold at four per cent. interest? No, the money was being invested in manufacturing institutions in this country, and in other ways, at higher rates. The money in the United States could not be invested at a reasonable profit, and the result was that the people were taking advantage of the sale of four per cent. bonds. Then it was argued that the Americans had paid off millions of their debt, but how had they paid it, was it by revenue arising from importations? No, the Customs duties were less to-day than they were when the debt was contracted. Consequently, it must be from internal revenue. It was no sign of prosperity that they had paid off an enormous debt. Had not the people been taxed by the Government for the payment of that debt? Canadians need not be ashamed to make a comparison between the export trade of their country with the export trade of the United States. The exports of the products of the mines from Canada was \$1.02 per head of the population, against \$1.36 from the United States; fisheries, Canada, \$1.50 per head, United States, 90c.; forests, Canada, \$5.50

per head, United States, 35c.; animals of every description, from Canada, the export per capita was \$3.70, from the United States, \$3.16; agricultural products from Canada, \$5.78 per capita, from the United States \$3.56; manufactured goods from Canada, \$1.60 per capita, from the United States, \$1.79. The total export from Canada was \$19.10 per capita; from the United States, \$10.32 per capita. So that we need not at all feel ashamed to compare the trade and manufacturing industries of Canada with those of the United States. He would give a little incident which occurred last fall, to show how the state of the people in this country compared with that of the people in the United States. During the harvest months in the Western States, the farmers had to protect themselves against people who endeavoured to destroy their agricultural implements in order to secure work, while in Canada the farmers were then offering \$2 to \$2.50 per day to people to gather the crops. This proved that the state of the American people was then not so favourable as that of the Canadian people. A great deal had been said about the exports manufactured in the United States. What did they amount to? Something about \$75,000,000 a year for a population of 45,000,000. It was said that the manufactures of the United States were flooding the whole civilised world. There were but \$75,000,000 worth of manufactured goods exported from the United States, and it was preposterous to say that this amount of exports was flooding the markets of England, Germany, and of all the countries of the world. The exports of England to the United States alone, last year, were ten millions more than the entire exports of the United States. Still, these gentlemen were patriotic enough to compare the traffic of England with that of the United States, always to the advantage of the latter. In cottons alone, the whole of the export trade of the United States, the year before last, was \$10,500,000 worth, while the export of cotton from Great Britain amounted to \$211,000,000, conclusively proving that the trade of the United States should not be compared with that of England or Canada. If there was one thing, above

all others, which we should frown down, it was this eternal comparison between Canada and the United States, to the disadvantage of our own country. The right hon. the Premier and his followers, during the last election campaign, and during this Session, had done more to promote emigration to the United States than all the emigration agents of the United States combined. What conclusion could an intending emigrant from the Old Country come to, on taking up the speeches delivered during the campaign and in this House since it met? Here were the leader of this Government and his prominent supporters lauding the resources of the United States, and decrying the condition of Canada, so that intending emigrants would conclude that Canada was not a fit place to go to, compared with the United States, and they would go to the latter. Those speeches had done more harm than was imagined. We required millions of people to take possession of our country, and the result of these speeches would be that emigration from foreign countries would go to the United States. The next comparison, at which he was rather amazed, was the statement of the Finance Minister, in respect to the revenue, that we were going to make the people of the United States pay two million dollars more under this tariff. Had it been the hon. gentleman who had preceded him, or legal gentlemen, who were not supposed to know much about commercial transactions, who made this statement, he would not have noticed it.

MR. TILLEY: I made no such statement. I said the two million dollars we asked for would come largely out of the imports from the United States.

MR. OLIVER said, as in duty bound, he stood corrected, but the remarks of the Finance Minister, as printed in the *Hunsard*, were not exactly what he now stated them to be. However, if he did not say so, two thirds of his supporters had said so at the elections. He was glad to see the Finance Minister rise to repudiate the statements of his supporters, that he had the courage to say that these gentlemen, who were elected through telling the people that the United States would pay the duties on the goods imported into this country, were wrong, and

deceived the people. This was one promise which hon. gentlemen opposite made which the country would not realise. He had read a speech delivered here last Session by an hon. gentleman whom he was very glad to see here, since a Conservative was elected, in which he stated that the Americans would pay all the duties on goods coming into this country. That statement was not more absurd than this which was made by hundreds of gentlemen throughout the country. He would ask the hon. gentleman who had made those statements if the price of corn had fallen in the Chicago markets since this duty was imposed. There was a test of the whole thing. It was reported in the *Globe*, and other papers, that an hon. gentleman in this House had refused to fulfil an engagement into which he had entered because he would have to pay the duty. This was proof positive that the Americans would not pay the duty, but that every cent levied on these goods which we were in the habit of purchasing from the United States would be paid by ourselves. In order to fulfil the pledges hon. gentlemen opposite had made, they would have to show the people of Canada that corn in the Chicago market had fallen seven and a half cents per bushel. That was practically what they told, that the price of oats had fallen in the western market, and that the price of every class of goods imported into this country had fallen in the foreign markets. It was a false argument that was used at the last elections, and the people, not having any great knowledge of political economy, were carried away by the cry that the people of the United States would have to pay the duty. He need not dwell upon this subject. It was such an absurd one that now, at all events, when the application of this principle of the tariff took place, they would all realise, to their cost, that they paid the duty, and not the Americans. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) the other evening, and the hon. gentleman who sat down lately, used the same argument, that manufacturing institutions could not compete in a foreign market unless they were nursed at home; that England had protected her manufacturing industries until they were able to compete in the markets of the world with those of foreign countries. Would it not

be reasonable to suppose, that if the duties of England had raised her manufacturing establishments to their present state of perfection, similar duties in Canada would produce the same result? What were the duties imposed in England at the time her manufacturing establishments were made perfect, so as to enable them to compete with the establishments of other countries? They were, on metal, 15 per cent., leather 15 per cent., cotton 10 per cent., woollens 15 per cent., earthenware 10 per cent. Our old duty was 17½ per cent. He held that, if the English manufacturing establishments were brought to that state of perfection under a tariff from 10 to 15 per cent., Canadian manufacturing institutions should also become perfected under a protection of 17½ per cent. We could see the benefit that arose in England from the removal of those duties. Take the very articles he had mentioned:—In 1843, under the protective system, the export of cottons was £13,900,000; in 1875, after a period of Free-trade, it was £58,600,000 sterling. Leather under Protection, the export was £401,000 sterling; after a period of Free-trade, £3,019,000. Linens, under Protection, £2,356,000 sterling; under Free-trade, £7,272,000 sterling. Woollens, under Protection, the export amounted to £5,185,000 sterling; under Free-trade, it reached £21,000,000, sterling. Earthenware, under Protection, £555,000; under Free-trade, £1,900,000. And the export of metal, from £4,000,000, under Protection, rose to £39,000,000, under Free-trade. This proved that the commercial and manufacturing interests developed more rapidly under Free-trade than under Protection.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILL.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No 23) To incorporate the Gazette Printing Company.—(Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre.)

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the debate on the Customs and Excise Resolutions.

MR. OLIVER said, before entering upon his next argument, he wished to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that he was reported in the Government organ in the same way as he (Mr. Oliver) had stated this afternoon. The report of his speech in the *Mail* stated: "We propose to collect a larger amount of the two million dollars out of our American neighbours than we do out of England." The language conveyed that meaning to him, that not only would the American people pay the heavy duties on the goods imported into this country, but the English people also, on those brought in from England. The hon. the Finance Minister was so reported in the American Press also. The extracts he (Mr. Oliver) had read from that Press showed they understood the Finance Minister had stated that. However, he was very glad the hon. gentleman now stated he had been misunderstood. He hoped that the hon. gentleman would instruct the organs of the Government that the Americans and the English people did not pay the duties imposed, but the Canadian people. He thought it was due to the people of this country, in the various constituencies where hon. gentlemen opposite had advanced this doctrine, and succeeded by means of it, to undeceive them—to tell them that they had deceived them on this point. He did not think they would have tried to do so, for he believed that, before it was possible for those hon. gentlemen to reach home, the people of those various constituencies would ascertain that they, and not the people of the United States, paid the duties. The next reason given for the adoption of this tariff was that it would equalise the purchase and sale of goods by the country, or do away with the balance of trade. When he heard that statement from the Finance Minister, he wondered whether the balance of trade was against Canada during her prosperous years or not; but he found, upon examination, that, when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Customs, in 1871 and 1872, that balance, for a number of years, against Canada, was \$35,000,000. Now, the country was more prosperous during that time than since, when it had averaged \$24,000,000. What did that prove?

In his opinion, that the purchasing power of the people had decreased, and that, when the country was prosperous, the balance was sure to be largely against us. Let them take the United States. During the last twenty-three years there were seventeen of great prosperity, when the balance was largely against the Republic, while, during the depression, it had turned in its favour. With respect to France, during 1868 and 1869, just before the Franco-Prussian war, when the country was highly prosperous, the balance of trade against her was £24,000,000 sterling; but, in 1872 and 1873, immediately after that war, when France had not recovered from the struggle, the balance in her favour was £18,500,000 sterling, and in 1876-77, when she had fully recovered from the effects of that war, the balance of trade against her was £27,400,000 sterling. He thought these figures conclusively proved that, when a country was prosperous, the balance of trade would be largely against her. Take the Australian colonies again, which were said to be the richest possessions of Great Britain, and whose credit stood higher in the English market than that of any others, and the balance against them would be found very large. He was not astonished at the hon. members for Richmond and Wolfe and Essex (Messrs. Ives and Patterson) saying that the balance of trade against a country was an indication that it was not prosperous, but he was amazed to hear the same doctrine preached by the Finance Minister. Let them take an example or two to see how it worked: A vessel sailed from Halifax, say, to the whale fishing grounds; she was cleared without any entry in the trade and navigation returns. There was nothing sold in consequence of her departure; she returned from the fisheries with a cargo representing \$10,000 in value, whereupon an entry would be made of that amount of whale oil as an importation. According to the logic of hon. gentlemen opposite, the country would be poorer by the introduction of the oil to the value of that amount. If that doctrine was true, the country would be the poorer by those \$10,000 than if the vessel had not cleared from Halifax. Take another illustra-

tion: A vessel that sailed from Halifax had \$50,000 worth of wheat on board; she was bound for the Liverpool market; she was stranded on shore, the whole of that wheat going to the bottom of the ocean. They had sold that wheat, but there was no purchase of goods in return to correspond with it; consequently, they were \$50,000 richer than if that vessel had not gone to the bottom. He thought there could be nothing more fallacious than the argument that the balance of trade against a country was an evidence of its want of prosperity. The next argument he would notice had been dwelt upon largely this afternoon, namely, that this tariff was designed to prevent the Americans from competing with Canadian manufacturers, to destroy the slaughtering of American goods in the Canadian markets, which had been going on for a number of years. What proportion of those goods did they receive from the United States that were consumed by the people of this country? He saw by the Trade and Navigation Returns that, deducting tea and sugar, they received from the United States \$13,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, which came into competition with \$335,000,000 worth of manufactures yearly consumed by the people of Canada—or a very small proportion of that aggregate. It was seven dollars' worth of American goods competing with \$100 worth consumed here. Was that anything to complain of, or did it destroy Canadian trade? Take agricultural implements, an industry which was one of those described as partially destroyed or crippled by American competition. Canadians consumed about \$3,000,000 worth of them, the importations from the United States reaching about \$19,000, or sixty-three cents in every \$100, and they had to impose a duty of 25 per cent. on those implements for the purpose of excluding from these markets that small foreign proportion. Of boots and shoes, they consumed \$18,000,000 worth, and imported but \$207,000 worth from the United States, representing \$1 for every \$100. Brooms and brushes, importation, \$32,000; total consumption, \$750,000, or \$3 in every \$100. Of furniture, imports, \$380,000; total consumption, \$6,200,000, or \$6 to every \$100, and, in order to exclude that small

MR. OLIVER.

proportion of American production from Canada, they had to give their manufacturer about $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more protection than before. Sewing machines, total consumption, \$1,500,000; imported from the United States, \$71,000, or \$5 in every \$100. Now, he believed that the percentage of American goods brought into this country and sold here, could not possibly be any great injury to the manufacturing establishments of our country. It was said by his hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe that the depression arose from the many failures throughout the country, and, if they looked at the question honestly and fairly, they would find that the goods slaughtered had come from Great Britain as well as the United States. The fact was that there were many failures last year, the stocks connected with which realised \$24,000,000 less than they were purchased for, and competed with the regular trade in this country. This was a great injury to that trade, no doubt, but he denied *in toto* that the slaughtering resulted from the importation of \$13,000,000 of American goods, believing it was due to the number of failures throughout the land. The next statement in favour of the tariff was that it put all parties on the same footing, that all would realise from it equal benefits. This was the promise made the people during the contest last summer and fall; but a close examination of the tariff resolutions would demonstrate the fact that the manufacturing institutions were not all placed on the same footing, and that the great consuming public, or poorer classes, would stand on a different footing from the rich. For instance, furniture was protected by 35 per cent., and the lumber of which it was made was admitted free; woollen goods were protected by 30 to 35 per cent., and wool admitted free; cotton goods, by 35 to 45 per cent., and raw cotton free. He had seen it stated in the public press that, in Montreal, there was the largest cotton manufactory in the Dominion, and that it had been in the habit of declaring a dividend of 10 per cent. on the stock, but that, this year, it would pay 15 per cent., and set a large amount besides to the rest account. Now, he submitted that an institution of that kind was sufficiently protected without this tariff, by the old

rate. Brooms were protected by 25 per cent., while broom corn was admitted free; leather manufactures by 25 per cent., and hides and pelts free. How did those institutions compare with other manufacturing establishments? Carriage manufactures were protected by 25 per cent., and all their materials were also taxed, except wood. Locomotives and cars had 25 per cent. protection, and the raw materials also taxed. Iron work of all kinds was protected, and the raw material carried a heavy duty. Stone and marble manufactures were protected by 25 per cent., and the raw material taxed 10 to 20 per cent. Why was the raw material admitted free for one class of manufactures and taxed in another? The Government ought to explain this anomaly. Here was another discrepancy: coal was taxed 50c. per ton, for protection; now, it was promised, during the elections, that all the mining industries should be protected. Why, then, were the Goderich salt mines not put on the same footing as the coal mines of Nova Scotia? The Goderich salt miners would receive a little bonus, in the shape of a market for 6,600 barrels more per annum than they enjoyed hitherto, by the exclusion of that quantity from the States, but they would sustain injury in consequence of vessels coming to Goderich and Kincardine, with heavy loads of produce, and going back with a mere trifle of freight, which would more than balance that advantage to them. Why had the coal miners received so much more advantage? Was it because they had been more persistent in dealing with the Government than the owners of the salt mines of the west? He would now come to that class of goods consumed by the working people, and those goods taken by the more fortunate and wealthy. Furniture enjoyed a protection of 35 per cent., and paintings, drawings and carvings but 20 per cent.; so that the wealthy man could furnish his drawing-room with all sorts of expensive paintings and drawings, on paying only 20 per cent., while the workingman could not buy a single article of furniture for his house without paying 35 per cent. Hair-oils, tooth and other powders, and pomatums, besides all the perfumeries, would be taxed only 30 per cent. They found

that waggons and wheel-barrow were taxed 25 per cent., while jewellery and gold watches were only taxed 20 per cent. They found that mowing machines and agricultural implements of all kinds were taxed 25 per cent.; also, that the articles of shawls and hosiery were taxed 40 per cent., while dressed and expensive furs, worn by the more wealthy people, were taxed only from 15 to 25 per cent. They found earthenware was taxed 25 per cent., and china and porcelain only 20 per cent. They found that cottons were taxed from 30 to 40 per cent., woollens from 30 to 40, flannels from 35 to 40, blankets as high as 40, and tweeds from 35 to 40; while silk velvets and all manufactures of silk, or of which silk formed a component part, or was of chief value, were taxed only 30 per cent. They found, also, that ostrich feathers, undressed, were taxed 15 per cent., and the dressed 25. He thought he had shown, by the figures he had quoted, that a great many industries were not put on the same footing as other industries. He had shown, by the figures, that those articles used by the poorer classes were taxed very much higher than those used by the more wealthy classes of the people of this country. He believed the true policy should be to tax the luxuries, which the people could do without, while the necessities of life should be admitted as free as possible. They found, moreover, that all the manufacturing industries were protected to a certain extent, but there was one class of the people of this country which was not protected, and that class was the workingmen. It had been stated on every stump, and on every public occasion, by the supporters of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, that the workingman would be benefitted by the introduction and passage of a tariff like the present. Would all these promises be fulfilled? He held it was impossible for the Government to fulfil all these promises. His hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) had remarked that the workingmen should be protected as well as the manufacturers. And labour ought to be protected; it was lower to-day than it was last year. He noticed in one of the Government organs of this city a report that in one of the towns in his county there were two manufactories, one of leather and one of agricultural im-

plements, both of which had reduced the wages of their labourers. The head of one establishment was a Conservative, and the head of the other was a Reformer. In one establishment the workmen had struck in consequence of the reduction of wages, while in the other they were still going on. Did not this prove that the value of labour was less now than it was some six or eight months ago? They also found that, notwithstanding that 35 per cent. protection had been given to furniture manufacturers, a furniture manufacturer in Toronto had, according to report, dismissed some seventy hands lately, and the others were working only part time. Now, this proved that it was a fallacious doctrine that was preached in Toronto, when it was said that the workingmen would be benefitted by the adoption of this tariff. If they should see that large establishment in Toronto taking on new hands and increasing the pay of its workmen, it would be evidence that the Government had kept faith with the people of this country. But it was impossible to do this unless the suggestion of his hon. friend from West Elgin was carried out; in order to make the tariff logical, in order to make it at all consistent, the workingmen should be taken into consideration. He saw by the report of the Immigration Committee that every immigrant brought into this country was valued at \$1,000; in the United States the same valuation of \$1,000 was put upon each immigrant. Now, why should not the labouring man be protected as well as furniture? Labour was the workingman's capital, and yet labouring men were brought into this country to compete with the native workman without any protection being accorded to the latter. Why should not every immigrant be taxed at the rate of 35 per cent.? He held that, in order to make this tariff logical, in order to carry out the pledges that the supporters of the Government had made to the people of this country, they ought to adopt the suggestion of his hon. friend from West Elgin. Look across the Rocky Mountains to the constituency represented by the hon. leader of the Government; from day to day came representations from that important colony, declaring that Chinese cheap labour was destroying

the labour market of that country, and demanding protection for the native workingmen. It was said that the adoption of this tariff would create a home market for the consumption of the agricultural products of the country, and that a home market would be better than a foreign one. This was the doctrine preached by the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, was this expectation going to be realised by the farmers? What were the facts with reference to the United States ever since they had Protection? The natural products the country exported had gone on increasing, and it would be the same here. Look at that great country that we were endeavouring to settle at the present time. Could we ever manufacture as many goods in this country as would employ men enough to consume the whole of the agricultural products of this country? The same arguments had been preached to the farmers in the United States as were preached in Canada, but they had proved fallacious in the United States, and would prove fallacious in Canada. It was said that the tariff would increase the exportation of the natural products of the country, but this was another mistake, because, if vessels could not bring pig iron and coal into our ports from foreign countries, they would certainly not carry any of our natural products away, since the policy was to stop the importation of those articles into this country. But the most fallacious argument of all was that the tariff would not increase the price of goods manufactured in this country and imported. Why, the people had already realised that it would increase the prices of the articles they were consuming. Could it be supposed that any merchant in any country would sell his goods for less than the same articles would cost if imported? Another matter he would refer to: Last year we imported cotton goods to the amount of \$6,890,000, and there was now an increase of duty of about 30 per cent. on that class of goods; he supposed that we would continue to consume the same value of those goods as we had done in the past. If we did not import the same value of these goods as in the past, the argument would still hold good, because the increased price of the articles manufactured in this country would

correspond with that of the articles imported. They found that 30 per cent. on cotton imported amounted to \$2,067,000. Of earthenware goods we imported \$432,000, on which an increased duty of 12½ per cent. would amount to \$54,000; hosiery, \$456,000, increase of duty 22 per cent., increase of cost \$28,250; blankets, \$226,000, increase of duty 12½ per cent., increased cost \$28,250; carpets, \$663,000, increase of duty 12½ per cent., increased cost, \$82,300; flannels, \$372,000, increase of duty, 30 per cent., increased cost, \$112,600; tweeds, \$93,000, increase of duty 22 per cent., increased cost \$205,000. Most other articles showed a similar increase in the cost to the consumer, if we imported them, and if we did not import them the same articles manufactured at home would be kept up to the prices of the imported articles. Then the article of tea was increased in price at the rate of 10 per cent., by excluding the American merchants, because the specific and *ad valorem* duties amounted to the same as before the change took place. The *ad valorem* duty of 10 per cent., discriminating against tea imported from the United States, would throw the whole tea trade into the hands of, perhaps, a dozen merchants in the Dominion of Canada, and these merchants would be able to raise the price of tea by 10 per cent., so he held that tea was raised in price 10 per cent. in consequence of the duty, which would be an increase of \$360,000 per year to the tea drinkers of this country. Now, where did this money go to? It would not go into the Public Treasury, because tea would not be imported from the United States, but it would go into the pockets of a few merchants in Canada. Next, he came to the article of sugar. He had seen a beautiful map, showing from what countries our sugar was derived, but he thought the consumers of that article would be far more interested in seeing a map showing the rise and fall of sugar for the last eight or ten years. No matter where the sugar was raised, the great question with the consuming population was where they could get their sugar the cheapest. Now, they found that the finer sugars were raised from 45 to 54 per cent., an increase of

9 or 10 per cent., and this would increase the price of sugar by 1c. per pound in the Canadian market. The duty on refined sugar coming into this country would throw the whole trade into the hands of one refining establishment in Halifax, one in the city of St. John, which was to be built, and one in the city of Montreal. These three establishments would drain from the consuming population of this country \$1,000,000 more than they were paying now. We consumed of this article about 100,000,000 pounds per year, and an increase of 1c. per pound on this quantity would make a difference of \$1,000,000 a year, which would go into the pockets of the refiners. Now, if this vast sum was going into the Public Treasury, to be spent for the benefit of the whole people, he would not complain, nor would the people complain; but, when they found that this \$1,000,000 was going into the pockets of a few individuals, they would tell the Government, in unmistakable terms, that the tariff did not suit them. They found an increase upon coal also. There were now about 900,000 tons imported into this country. Upon that we would pay \$450,000 and the greater percentage would come out of the consuming population of the Province of Ontario. And why? To give protection to a few coal-owners in the Province of Nova Scotia. It would be infinitely cheaper for the people of this country if they were to give them a bonus of 50c. or 75c. upon every ton of coal they exported. Although he did not advocate giving bonuses, it would be cheaper to the people to give them that bonus than to pay a duty of 50 c. per ton. Now, as to Indian corn. During the last five years, we imported a yearly average of 2,665,000 bushels, which entered into consumption. There is a duty of 7½c. per bushel put upon that. The hon. the Finance Minister had stated that it would increase the price of corn. He had repudiated the fallacious doctrine that the people of the United States paid the duty, and he (Mr. Oliver) gave him credit therefor.

MR. TILLEY: No; I did not say that.

MR. OLIVER said he hoped that the hon. the Finance Minister was not

MR. OLIVER.

going to take it back. He (Mr. Tilley) had been so reported, both by the American and Canadian press. We would have to pay \$198,000 a year more for Indian corn than if it came in under the old duty. He thought he had said enough in reference to the increase of prices, but there was just one letter he was favoured with from an agricultural implement manufacturer, which showed the increase of the price of raw material used in his factory, as follows:—Steel rake teeth \$6,600, old duty \$1,150, new duty \$1,980, increase \$825; bolts and nuts \$1,800, old duty \$315, new duty \$540, increase \$225; knives and sections \$3,000, old duty \$525, new duty \$900, increase \$375; steel unmanufactured \$1,500, old duty nil, new duty \$150, increase \$150; pig iron, 350 tons, old duty nil, new duty \$700, increase \$700; bar iron, 200 tons, \$7,000, old duty \$350, new duty \$1,225, increase \$875; varnish, 400 gals., \$500, old duty \$87, new duty \$180, increase \$93; coal, 400 tons, old duty nil, new duty \$200, increase \$200; sundries \$3,000, old duty \$300, new duty \$600, increase \$300; showing the increased cost in one factory alone, of raw material, to be \$3,743. If he were disposed to follow the argument that the imposition of duties would increase the cost, he had only to take the statements of the leader of the Government in 1876, when he had the pleasure of hearing the hon. gentleman stated that, to meet the wishes of the Maritime Provinces, the duties were reduced from 20 to 15 per cent., and, in advocating that reduction, he declared that it would reduce the taxes of the people by two or three million dollars yearly. He now came to that unfortunate class of humanity, the farmers. There had been a conspiracy in this country to defraud the farmers. In 1875, when the manufacturers met in the city of Toronto, it was stated that, unless they could convince the farming population that Protection would be advantageous to them, they could never get Protection. Accordingly, they created a Manufacturers' Association in that city, money was contributed, and lecturers hired to go through the length and breadth of the country. Did they believe that these manufacturers paid this money for hiring

lecturers for the pure love they had for the farmers, or to benefit themselves? It was for themselves. Did they think those men contributed this money to create public opinion in favour of Protection, unless it were going to result to their benefit? In 1877, the president of the association, in his annual address, publicly stated that Protection could not benefit the farmers of this country. He was a gentleman of large commercial experience, probably one who knew as much about these matters as anybody west of the city of Montreal. He declared openly to the association that Protection would not benefit the farmer. But they knew they could not get protection unless they created this public opinion. Unfortunately for the people of this country, they did succeed with the assistance of the depression of trade to bring about that public opinion; hence the result of the election on the 17th September last. It was a principle laid down by political economists that, if a country, as a rule, raised more produce than it could consume, Protection would not increase the price, but that the surplus sold in a foreign market would regulate the price of the whole. He was confident his hon. friend the Finance Minister would agree with him in that. What were the facts? He had a statement of the exports and imports of cereals for the last five years. He had averaged the five years, as he did not think it wise to take an exceptional year. They found, of wheat, a surplus exported yearly of 3,603,200 bushels; oats, 1,605,680 bushels; barley, 6,619,712 bushels; peas, 2,231,326 bushels; oatmeal, 171,571 barrels; making the total yearly surplus 15,775,628 bushels. If that principle were correct, he would like to ask the hon. the Finance Minister if the imposition of duty on cereals was going to increase the price when they had a surplus? It was stated by his hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that telegrams from the European market were laid upon the tables of the Stock Exchange, and discussed by every operator in cereals, and that the Liverpool prices were the prices paid by every other country. It was impossible. He would

state the great injury that would be sustained by the farmers of this country by the imposition of a duty. Their large mills could not be on quarter time without supplementing Canadian wheat with Western wheat. He might explain the reason they had a surplus of wheat, and that the large quantity of raw material was shipped from Canada to mills in England. It was stated that the shippers of raw material to England had an understanding with the carriers whereby they paid a shade lower for the raw material than those who manufactured the goods. If they crippled those mills, what would be the effect upon the farmers themselves? In all probability, a great number of those mills would withdraw from the Canadian market, and the result must be unfortunate for the sale of products. He would give a quotation from the London market to prove what he had stated, and the London market was the best grain market west of the city of Toronto for the purchase of cereals. It was as follows:—

| | March 15 | | March 22 | |
|----------------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Wheat, Deihl.. | \$1 63 to | \$1 66 | \$1 60 to | \$1 65 |
| “ Treadwell. | 1 63 | 1 66 | 1 60 | 1 65 |
| “ Red fall... | 1 60 | 1 63 | 1 60 | 1 63 |
| “ Spring | 1 20 | 1 38 | 1 20 | 1 38 |
| Oats | 96 | 1 00 | 90 | 1 00 |
| Barley | 80 | 1 30 | 80 | 1 30 |

This showed that there had been no increase in the price of wheat, barley, etc. The same argument applied to stock. By the imposition of a duty on stock they were going to inflict an injury on the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, as a large proportion of stock was imported into those Provinces. They paid 10 per cent. duty now, and increased it by the imposition of 10 per cent. more, and it would be so much money out of the pockets of the poor people going into those Provinces. What would have been said if, thirty or forty years ago, when settlements were forming here, if the Government had acted towards the settler in the same manner that this Government was acting towards the settlers of the great North-West? They would have been looked upon as a Government utterly unable to rule the destinies of this country. The Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia had imported 12,910

head last year, at a cost of —including the ten per cent. duty— \$87,638, and, by the imposition of a further ten per cent., if the same quantity or value of stock was imported next year, the cost would be \$8,763 more, or \$96,401 in all. He then came to the article of wool. He remembered being in the county of Bothwell on one occasion during last summer, and he heard the hon. gentleman who was defeated in that county say upon every stump, and he gave himself considerable importance in the county, that he was the apple of the eye of his leader, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald; that he was the mouth-piece of the great Liberal Conservative party. In reference to wool, he condemned the Government because they had not imposed a duty upon it, and stated distinctly that this was one of the articles on which duty would be imposed. If that gentleman were the mouthpiece of the great Liberal Conservative party, and if he made that pledge, not only to the people of Bothwell, but of every other county in which he made his appearance, should not the Government carry out the pledge given by one of their leaders? He thought, if there was an imposition of duty on short wool, it would do some good. It represented about 25 per cent. of the whole produced in this country. He thought it was impossible, in any degree, to enhance the value of the products of the soil by the imposition of a protective duty. He had just one or two other remarks to make, then he would close. He thought that the railways would be injured by this tariff. 12,000 tons of steel rails were required for the Credit Valley Railway, and the increased duty on the steel rails which had been purchased in England would amount to \$42,000. That would be a great drawback to the completion of this road, and other important works would be similarly affected. These enterprises were for the benefit of the whole people, and he thought some consideration ought to be given to the people. What was going to be the result of this duty? The carrying trade of the country would be injured. The Grand Trunk Railway had hardly paid their running expenses during the last few years, and, if a large amount of extra duty was put upon

them for the fuel they consumed, the great carrying trade of the West would be crippled. That was a subject that the Government ought to consider. The Government had taxed the people millions of dollars for the construction of these public works. And why were they building these public works? It was to compete with the American routes for the export trade of the great West. And what were they going to do? They were going to put a barrier in the way of that great volume of trade going through this country. It might be said that the carrying trade of the West would be shipped into our country, then manufactured and shipped out again. He would ask the hon. the Minister of Finance, if the Americans were going to be allowed to ship cereals into this country, where was the protection to the farmer? What would they think of the merchant that would build a large establishment, one of the largest in Canada, and fill it with the finest French and English goods, and then put up a toll-gate, and say that every one who wanted to do business, or inspect his establishment, would have to pay toll? Would he be fit to carry on the business of this country? And what would be said if a Government, that spent hundreds of millions of dollars of the people's money to improve inland navigation, and to complete railways for the purpose of competing with the American routes, then put a barrier in the way of that carrying trade? Would it not be as insane an act on the part of the Government as it would be on the part of the merchant? He must apologise to the House for occupying their time. He trusted the Government would pause before they put upon the Statute-book a principle so injurious to the people of this country. It might take only a few days to put it on the Statute-book, but it would take years to remove it. An injury could easily be done, but it was difficult to remove.

MR. TILLEY: When submitting, for the consideration of this House, the propositions of the Government relative to the proposed changes in the tariff, I felt the question was one of such magnitude and importance, that I might justly be pardoned if I did not occupy the attention

of the House, on that occasion, with references that had been made by my predecessor affecting the policy of the Government of which I had the honour of being Finance Minister up to 1873. I did make some reference to remarks that had been made by that hon. gentleman in speeches at St. John and elsewhere, and I made them, Sir, I think, in a parliamentary spirit, as I trust I will ever make my remarks to this House, or any other assembly of the kind. I felt I had made them in a manner such as would produce a response from the hon. gentleman in a corresponding spirit. I regret that the hon. member did not meet me exactly in that spirit, and if, in the course of the remarks I make this evening, though they will be perfectly parliamentary, still, if I should be a little more pointed in my remarks, and a little more energetic in the way I address myself to him, I trust the House will pardon me. In the first place, I have but little to say to the hon. gentleman after what was said by my colleague the hon. member for Cumberland. I think that many of the fallacious statements, that many of the statements that are not borne out by the public records of the House of Commons, were answered promptly, fully and satisfactory by my hon friend. But still, Sir, there is a matter that does not appear to be quite settled, and which I would like to have settled. It is, Mr. Speaker, whether the statement I submitted, in 1873, in reference to the expenditure and income of 1873-74, whether the propositions I made were of the outrageous and unjustifiable nature that had been stated by the hon. gentleman. If we take his statement as reliable in every respect, I have committed a grave offence; I have made propositions, as far as expenditure was concerned, far in excess of any reasonable expectation. But I think, Sir, I will be able to show that, had the Government, of which I had the honour of being a member at that time, remained in power, I think I shall be able to show, from the public records, and from the statements he and his colleagues have submitted to the House of Commons, that, with the tariff in existence in 1872, without any increase, it would have been sufficient to meet the expenditure.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No.

MR. TILLEY: Well, let us come to the law and the testimony. I find, Mr. Speaker, that the revenue received for 1873-74 was \$24,205,092. There was a good deal of discussion in 1874, between my hon. friend the member for Cumberland, and the then Finance Minister, as to the amount collected in that year, and that properly belonged to it, or rather collected in that year, and properly belonging to the year following. I want to call the attention of this House to the statement made by my predecessor the other night. What was it? He said that the members of the Government and Finance Minister had not kept their counsel, as he said they ought to have kept it, the public were made aware of the intentions of the Government, and the result was that, within one month, the total amount collected in February, 1874, was but half the amount collected in February, 1879. I want that to be borne in mind. I estimated that \$850,000 of the receipts of this year belonged properly to the next year. The extra revenue of this year is, according to his own statement, double what it was in 1873-74. If that be the case, and my estimate is correct, there could not have been \$1,000,000 of the revenue of 1873-74 properly credited to 1874-75.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The hon. gentleman has quoted me incorrectly, and, if he will allow me, I will tell him what I did say. I made no reference to February, 1874. The reference I made was to the first twenty days of April, 1874, which is quite a different thing.

MR. TILLEY: Well, I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for correcting me. Taking his proposition as from the 14th April, 1874, it gave only \$1,000,000 in excess, while he stated in February, of this year, it was \$2,000,000, instead of \$1,000,000. Now, suppose, for the sake of argument, that the receipts in April, 1874, were \$2,000,000, I have estimated that the statement I have submitted here that \$350,000 Excise, and \$500,000 Customs, both properly and fairly belong to next year. I also stated that, probably, we would have collected, before the fiscal

year is closed, \$150,000, as extra duties resulting from change in tariff. That will make \$1,000,000. Suppose we receive no more this year than we did in 1874? If they received \$1,000,000 in excess of what belonged to revenue, it would have left \$23,205,092 as the receipts for that year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No; decidedly not.

MR. TILLEY: My case does not depend solely upon this point. I know it is but an estimate, and may vary to the extent of \$200,000, \$300,000, or \$400,000. But I have sufficient to make out a case, even if that should be granted. The expenditure for that year was \$23,316,316, as shown by the Public Accounts. If the late Government received, at that time, only half what we have raised at present, or suppose they received as much as we have received at the present time, belonging to next year, then you have the sum of \$23,205,092, against an expenditure of \$23,316,316. But suppose our calculations are not correct, what should properly be deducted from that expenditure, in order to show whether the statement I made was correct or not? It is well known our estimates of income were always under the mark from 1869 to 1873. There was not, during one of those years, a time when the estimate of income was not far below what was received, and our estimate of expenditure greatly in excess of our actual expenditure. In order to show the unfairness of the statement of the hon. member, he speaks of the expenditure of \$300,000 or \$400,000 added to the expenditure of Prince Edward Island; but he, in no way, referred to the revenue derived from the Island. Let us go a little further, in order, Sir, to swell the expenditure of that year to the largest possible amount, and to justify the Government in placing in His Excellency's speech the statement that it was necessary, in order to make up the deficiency of that year, that increased taxation should then be imposed—in order to place the Government that had preceded them in the position of being responsible for the increased charges, items were placed under the head of expenditure that ought never to have been placed there at all. This matter has

MR. TILLEY.

been discussed over and over again, and, when his hon. friend the member for Cumberland was speaking the other night, I could not help feeling it was a great privilege for hon. members to wear their hats in the House, and he could not help thinking the late Finance Minister would have been very glad if the rim of his hat had been broader than it was when his hon. friend was bringing the matter home to him. My hon. friend from Cumberland said the late Finance Minister had charged \$546,000 to income that should have been charged to the construction of the Intercolonial Railroad. And my hon. colleague said he had indisputable evidence that it was pointed out to the Finance Minister, by one of his officials, that the charge was improperly entered. The leader of the Opposition afterwards took exception to the matter; but I happen to have before me what will settle the question. I hold in my hand a return laid before Parliament, through the Minister of Public Works, a statement of the number of miles of the Intercolonial Railway in operation on the 1st July, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877, also showing the cost of operating the same, signed by Mr. Brydges, and laid on the table of the House, in accordance with the request of some hon. member. I find the expenditure for working the railway for 1873-4 is \$1,301,550. In the Public Accounts it stands \$1,847,178. Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether there can be anything more decisive, or more definite, than that statement, showing that \$546,000 has been charged as expenditure against income that ought to have been charged against the construction of that road? Now, I think, that is unanswerable. There is an official document, signed by Mr. Brydges, and laid on the table of the House by the late leader of the Government. Now, Sir, I hold that that item should never have been entered under that head of expenditure, and I hold, therefore, that it should never have been charged against our Government. It ought not to have been charged in that account, as against revenue, but as against capital. There seemed, as I stated before, a great anxiety on the part of hon. gentlemen, to swell the expenditure of that year. I find charged to management \$60,000, or thereabouts,

commission on the loan I negotiated in 1873. This item had never appeared before, and had never appeared since, under that head. Then there was \$41,000, the sinking fund paid in July, 1873; that I did not take into account, because it was due the previous year, 1872. I could not have foreseen when I made my statement, that gentlemen opposite were coming into power, and that they were going to dissolve the House, and that they were to have a Session in the autumn. I could not, therefore, be expected to make provision in the Estimates for expenditures for legislation, except what we were cognisant of. I find \$200,000 added to legislative expenses as the result of the autumn Session and the election afterwards.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It was not us that called that Session.

Mr. TILLEY: But I am speaking now in justification of my estimates submitted. It was not possible for me, at to the time, to foresee that that Session was be called, that hon. gentlemen would dissolve the House and go to the country. Then we find refunded duties charged against of \$69,000 that ought not to have been paid, and would not have been paid had we remained in power. These items amounted, together, to \$916,000, and were to be deducted. This would reduce the expenditure to \$22,400,316. Now, he came to another question, that of the loan. His predecessor, in reference to that loan, the four per cents unguaranteed, produced but £86, and he made a calculation, if I recollect right, that guaranteed debentures of four per cents were 104½. When I first floated the guaranteed loan of £1,800,000, I could not see why the guaranteed loan should not bring in proportion as much as consols. But in discussing this matter with public men, they said that no guaranteed loan that had ever been given by Great Britain, for any country, has ever produced anything like the same returns as any ordinary Government loan. When I was in London, in November, I found, to my amazement, that these bonds, four per cent. guaranteed, were bringing a much lower price than they had ever been quoted before. I asked Sir John Rose, the agents and other gentlemen, how it was that these guaranteed loans

were at present quoted and sold so low— one gentleman telling me he had been glad to take three per cent. premium for them, with almost five weeks' interest that had accrued. What was the answer? It was one that required some explanation. It was: Oh, they are floaters. I said, what are floaters? He said they are termed floaters because, when interest is low, worth say two per cent., the guaranteed securities of this and other countries are bought by money brokers and men with limited means, because these securities bear four per cent. They lodge them with the Bank of England and other banks, and get the money at two per cent. The result is, that while money is very cheap there is a demand for them for that particular purpose; but at that time, after the failure of the Glasgow Bank, and when rumours were afloat of other failures of banks in the west of England and elsewhere, when every bank in the city was fortifying its position and using every pound available for the purpose of strengthening their reserves, the rate of interest had gone up, and the banks were demanding the money they had advanced on these floaters, and consequently they were forced into the market to be realised on, and these circumstances brought the price down, and placed them in the position in which they were when I was compelled to make that loan; a state of things entirely different from that of the June previous, when these securities were at the highest point, and when it would have been wise for the Finance Minister of the day to take advantage of the position. The hon. gentleman said, the other night, that he had lost his election because he was looking after the interests of his own party. It appears to me, and this opinion is entertained also by the country, that if he had been floating a loan at that time instead of looking after the interests of the party, he would have realised much more than I was able to realise under the circumstances referred to. Sir, it was because these guaranteed securities were then at that figure that I was unable to realise a higher rate, and I may say it was remarkable, considering that I was endeavouring to make good what ought to have been done by my predecessors under more favourable circumstances, that party feeling and party prejudices

allowed them to go so far when they ought to have been anxious that I should have the greatest success, inasmuch as they were deeply interested in the result; but their policy and their conduct was censurable, and I met with opposition when I ought to have had their support, as I was placed in that position by them, not by my own choice. The late Minister of Finance says the unguaranteed 4 per cents. brought only 86 pounds on the hundred. They brought, taking into account the value of the guaranteed securities, about 90½; that is what they realised. I have in my hand a letter from Barings and Glynn, stating that there never was a time when previous Dominion loans were placed on the market so unfavourable as then. They were put up to competition, at all events they were offered to the highest bidder. The hon. gentleman asked me, the other day, if I knew how much had been taken by the agents, and how much by the Bank of Montreal. I said I did not know, except in conversation with the directors and the Manager of the Bank of Montreal, how much they had taken, or whether the agents had taken any at all or not. He said I ought to have known. It is remarkable the hon. member this Session asked for information that he refused to give when he was in the Government.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I have, on all occasions, stated exactly what the agents had done. What I refused to give, because I had not the information, were the names of the other parties, not the agents, who had subscribed to the loan.

MR. TILLEY: On the day on which the tenders were submitted, I saw four schedules brought in, numbering from one down to eighty. I do not suppose, if I had examined them, I would have known if the Bank of Montreal had tendered, had the manager not told me that they were going to tender, as their tenders were probably made through a broker. The hon. gentleman said he knew if I had named the price and had £3,000,000 offered, and I had £5,000,000 tendered, and I had to sit down and decide who should receive the £3,000,000, I would perhaps know too. That was not necessary. All that I required to know was that the amount was taken

MR. TILLEY.

above the minimum given in the prospectus. The hon. gentleman opposite was somewhat severe on me because I took a step which I believe nineteen-twentieths of the people of this country will justify, and that step was with reference to the payments of the revenues received by the Collectors of Customs and Inland Revenue into the banks upon which the cheques for those duties were drawn. I do not recollect, at this moment, that a bank manager approached me on this subject, but members of the House came and pointed out the difficulty. I do not wish to say anything that would affect the position of the banks; on the contrary, I believe the suspicion with reference to their standing was without cause. From the observation that I had given to the matter, the banks, as a whole, are sound, but there was an anxiety with reference to the deposits, and men everywhere, owing to various causes, were withdrawing from the banks their deposits, much to the injury of the business of the country. When these gentlemen said to me duties amounting to \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000—the amount was \$4,700,000,—will be paid in during the next three weeks, and if these cheques for this money go to the Bank of Montreal, and that Bank should demand from the others specie for them, you will add to the commercial embarrassment and greatly injure the business community. In accordance with these representations, I afforded facilities for persons transacting business throughout the Dominion, not to give encouragement to take goods out of bond, because it was known on the 17th September that this policy would be adopted. The people were prepared for the change because they had confidence in the declarations made by the party leaders, and, therefore, went forward, as every member of this House would have done were he in business, anticipating the increased duties, and taking out of bond everything they could; it, therefore, became a question whether we would increase the existing embarrassments or remove them as far as possible. We did not say to our collectors deposit your money in such and such a bank, because the directors and managers are our political supporters. We said, whatever cheques you receive

drawn on different banks, deposit in those banks to the credit of the Government. If we had placed \$800,000 or \$900,000 in a bank, half of which was without interest and half at four per cent., and it was found that that bank was using its influence in every shape and form in controlling and corrupting constituencies in the interests of this Government, then I could imagine how hon. gentlemen opposite might, with reason and with great power and effect, point to the corrupt and dishonourable conduct of the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few remarks in reference to statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite; but, before doing so, I come to a point that was referred to by an hon. member from the Eastern townships, who made such an admirable speech this afternoon on the question of taxation. The people are told that this Government are levying new and heavy taxes on the people. Did I not state in my speech the other night that these were necessary because of the decreased value of goods, added to the depression in trade, that we wanted to-day, only the average of the money received from Customs in 1874-75? We are not asking as much as they received at that time, but we find that there will be, this year, a deficiency of \$2,400,000, and it is a question whether we will meet the matter boldly, saying that this amount must be collected, and our credit maintained, or make an open declaration that we are prepared for another deficit of two and a-half million dollars. Suppose our friends opposite were in power to-day, they could not provide for this deficiency in any other way than by asking Parliament to impose additional taxes. There is a simple way of doing that, by adding to the 17½ per cent. list 5 per cent. As we received \$7,000,000 last year from goods paying 17½ per cent., the 5 per cent. additional would give \$2,000,000 more. It would be a simple way of obtaining it. It would not require many depositions or much calculation, and the Finance Minister would not be under the necessity of giving extended explanations as to the mode of levying it. That was the way our friends did before to the extent of 2½ per cent. Suppose they doubled it now, what would be the effect? We hear a great deal said now about

interfering with the industries of Great Britain; on the other hand, we are *in toto* insulting the United States, because we are imposing new duties upon them. It appears to me, viewing it in a patriotic light, we ought not to create, by anything we say in this House, any unpleasant feeling, either in Great Britain or the United States, especially when it is not warranted by the propositions submitted to Parliament. Supposing 5 per cent. additional was added to the 17½ per cent. list, what would be the effect? I said the other night that the average duty collected on goods from Great Britain was 17½ per cent., and on those from the United States only 10 per cent., and if our friends opposite had been in power and had not imposed duties to encourage Protection, because that would be at variance with their principles, they would put 5 per cent. upon the 17½ per cent. list, which would give an increased advantage to the United States instead of diminishing it. Still we hear from the other side, "Oh! this will create an unfriendly feeling in Great Britain towards Canada."

MR. MACKENZIE: You have no right to make a proposition for us, and then proceed to demolish it.

MR. TILLEY: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon for supposing they would be consistent. I was supposing that they could not levy a duty to protect our native industries. If the hon. gentleman says I am doing his party an injustice by supposing that they would be consistent, I am willing to take it all back. A word or two as to the effect our proposition will have on the manufacturing industries of Great Britain. We are called upon at this time, and have been ever since Confederation, to ask for a larger amount of money than we would have required under other circumstances, because we have spent, since Confederation, large sums in the improved navigation of the St. Lawrence, the construction of railways, the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and now the Pacific Railway. It is quite true that the proposition I submit will impose on, and probably produce, something like \$750,000 from the imports of Great Britain. But our friends at home should bear in mind that we are engaged in a

work in which they are deeply interested themselves. Every million dollars we spend for the improvement of our navigation, whether in building lighthouses, in the establishment of telegraph stations, in the deepening and enlarging of canals, or in the construction of railways, enables us to put the products of Great Britain into the Dominion, and into our great North-West, which we are going to people with millions, at a much lower rate than we otherwise could. The expenditure of this large sum will operate indirectly to the benefit of the manufacturing industries of Great Britain; it would be utterly impracticable to do it were we not spending that large sum, thus indirectly benefitting the manufacturing industries of Great Britain. In opening up that great North-West, we expect to provide a comfortable home for the surplus population of Great Britain. We will thus relieve Great Britain of its surplus population, and plant them where they will still be subjects of England, purchasing of her manufactures \$9.25 per head per annum, against \$2.50 if they removed to the United States and became aliens. Great Britain has a great interest in this work, and in the development of this great region. Will it be said that the increase of wealth and population resulting from the filling of our western territory with millions of settlers, will not be a source of strength to the mother land? We have only to point to the fact that a few months ago, when there was a possibility of trouble between the Mother Country and Russia, Canada was prepared to send 10,000 men, and back them by tens of thousands more, to fight for the old flag under which we are proud to live. Instead of there being any feeling in England against us, although there are some Free-trade men who care not about the colonies, the heart of the people is with us. They know that this money is required for the development of our country, and for opening up new channels of trade between the Old World and the New, and to enable Canadians to compete with the manufacturers south of the line 45. The sympathies of the English people will be with us, instead of adverse, as has been desired by hon. gentlemen in Opposition. With refer-

ence to the United States, I was a member of the Government of New Brunswick when the unfortunate struggle between the North and South was at its height, and I then acted upon the principle, a principle I still hold to, that a Canadian statesman, who does not, in dealing with our American neighbours, duly consider their feelings, does not act in the interests of Canada; but he is not expected in any way to sacrifice the interests he is specially charged to protect. In the United States, the press differs in opinion with respect to this tariff. The Government, after refraining for twelve years from imposing duties on articles imported from the United States that were free under the Reciprocity Treaty, only now propose to reimpose them, though the United States Government restored the duty on our natural productions immediately on the abrogation of the Treaty. This proposition being accompanied with the declaration that we are prepared to meet them half way in the reduction or removal of duties, was calculated to prevent unkind criticism, and such has been the case. Goods imported from the United States will pay a larger share of the duties than goods from Great Britain. I have statements here that will bear out this assertion. The member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) observed that I stated that we expected to receive \$2,000,000 from the United States. What I said was that we expected to obtain this amount altogether, the larger portion from the goods imported from the United States. I did not enter into the question as to whether the producer or consumer would pay it. Under those circumstances, I think there cannot be any unkind feeling towards Canada by the people of the United States. I see a moderate periodical, published there, remarks that the Canadian Government should have approached the United States Government on this question, before throwing down the gauntlet. We have twice approached them on this subject, and our propositions have been rejected; and the present Government have decided to wait till they make the advance, and show that they are prepared to meet us in a liberal spirit. I now come to some of the

general objections that have been offered to the measure submitted to the House. Hon. members on the Opposition side have read letters disapproving of some of those propositions. All I can say is that, if any hon. member supposed that such a complete revolution in tariff arrangements as this tariff effects could be made without eliciting some complaints, he must have been very sanguine. All I can say is that it will be shown, by the amendments that I propose, that we have not made any very radical change of principle, and that, though gentlemen will ask for changes here and reductions there, and make complaints as to certain details, taking the Dominion as a whole, I have reason to feel that the majority of the country is with us in those propositions.

MR. MACKENZIE : No.

MR. TILLEY : We will see. What are the general objections to the tariff? My predecessor and the hon. member for West Middlesex (Messrs. Cartwright and Ross) complained that one effect would be to make people look to the Government and Parliament for relief. I was not surprised to hear my predecessor make that statement, because I think he distinctly asserted that it was impossible for the Government to do anything more than they had done for the relief of the people by legislation; but I was surprised to hear it from the member for West Middlesex. I thought I had followed him the last eight or ten years in the consideration of a question in which this Dominion is greatly interested. I had watched him as, step by step, he went on advocating such measures as he felt were necessary for the relief of the people from the vice of intemperance, and that he took the ground that Parliament was the place to come to, as shown by the reform consummated in the Act passed last Session. Did my ears deceive me when my hon. friend declared that it would be a calamity if the people were taught to look to the Parliament and Government for relief from the great evils that existed in the land, when it was mainly to that source that he had educated the people to look? I have a word to say in answer to the arguments of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr Charl-

ton). Extracts were read from his speech, the other night, and nothing that I could say would be so effectual as to read the speeches he made on former occasions. In answer to the hon. member for Oxford, did he not move for a Committee to enquire into the expediency of protecting the industries of the country? I think, when I was Finance Minister before, that he was one of the warmest advocates of Protection that I knew in Parliament. The hon. member for North Oxford, with Mr. Joly and the late member for Waterloo, and others, pressed upon me and upon Parliament the proposition to admit the production of beetroot sugar, for ten years, free of any excise duty, giving the producer a protection equal to 3c. per pound. This was the most thorough protective proposition made in Parliament, and the member for North Norfolk also joined in the demand. We have heard complaints about the promises made by gentlemen on this side to the electors at the last general election. These statements are made to destroy the effect of the elections of 17th September last. What did they say? That men were not bought by money, but by promises, and an hon. gentleman on the Opposition side has stated that there never was an election in Canada where there was so little money spent as in that one. Then, for the first time, we were before the country with a square issue, which was not money nor office, but a great question of principle. I know that many who supported me formerly then voted against me, because they had been told that, if they supported the Conservative party, their flour would cost a dollar a barrel more, and their coal cost more also, as the result of increased taxation; and the manufacturers were told by the hon. gentlemen on the other side that they would get no increased protection. I claim that both sides were discussing principles that involved, no doubt, individual interests; and I would ask if it was not the highest tribute that could be paid to the people of the Dominion to say that, on the 17th September, they laid aside all party questions, and voted for their principles by an overwhelming majority, sustaining the men who have submitted this policy to Parliament. We are told that this is

a sectional policy, that it is going to separate the people, that the Government or the Finance Minister was simply a Committee appointed to receive propositions from the men who came to Ottawa. I can only say that, if we accepted the propositions from all parts of the Dominion, the tariff would have been a queer mixture indeed, because we naturally had conflicting interests to deal with. But the Government, in view of its responsibilities, as representing Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and the North-West, had to consider and decide as to what was in the interest of the whole Dominion, and what might meet, fairly and justly, the interest of the whole country. If we had come down with a proposition directly in the interest of one Province, no matter how great it might be, had we taken propositions *en bloc* from Ontario for example, the other Provinces would have grounds for complaint. Our scheme is not for a section, but for the interest of the whole country. A great deal has been said about the poor man by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, if these propositions are successful, the labouring man will derive the greatest benefit from them. If they are now idle, what is the advantage of their living in a cheap country? Do you want him to be idle? No; you wish to get him something to do. When our friends on the other side of the Atlantic understand our scheme, and see that, instead of sending hundreds of thousands of people out of this country, it is to keep them in it, under the sovereignty and power of England, they will heartily approve of it. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) said that I had stated that, had I been in office in 1874, I would not have disturbed the rate of 15 per cent. I did say so. We intimated, in 1873, that there would probably be a change in the tariff the next Session, which then, however, we did not need. Then we had an ample revenue for our purpose, to meet the \$22,500,000 that ought to have been expended, and no more. I stated that, for the years 1873 to 1878, the expenditures of the government of this country might have been kept within \$22,500,000, or an average for those four years. The Estimates I submitted to Parliament a few days since prove

that. I did state this: that, had we been in power, we would not have asked to disturb the 15 per cent. list. We would have taken the money out of other articles that would have afforded encouragement to the industries of the country. And now, if we ask something more than 17½ per cent., it is because we are under the painful necessity of having \$2,000,000 more of money than 17½ per cent. yields, not because it is our desire or our wish to increase taxation. But we come back to the poor man. I stated, for the purpose of showing the position our friends occupy with reference to the question of the poor man, that it was unjust to him to levy 5c. on a pound of tea which cost 16c, when a man who bought 40c. or 50c. tea paid the same duty. And I say so still, and it is consistent with the propositions now before the House. I said it was unfair to make a man who bought a gallon of wine costing but 50c. pay 72c. duty, while a gallon costing \$4 or \$5 paid the same duty. Then there is the question of petroleum. Hon. gentlemen opposite thought it proper to impose 75 per cent. on it. Hon. members say: "Under these circumstances, you are taxing the poor man, and letting off the rich." In the case of tea there is no remedy—you must pay it; but, in the case of woollen goods and cotton goods, what is our object? I stated it distinctly, that when we could not manufacture an article in the country, there was no reason why we should exact from the English manufacturers a high rate of duty, and make our people pay it. But we impose a duty upon coarser material, for two reasons. Take woollen goods as an illustration; the coarse article can be manufactured in the country, and will not only give employment to manufacturers, but it will afford a market for that article, in which the hon. member for North Oxford feels such a deep interest—our native wool. He has said the imposition of a duty upon wheat, because we have a surplus, will give no benefit to the wheat grower, and still my hon. friend is overflowing with sympathies for the man who has a flock of sheep upon the hills. We have a surplus of wheat, and, according to his doctrine, it makes no difference whether you put a duty upon it or not.

MR. OLIVER: We have no surplus of wool. We import 3,000,000 pounds more than we export.

MR. TILLEY: Yes, we import more than we export, but the wool we grow unfortunately, is not, and cannot be, used for the kind of manufactures that are now made in the country. We are making this proposition to encourage the manufacture of good, strong, coarse cloths and blankets, to take the place of shoddy, by which he is cheated of his hard earnings, for when he has a suit of it on, if he goes out to work in the rain, he comes home with his knees out of his pants. We propose to have manufactured here what we want for our own use, and what we have been taking from the United States. We will try the experiment, and if we are to take the United States as a proof of our position, some twelve years ago they imposed 50c. a pound on all woollen goods imported, besides 20 or 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, and what was the effect? Woollen goods there, to-day, are cheaper, unquestionably, by 12½ to 25 per cent., than they were at that time. That will be the effect in this country; it will give the poor man a cheaper and better article than he has now. It may be, as the hon. gentleman stated, that on account of the competition, the manufacturer will derive no profit, but, at any rate, the people will get a good and cheap article, in place of a rotten, worthless one. Now it is said that the china the rich man uses, pays a duty of 20 per cent., while the common earthenware pays more. We have several large establishments engaged in the manufacture of earthenware; there is one in Montreal manufacturing \$7,000 per month. In the Province of New Brunswick there is one for stoneware; but if we have no more, this tariff will cause others to be established. On these two articles that we can produce, we are asking encouragement; we ask it because it will give employment to the people. That is an article that does not require millions of dollars to be invested in it, and you will have them in every part of the country, wherever you can find the material.

MR. MACKENZIE: Where is the clay?

MR. TILLEY: There is plenty of it; if not in the West, then in the East, and we will be happy to reciprocate in products. Then we come to glassware. There are certain classes of common glassware that we do make, and we have imposed an additional duty on it, and it is believed that competition will produce an article which can be furnished to the consumer as cheap as it is at present. Then we come to pianos. It is said that it is not proper to make a piano costing \$200 pay a higher duty than one costing \$500 or \$600. It is impossible, in a proposition of this kind, to regulate a scale to bear equally all around, but we impose duty on these articles with a view of encouraging the industries that we have in this country. They can make all, or nearly all, that we require, providing that they have the market largely to themselves, and the proper duty is paid upon those articles when imported; therefore, it was considered advisable to impose a specific and *ad valorem* duty. Then there has been a good deal said about books. English books, it is said, pay a higher duty, and that the cheaper books pay less when the duty is paid by the pound. We know that a great many of the cheaper books, when they paid 5 per cent., paid less in proportion than the others, because you had to pay for the binding. But as I stated in the outset, it was for the purpose of saving a valuable and expensive book, that, from the ability that had been displayed by its author, and the price he had fixed upon it, which made it higher than ordinary publications, we thought a specific duty should be imposed, instead of an *ad valorem*. It was for the purpose, also, of removing the anomaly that existed up to the present time, whereby we impose 17½ per cent. on paper, and we admitted books, printed paper and binding at 5 per cent. That was an injustice to our own printers and our own paper makers, and this proposition is made to remove that anomaly. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, in his speech, the other night, pointed, as he has done on other occasions, to the United States, to show the effect that Protection had had upon the commerce of that country: that it had destroyed, to a certain extent, the commerce of that country; that is, that it had diminished

the tonnage of that country. Did my hon. friend recollect at the time, that, while we were adopting a protective policy with reference to various other industries, on the question of shipping, we propose increased facilities. Taking the shipping of the United States at its summit—as it existed in 1863, that shipping fell off 400,000 tons the following year. That was the result of the difficulties that existed in that country; ships were either destroyed, or they were registered under the names of British subjects. But my hon. friend will say that it was the high duties that were imposed upon the articles that entered into the construction of ships, that caused the diminution. Now, that was not the only difficulty that existed during the war, and there is no doubt that in Great Britain the construction of iron ships, which have largely taken the place of wooden vessels, had a good deal to do with it; and there is no doubt that the duty that was imposed upon the materials that entered into the construction of United States vessels, had a good deal to do with making them more expensive than the ships of other countries, and hence the tonnage fell off. But my hon. friend should have remembered that in the proposition the Government has made, we protect the shipbuilder in giving him cheaper material; we enable him to build cheaper than before, and therefore, the very difficulty that existed in the United States has been avoided by this proposition. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) took some plausible points in his speech. I can quite imagine him on the stump; I do not wonder that he succeeded in getting a seat in Parliament, because he can take a point and present it in a plausible kind of way. He says the Government have brought down a proposition to give drawbacks upon the ships built throughout the Dominion; but he says, what are they doing for the locomotives? My hon. friend thought, no doubt, he was making a point that would take in his own constituency, but had he forgotten all that has been done by the Government of the Dominion and by the Government of old Canada, by the Government of Nova Scotia and other Provinces in the construction of railways? Is there any other industry in this Domin-

MR. TILLEY.

ton that has received the same direct support from Government? My hon. friend thought he was making a point, as, in his section of the country they do not own ships, but if there is a railroad that passes within a mile of his county, or that passes through it, that railroad has received assistance from the old Government of Canada, or from the Province of Ontario, in excess and beyond anything that has ever been given to any other industry, and properly so. I now come to an important question, that is, the sugar question. I must say I was a little amazed at the statement made by my predecessor the other night. I may not have heard him distinctly, but I thought he stated we would lose \$1,000,000 by our proposed change of duties on sugar.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I stated the people of Canada would lose more than \$1,000,000.

MR. TILLEY: It seems, Mr. Speaker, that I have not been mistaken. I had not the honour of a seat in the House when my hon. friend was Minister of Finance, but I recollect seeing in the papers the proposition that he laid upon the table, with reference to sugar, and the remonstrance that was made, and I appeal to members who were in the House at the time, to bear me out in the statement, that his first proposition was in the interest of refining of sugar; but did not that hon. gentleman come down afterwards by way of encouraging refining in this Dominion, and take $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent off the specific duty? If I am correct, the hon. gentleman came down and made that reduction with the view of continuing in existence the sugar refineries of the country. It appears to me that he was pretending to give them something, while he was refusing to counteract the effect of the bounty given in the United States, pretending to give something to them, when there was nothing in it whatever: or else he was propounding a proposition that is very much in accordance with the one we have here. What is this proposition? It is the levying of specific duties exactly where the hon. gentleman left them. The *ad valorem* on all sugar below No. 14 is 30 per cent. instead of 25, but that is no increase, because it is stated

distinctly that when sugars are imported direct from the West Indies, there shall be no duty collected on packages, which is equal to a reduction of 5 per cent. We put it precisely where it was in that respect. On refined sugar or sugars above No. 14, we give 5 per cent. more additional to the refiner. It is protection against this undue operation of the bounty system of the United States, which has destroyed sugar refining for the last five years in this country. That is our proposition. There is only 5 per cent difference on sugar above No. 14. The hon. gentleman says that the people of Canada lose \$1,000,000 by it. I have made some calculations on this matter; I may be entirely wrong, but I will give you the result of them. He says that the revenue last year was \$2,900,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I said nothing of the kind.

MR. TILLEY: I understood him to say that the revenue was \$2,900,000, and the receipts, under this tariff, would be \$1,900,000, which would be a loss of \$1,000,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I will tell the hon. gentleman what I said, and what I think he must have understood. I had the public returns in my hand, from which I was reading. I read to him then, what he must know—and it is perfectly absurd for him to affect ignorance—that we got \$2,500,000 last year, of sugar revenue, and by his present taxes it would cost the country \$2,920,000 if that sugar was brought in in the same quantities and the same values as now; but if, as is probable, the sugar is manufactured in this country, the total revenue would be \$1,900,000, or thereabouts.

MR. TILLEY: I understood him to say revenue, but that answers my purpose very well, because it enables me to give my statement, which is directly opposite. Now, I have made up here what I think will be the result, under this tariff of next year, as compared with what it cost last year. Last year we imported 105,240,000 lbs. This year I am supposing the whole will come in to be refined. And there is another point, with reference to the trade

in the United States, and in England. Under the operation of the law we now ask the Parliament to approve, there will be little refined sugar coming from the United States, but, under its operations, we will have large imports from England. Mr. Tilley 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. Mr. Tilley then read the following statement, showing the imports from Great Britain and the United States, for 1878, and the proposed increased duty on the same:—

Agricultural implements from Great Britain, \$9,592; from the United States, \$132,053, 7½ per cent. increase; animals from Great Britain \$3,084, from the United States \$338,015, 10 per cent. increase; breadstuffs from Great Britain \$21,884, from the United States, \$13,350,777, 15 per cent. increase; carriages from Great Britain \$2,130, from United States \$83,504, 7½ per cent. increase; clocks from Great Britain \$7,420, from United States \$59,770, 17½ per cent. increase; coal, anthracite, from Great Britain \$7,503, from United States \$1,468,523, increase 50c. per ton; bituminous coal from Great Britain \$323,055, from United States \$1,169,731, increase 50c. per ton; copper manufactures from Great Britain \$8,637, and from United States \$15,884, 12½ per cent. increase; cotton manufactures, specific and *ad valorem* from Great Britain \$1,203,830, from United States \$2,472,184, 10 per cent. increase; coarse earthenware from Great Britain \$40,000, from United States \$40,000, 10 per cent. increase; dried fruit from Great Britain \$166,018, from United States, \$261,000, 7½ per cent. increase; green fruit from Great Britain \$134,460, from United States \$333,334, 10 per cent. increase; furniture from Great Britain \$12,201, and from United States \$387,270, 17½ per cent. increase; gas fixtures from Great Britain \$11,113, from United States \$73,823, 12½ per cent. increase; India rubber goods from

Great Britain \$56,079, from the United States \$92,261, increase $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; locomotive machinery from Great Britain \$137,507, from the United States \$507,705, increase $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; tubing, tacks, nails, spikes, sewing machines from Great Britain \$138,806, from the United States \$379,113, increase $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; glassware, common, from Great Britain \$37,544, from the United States \$208,443, increase 10 per cent. ; do., fine quality, from Great Britain \$149,724, from the United States \$212,743, increase $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; builders', cabinetmakers' and carriage ware and cutlery, mostly from England, pay but $2\frac{1}{2}$ *ad valorem*, from Great Britain 166,274, from the United States \$1,731,766, average 10 per cent. ; lard from Great Britain \$1,654, from the United States \$210,902, increase 75 per cent. ; bacon and hams from Great Britain \$1,014, from the United States \$260,003, 100 per cent. increase ; small organs and pianos from Great Britain \$9,668, from the United States \$459,322, increase $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; books from Great Britain \$370,069, from the United States \$451,486, more than doubled ; billiard tables from Great Britain \$175 ; from the United States \$11,129, $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase ; brooms and brushes from Great Britain \$20,319, from the United States \$22,707, increase $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; gunpowder and explosives from Great Britain \$20,319, from the United States \$90,000 increase $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; hats, caps, from Great Britain \$368,000, from the United States \$675,600, increase $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; copper and brass from Great Britain \$76,338, from the United States \$24,195, 10 per cent. increase. The imports of the following articles are greater from Great Britain than from the United States : manufactures of furs from Great Britain \$129,187 ; from the United States \$67,892, increase $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; pig iron from Great Britain 26,174 tons, from the United States 3,913 tons ; from Great Britain \$397,829, from the United States \$90,901, increase \$2 ; bar, steel, rails, blooms, billets, &c., from Great Britain \$1,804,519, from the United States \$322,688, average 10 per cent. ; iron plate from Great Britain, \$348,613, from the United States \$61,254, average 10 per cent. ; woollen goods from Great

Britain \$2,765,131, from the United States \$73,807, increase $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; do. from Great Britain \$2,756,000, from United States \$74,000, increase 10 per cent. ; do. finer from Great Britain \$716,068, from United States \$62,682, increase $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; blankets and coarsest woollens from Great Britain \$1,107,000 from United States \$162,657, increase $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; cotton goods from Great Britain \$2,835,249, from United States \$1,622,752, increase $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; earthenware from Great Britain \$360,000, from the United States \$15,000, increase $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ; linen goods from Great Britain \$908,237, from United States \$67,459, increase $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The whole value of the imports from Great Britain, here referred to, is \$17,983,321, and from the United States, \$28,606,691. In this way it is expected to increase the revenue from articles on the first page largely imported from the United States, \$1,027,500 ; on merchandise received principally from Great Britain, \$505,000 ; on smaller articles and imports from other countries, under the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase, \$750,000 ; from silk goods \$150,000 ; spirits and wines, Customs, \$110,000 ; Excise, spirits \$100,000 ; making a total of \$2,642,500. Then deducting the reductions on sugar, \$250,000 ; tea, 90,000. With regard to the tea, it will now be largely imported from England and from China and Japan, instead of from the United States. If five or six establishments monopolise the whole of the business of the Dominion, I would ask if it would not be preferable that these establishments should be located in Canada instead of New York or Boston? The reduction on molasses would amount to \$100,000, and the amount on drawbacks \$100,000, giving a total of \$540,000, which would leave a balance of \$2,102,500 as the expected result of this tariff. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to enumerate the remainder of the alterations which had been made, as follows :—

Candles, parafine, per pound, changed to 5c. Sperm and others, except tallow, 25 per cent.

Rabbit metal, 10 per cent.

Buttons of all kinds, 25 per cent.

Checked and striped shirting, 2c. per yard, and 15 per cent.

Cotton duck or canvass and sail twine, 5 per cent.

Dried apples per pound, 2c. All other dried fruit, 25 per cent.

Hats, caps and bonnets, 25 per cent.

Hatters' plush of silk or common, 10 per cent.

Canada plates and sheet iron, 12½ per cent.

Iron and steel wire, 15 per cent.

Iron castings of all kinds, 25 per cent.

Cast-iron, gas, water and sewer pipe, 25 per cent.

Rolled beams and channels, angle and tyre, 15 per cent.

Iron bridges and structural iron work, safes and doors for safes and vaults, 25 per cent.

Wire-work safes and locks of all kinds, 30 per cent.

Lead pipe and shot, 25 per cent.

Gloves and mitts of leather, 25 per cent.

Oil cloth, 30 per cent.

Pipe organs and sets or parts of sets of reeds for cabinet organs, 25 per cent.

Paper pulp, 25 per cent.

Paints and colours ground in oil or any other liquid, 25 per cent.

White and red lead, dry, and bismuth, 5 per cent.

Paper hangings and paper calendered, 22½ per cent.

Lead pencils, 25 per cent.

Rolled silver, 10 per cent.

Prunella and cotton knittings for boots, shoes and gloves, 10 per cent.

Soap, perfumed, 30 per cent.

Wines to pay additional for each degree of strength over 26 per cent. of proof spirits, instead of 6c. for every five degrees or less, 3c.

Cologne water, etc., per gallon, \$1.90 and 30 per cent.

Steel ingots, bars, coils and sheets, railway bars, fish plates, after January 1st 1881, 10 per cent.

Glucose syrup, per pound, ½c. and 35 per cent.

Felt for boots, shoes and glove linings, 10 per cent.

Barytes, brimstone, crude chloride of lime, cream of tartar in crystals, etc., free.

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. Mr. Tilley said that these increases were necessary to meet the expenditures of the country, and such being necessary, they had been arranged so as to develop the industries of the Dominion. The majority of the people believed that with energetic and enterprising American manufacturers across the lines, Canadian manufacturers could not prosper under a low tariff. 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 recently 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 and the United States as well. 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. At all events, the Government felt they were acting in this question in the interests of Canada, which looked to the Government and to Parliament to legislate in its interests. It was all very well to make this a cheap country to live in, but if the people had no employment, low prices were useless. If we desire the Dominion to become what we expect to see it, we must not only bring people into it, but retain those already here, each of whom, according to the calculations of hon. gentlemen opposite, was worth \$1,000. At a subsequent stage the House would enter into the details of the proposals, which could then be discussed more fully, but he was satisfied that to-day the people of the country were in favour of the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite said the sun was shining on their side. If it were so, let them bask in it, but they on the Ministerial benches believed that the Policy submitted would promote prosperity and happiness to the country.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: It is an old and well known principle with persons who are engaged in teaching elocution that, on all occasions, the weaker the argument the louder the tone in which that argument should be delivered. I congratulate the Minister of Finance in having given us to-night the edifying spectacle of a Minister of Finance who, for the first time in my recollection, and my experience extends over sixteen Sessions, has found it necessary to thump his desk and shout at the top of his voice while explaining his tariff propositions. I can understand that any gentleman who has any regard at all for disinterested parties, would naturally suffer beneath the unanimous condemnation which has been heaped upon his proposition by the Press of the United States and of the Mother Country. If ever any tariff might be described as containing a perfect museum of every specimen of every legislative folly that any Legislature ever enacted, that hon. gentleman may pride himself on having brought down a practically good sample of the kind; we have taxes on food, taxes on fuel, taxes on transportation, taxes on knowledge, taxes that seem purposely designed to take the greatest amount of

money out of the pockets of the people, and to put the very smallest amount of money into the National Treasury. However, I am not going to follow my hon. friend, at this moment, through all the perplexities of his original tariff, and of the complex amendments introduced. I desire to take up one or two propositions which he advanced with respect to his own conduct in 1873. I maintain that never since Confederation had a Finance Minister so gravely violated every principle of common sense and duty as that gentleman did in 1873. And when that hon. gentleman states that he would have obtained from the then tariff a sum sufficient to meet the amount actually expended in 1874, much less the sum he proposed to expend, I take direct issue with him. He declared himself, in 1873, as his own Budget speech showed, that all the revenue he expected to get was \$21,740,000, giving, with Prince Edward Island, a total of \$22,000,000. He says that, always in former years, the Estimates had been below the sum actually received. Why so? Because he says, in former years, a very large increase had taken place in the annual importations into the country. But what was the case in 1873, as compared with 1874? Why, with the addition of Prince Edward Island, the actual quantity of goods entered for consumption, in 1874, was less by \$100,000, than that in 1873. By what process of ratiocination can that hon. gentleman maintain, when we imported \$127,500,000 in 1873, and only \$127,400,000 in 1874, a great deal of which would not have been imported but for the tariff, which I, myself, brought down, and when he knows that, under the identical tariff under which, in 1873, with a larger importation, he only collected \$12,950,000, he had any ground for expecting to receive one penny more in 1874? Every man can understand that, when we imported less in 1874 than in 1873, had the tariff remained unchanged, there was not the slightest ground for expecting the addition of a single sixpence to the revenue actually received in 1873. If the hon. gentleman chooses to look to my Budget-speech in 1875, he will see, in very minute detail, the proof that we received for Customs alone, wholly independent of the additional sum received for Inland

MR. TILLEY.

Revenue, at least \$1,300,000 more in 1874, under the operation of the tariff then brought down, than in 1873; and the hon. gentleman ought to know, if he chooses to examine the facts then brought forward, that there was not the slightest chance of our getting more than the \$22,000,000, had we not increased the tariff in April, 1874, under the operation of which at least \$2,000,000 additional was poured into the Public Treasury, giving full credit to Prince Edward Island. The terms with the Dominion, guaranteed by that hon. gentleman, resulted in a total charge to the Dominion of \$400,000 over and above what we received from that Island. For the benefit of my friends in Prince Edward Island, I may say I never, in the slightest degree, condemned the Government of Prince Edward Island for their action then. On the contrary, they showed a wise appreciation of the real position into which the hon. gentleman had brought this country, and I only wish there had been one-half as much foresight on the part of those who directed the affairs of Canada as on the part of those who managed the affairs of Prince Edward Island. As to the items which the hon. gentleman alleges were wrongly placed, the hon. gentleman had allowed the condition of the New Brunswick sections of the Intercolonial Railway to be grievously deteriorated, and then tried to cover it up by a large expenditure improperly charged to capital account, and this sum was very properly placed to the ordinary charges against the income of the year. That did not, in the slightest degree, affect the position I took. It was that the hon. gentleman himself had taken authority to expend \$23,685,000, for every penny of which I gave full details, although he had no ground for expecting to receive, even including Prince Edward Island, more than \$22,000,000 income. And, when the hon. gentleman tells us that the charges made on account of management were charges then made for the first time, I refer him to the statement in the Public Account of 1869, and signed F. Hincks, in which he will find \$110,178.46, for precisely the same items which were charged by the then Deputy Minister of Finance in making out the accounts for 1874. As to the loan the hon. gentleman made,

I take issue with him entirely. I repeat that our 4 per cents were sold at 86, and that the price in the market of the guaranteed 4 per cents, is not, and never was, a true or accurate rule as to the value of those securities. I point him to the example of his own former colleague, Sir John Rose, who, when our 5 per cents were selling at 90 per cent., succeeded in selling the guaranteed four per cents at 110, which was several per cent. above the then selling rate. I do not expect that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tilley) should have repeated that transaction; but I do say, that, when Imperial 3 per cents were at 96, as the *Economist* newspaper shows, and also shows that the selling price of 4 per cents was from 106 to 107 on the 30th November last, had the hon. gentleman used ordinary precautions, he need have had no difficulty in obtaining the figures I speak of for the guaranteed portion of our loan. The error he committed was this: He desired to float too large a portion of the ordinary bonds in connection with the guaranteed bonds. That matter had been fully discussed and investigated by Sir John Rose and myself, and we saw clearly that to attempt to float an equal proportion of the 4 per cents of our own with the 4 per cents guaranteed, would, in all probability, result in our getting a lower price than had we disposed of them separately. I was rather astonished to find my hon. friend admitting that he did not know what "floaters" were—one of the things I supposed every financier going into the London market would have fully understood. When he talks of our delay in borrowing, I may say that, with full knowledge that the fishery award was going to be paid, and with \$11,000,000 of an Imperial guarantee, and considerable funds on hand besides, I felt there was no occasion to negotiate a loan six or seven months before the money was required. Not once, but several times, have hon. gentlemen opposite made the charge that they took office with heavy liabilities overhanging them, sometimes put at fifteen, sixteen, or eighteen millions, according to the speaker, and that they had this to meet with no funds on hand. I can tell them that, with the cash on hand when we left office, the fishery award and \$11,000,000 of guaranteed

4 per cents., they had \$20,000,000 to pay \$15,000,000, and, if the Finance Minister found that a difficult task, I can tell him I should have been sorry to have had a clerk in the Finance Department capable of advancing such a statement. He talks of party feeling and party prejudice. I give him credit for not knowing what transpired in this House, when I was transacting loans, when, with barely 24 hours to do it in, I floated \$12,500,000 in 1873. Then, there was some considerable real danger, and my friends know the treatment that they and I received for my exertions on that occasion. The fact was, the press on our, the Liberal, side, were unanimous in pointing out that the position of Canada, in spite of all that hon. gentlemen opposite had said to run down our credit, was a great deal better than they had stated, and that there was no cause whatever for such detraction, and such needless and foolish language as the hon. gentlemen themselves had used for the purpose of inducing the people of Canada to believe that the financial position of the country was in danger; and it was from that cause alone that any English journal could have found the means of directing a sneer against the credit of Canada. The hon. the Finance Minister talks of bank deposits, and endeavours to cloak the misconduct of which he was guilty; in encouraging merchants to import goods in anticipation of the tariff, under the pretence that it was necessary to bolster up the credit of the banks. The credit of the banks received no assistance this way. I do not think they asked it. When he talks of placing \$800,000 or \$900,000, at 3½ to 4 per cent., in one particular bank, I would like to ask him on what principle he placed \$1,200,000 in the Montreal City and District Savings Bank within a very few days of the time he left office. He tells us that it is necessary to increase the taxation, because values are shrunk, and insinuates that the present taxation is not really an increase of the burdens of the people. But, if values have shrunk, so have the means of the people. Wages have fallen, and interest in a good many cases, rents, dividends, and all sorts of interest-paying investments have fallen off. It is absurd for the hon. gentleman to maintain that the tariff does not increase the

people's burdens. The actual fact is this: there has been a very considerable rise all over the world in the value of gold; and a great deal of the financial difficulties of our and other countries has arisen from the fact that we are obliged to provide for a very large amount of interest on indebtedness in a medium higher in value now than it was a few years ago. He tells us that 17½ per cent. was the average duty on goods imported from Great Britain, under the late tariff, and practically but 10 per cent. on goods from the United States. Of the \$46,000,000 worth imported from the United States, why could he not tell us that 25 per cent. is bought by us to sell again at a profit to our own people, and, to make a comparison ignoring that circumstance can only have the effect of utterly misleading the House and public. He tells us truly that the policy of the people of this country, for many years back—I may almost say for generations back—has been to expend enormous sums for the improvement of our canal and railway system, and the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and in every possible way to facilitate cheap transportation between this country and other lands, and yet brings down a policy deliberately directed to undo all the value of that expenditure—a policy which, after we have incurred a debt of \$150,000,000, for the purpose of enabling our people to trade freely, renders it practically impossible to carry on that trade on as profitable terms as before the tariff was introduced; and he makes our heavy obligations an excuse for rendering this outlay, practically, of very little value. He talks of the value to England of our North-West Territory. Well, I have, and always have had, a very high idea of the great value to Canada of that region. I look to its improvement and development as among the means which may enable us to withstand the pernicious effect of that tariff, and, possibly, in spite of the hon. gentleman's devices, secure us some reasonable measure of prosperity. But how do Ministers propose to promote the settlement of the North-West? There manufactures will be long in springing up, but they endeavour to weigh down its settlers by enormous additional taxation. They will not allow

the settler to buy sheep, horses, or oxen from the United States, or import the most necessary articles for breaking up the soil, where he can get them cheaply. That is the way Ministers propose to foster the development of the North-West. The hon. the Finance Minister states that the hon. member for Lambton told the people of New Brunswick that, if our Government were defeated, the people would have to pay taxes on flour, sugar, coal, and almost every necessary of life; and, if my hon. friend did say so, he proved to be one of the truest political prophets that ever existed. But, when our friends repeated these statements, we know how they were, from one end of New Brunswick to the other, denounced as imposters. Mr. Boyd, of St. John, and other gentlemen, were told there was not the slightest intention of the present Government to add to the tariff, that it was to be re-adjusted, that nothing was further from the purpose of the Government than to lay additional taxes on the necessaries of life. He complained bitterly that the people of New Brunswick were subjected, on the other hand, under the old tariff, to one fraction of a farthing per pound, per annum, on tea, but he has no compunction in inflicting an infinitely more oppressive tax on every article of food or clothing which enters into the consumption of the poorest class of the community. The hon. gentleman asked us what was the use of living in a cheap country? Well, four years hence nobody will make that enquiry or complain of Canada on that score, when this tariff shall have been in operation. But I will endeavour to explain the benefits of a cheap country. Where provisions are reasonably low, and interest is not excessive, where it is possible for a man to obtain a fair dollar's worth for a dollar's worth of wages, manufacturers are usually able to carry on their business to very great advantage. as compared with the people of the United States, where, although the artisan did get nominally higher wages, the whole effect of that increase of wages, as Mr. Wells has most admirably shown, was considerably more than neutralised by the enormous increase in the prices of those articles for which he must exchange his wages. When the hon. gentleman told us that hundreds of thousands of Cana-

dians had been forced to emigrate from this country, when he expatiated on this loss to Canada in times gone by, I could not help thinking he had forgotten to look back to the records brought down by his own Government in 1871-2, which showed that, between 1860 and 1871, when his colleagues were responsible for the well-being of Canada, nearly 500,000 Canadians left Canada to find a home in the United States, and if, as he says, every one of them was worth \$1,000, that would make, speaking roundly, a total loss of \$500,000,000.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: During the whole of which period the hon. gentleman supported the Government of which I was a member.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not all that time. I withdrew my support, finding that those terrible drains on the country were operating disastrously, and because of other matters not necessary to specify now. The hon. the Finance Minister dwelt at great length on the iniquity of a specific duty on tea, which, as I have shown, could, by no possibility, involve a cost to the people of more than about half a cent a pound per head, and yet this gentleman brings down a tariff which imposes a duty of 35 to 40 per cent. on the very coarsest articles worn by the poorest classes, and levies a duty on the most expensive broadcloth and articles used by the well-to-do classes, of only 5 per cent. The difference in cost between a single pound of the coarse material, worn by the lumberman, farmer and fisherman, and a pound of the coatings worn by men in higher stations, would be twenty-fold the difference that exercises the hon. gentleman so much in the cost of the teas consumed by the workingman under the old tariff. He attempted to show some contradiction between my argument and that of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—that the usual result of artificially stimulating manufactures is to bring a great amount of capital and an undue proportion of persons into certain industries; that, after a time, they glutted the market, and then there is seen, as in the United States, a great waste of capital, and much suffering among men engaged in employments to which the country was not suited, and, by consequence,

a sacrifice market in which people sometimes obtained goods a little cheaper than ordinarily. He forgot to add that all the competition in the world would not permanently lower the price of manufactured articles in this country. Where we have such natural advantages as enable us fairly to compete with other countries, then, no doubt, no matter what duty you put on, the ultimate cost to the people will be the natural cost of the article. Protection in one country leads ultimately to the sale of articles under cost of production. By what process do you arrive at any other result? You do not reduce the cost of commodities by violently altering the distribution of wealth. You give to some the opportunity of becoming rich, and on another, the much larger class, you inflict poverty and ruin, under the artificial stimulus supplied; and, finally, after wasting hundreds or thousands of millions you get back to the point from which you originally started, and discover that, after all said and done, there are certain classes of manufactures you cannot and never will be able to manufacture as cheaply as in those countries possessing greater natural advantages for them. The hon. gentleman deals at great length with my statement with respect to the probable loss from his proposed duty on sugar. What are the facts? We import 93,000,000lb. of the higher grades, and 10,000,000lb. of the inferior sort. Apply the new tariff to the qualities imported and used in Canada last year. On those 93,000,000lb., by his duty, we should receive a revenue of \$2,920,000. But, if that quantity was manufactured in this country, under the hon. gentleman's tariff—and it must be remembered he is going to reduce the duty on packages—the cost of sugar would not amount to 4c. per pound, as he supposes, but to only 3c. to 3½c., according to gentlemen engaged in the trade. Now, should those 93,000,000lb. be refined here and you have to import, not 15, but 10 per cent. additional, at the outset, you will find the total revenue from the quantity required to produce those 93,000,000lb. would reach \$1,842,000, and, consequently, the people of Canada will lose over \$1,000,000 a year, for no earthly purpose that I can discover, except to enable two or three

sugar-refineries to be established in various parts of the Dominion, and two or three gentlemen or companies, already well off, to put enormous annual sums into their pockets, and to waste probably as much more; because, owing to certain causes, it will be always cheaper to manufacture those sugars in other countries than in Canada. Consequently, you do not thus put into the pockets of your own people all the money you extract from the consumer, but waste probably twice as much as they obtain in the shape of profit. More than once in former years, gentlemen connected with sugar-refineries came to us and laid their complaints before us. On one occasion, as the hon. gentleman truly said, they did obtain a reduction of ¼ per cent. per pound in consequence, the proof being given us that the then American bounty—which has since been largely reduced—was operating in a way to cause great hardship to those refiners. We refused to go further, for this reason, that to have gone further would have involved us in just the results which the tariff of this hon. gentleman is going to do. Now, whichever way the hon. gentleman pleases to take it, I maintain that the loss to the people of Canada will considerably exceed \$1,000,000, but certainly will not be less. True, the loss to the revenue will not be altogether that amount; the loss to the revenue will be about half a million, and the further loss to the consumer will be another half million. That is the position, and there is no possibility for the hon. gentleman to escape from it, unless he proves that only one half the sugar now brought into Canada is refined here. But, having had some occasion to look into this question, I believe that, after a year or two of experience under the existing tariff, if not modified, every atom of sugar, or almost all, which is brought into Canada, will be brought in as refined sugar, with the exception of a little grocery sugar, and, consequently, that a serious loss will fall upon the people of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman talks of manufacturing flour in bond, as if that could be done without any inconvenience, and tells us that there will be no occasion for any officer to look after it. I did not notice—

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

and if the hon. gentleman introduced the item I beg his pardon—that he introduced, in the corrections of his tariff any item to remove that extraordinary anomaly by which he has imposed a duty of 15c. on wheat, and 50c. a barrel on flour. Does the hon. gentleman deliberately design that, if we must import flour or wheat into this country, he will give the American manufacturer, or the American miller, a bounty of 17½c. per barrel at the very lowest, in order to do away with our manufactures? If not, what does he intend to do? I can understand a duty on wheat in due proportion to that upon flour, but a heavier duty on the raw material than on the manufactured article, which deliberately discriminates against our own millers, is one of those kinds of Protection which I am sure “no fellah can understand!”

MR. MACKENZIE: There are no millers in the House.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I think there are millers enough outside to have made their views on this subject tolerably well known to the hon. gentleman, and, when we come to that item, I hope the hon. gentleman will be prepared to give us some explanation of the reasons which have led him to adopt this extraordinary anomaly. Although I disapprove his whole system, I can understand the imposition of a similar duty on flour and on wheat; but to discriminate against flour, and in favour of wheat—or against flour manufactured by ourselves—does appear to me to be a reversion of all the principles on which even this tariff of his own is based. Now, I will, later on, go through more in detail the calculations which the hon. gentleman has submitted, and on which he has based his supposition that he will receive \$2,000,000 additional revenue. At present, I desire chiefly to deal with two or three points that I think he has hardly sufficiently considered; and first of all with respect to the Excise duties. I have no objection—I suppose no hon. gentleman here has any objection—to an increase being made to the duty on whiskey, always provided that it is not raised to such a point as will promote illicit distillation. But, I find that there is very great danger, indeed, of illicit distillation increasing in Canada, under the

operation of a duty of 75c. the wine gallon. The hon. gentleman proposes increasing that one-sixth. I am afraid that his expectations of deriving any increase of duty will be disappointed. For the next six months, it is clear, from the returns, that no additional duty can be expected, and long before that time I fear he will find a largely increased number of illicit stills at work all through the country, and that, so far from his being able to recoup himself for the loss of \$200,000, or thereabouts, by the remission of the duties on beer he will run great risk of still further diminishing the revenue he now receives on the article of spirits. Then, with respect to the article of tobacco. He proposes to reduce the Excise from 10c. per pound on Canadian grown tobacco, to 4c. Now, it may be possible that no Canadian tobacco can be grown in Ontario, or Canada, which will enter extensively into consumption; but, on the other hand, if we are to judge from the reports that have reached us at various times, from certain parts of Western Canada, the proposition of discriminating so very heavily in favour of native grown tobacco is of doubtful expediency. As we derive about \$1,600,000 of our revenue from tobacco alone, I leave the House to consider for themselves how very grave and serious would be the consequences if any considerable quantity of tobacco should be grown in Western Canada, and prove to be fit for ordinary consumption. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will find that he is running very considerable risk in this respect, although it will require some little time to develop the result. If I recollect right the state of things in two or three of those Western constituencies in former years, very considerable progress had been made in the production of an article of tobacco which compared tolerably well with the coarser grades we are now in the habit of importing. How far the hon. gentleman is correct in the computation he has now submitted, is a more difficult matter to determine. He did not state to us definitely, and I would be very much obliged, if he has the material, if he would state now, what were the total quantities of goods at present imported into Canada, which he supposes will, in the course of the next year or two, be

manufactured here, under the operations of his tariff? That statement was never made in a definite form, although in one or two places he stated it with regard to two articles, of which he thought \$2,000,000 worth might be manufactured. May I ask, has the hon. gentleman got any definite information or calculations on that very important point?

MR. TILLEY: I have stated my calculations are made on the probable increase of the manufactures here, and, of course, losing the duty on them, and then taking into account the increased duty upon the balance.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Can the hon. gentleman state roughly how many millions of goods now imported he expects will be manufactured?

MR. TILLEY: I take them all separately.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I suppose the hon. gentleman has not ventured to make such a computation.

MR. TILLEY: I gave the items separately.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not in all cases; he gave it separately in the case of cottons, and in the case of woollens, and in the case of iron and steel, but not, as far as I recollect, for them all collectively. Of course, I would not attach, nor would I expect the hon. gentleman to attach, any great importance to this, but I think I am well within bounds in saying that the hon. gentleman himself can hardly expect more than \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 worth of goods, at any rate, would be manufactured under the operation of his new tariff. So far as I can trace the calculations he made, the hon. gentleman opposite appeared to be under the impression that \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 would represent the total quantity of goods which could be manufactured in Canada under the operation of this tariff. Now, what I desire to call the attention of the House to, particularly, is this: the extremely small number of people who can, by any possibility, be employed, even under such a revolutionary tariff as that which the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

If he be correct, or if I be correct, in supposing that from \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 worth of goods will be manufactured under this tariff, he may rely upon it that his calculations of revenue will come very far short of the amount he expects to realise, and all that could be looked for would be the giving of employment, at the outside, to some five or six thousand factory hands, because the statistics of all countries show that that number of hands is more than sufficient to produce \$10,000,000 worth of articles. We are to have all the trade and business of this country revolutionised; we are to have, to take but one illustration alone, the lumber interest of this country, employing from 45,000 to 50,000 men, with their families depending on them,—we are to have this interest put in the greatest peril, because it is impossible to conceal from the House that the imposition of a further burden of 30c. or 40c. or 50c. per thousand on the manufacture of lumber will go very far to give that great industry its death-blow for the time being. Those who know how much the depression in Canada resulted from the depression which unfortunately overtook the lumber interest know how all-important it would be that, if it were in the power of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues to give prosperity to any industry, they should give it to the lumber interest. They can understand, from that illustration alone, how exceedingly trifling all the benefits which are proposed to be secured under this tariff are, compared with the enormous mischiefs which will result from its operation. What is true of the lumbermen is true of the fishing interest, and of the transportation interests, and, as the agriculturists will find, true of their own interest also. It would be out of place to-night, because we have not yet got the emendations of the hon. gentleman—we have only heard his calculations—it would be out of place to go into minute details and see what an enormous sum of money is going to be taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada, for the sake of bringing in these \$2,000,000 of revenue, even if he succeeds in getting them; but this I will say, taking the goods we imported last year, ending June 30, 1878, and applying

this tariff, that is now brought down, to those goods which were then brought into the country, you will find that the loss to the people of Canada would range from \$6,000,000 to even \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000, that we are going to tax the people four-fold for every penny which it is proposed to raise as revenue ; and I repeat again, for what? Not for the creation of great industries which will give employment to many thousands of people, but for the creation of industries which will, at the outside, give employment to but 5,000 or 6,000 persons, will, perhaps, lead to the establishment of a dozen more factories, and, at the same time, will oppress grievously several most important industries, involving the individual interests, perhaps, of ten-fold the number of people who can, by any possibility, be benefitted by the propositions now before us. The hon. gentleman speaks of his reluctance to do anything that can injure the people of England. Well, I am bound to suppose that the hon. gentleman does not desire, and that no hon. gentleman in this House desires, to do anything which would imperil our connection with the Mother Country ; but you have only to look at the American press, and at the English press, to see what is the opinion of the leaders of public opinion on that point, in the country which is likely to be affected by it. We know that, for a long time, there have been a number of people in England who have felt that, burdened as they are with many heavy obligations, it was rather hard to be called upon to maintain the police of the seas in our interest, and to perform many other things popularly supposed to belong to a central Government, and yet to find, at the same time, their manufacturers excluded by their own colonies, at the very instant when they are themselves doing the utmost possible to promote trade with the colonies. And I can tell the hon. gentleman that he may rely that, when the people of England come to understand the exact operation of this tariff, he will find, whether he intends it or not, that he has gone a great step towards inducing them to look with complacency on any proposition which will relieve them from the burden of our defence. There is no use in pursuing the ostrich-like policy of shutting our

eyes to the manifest political dangers which are apparent in the course we are called upon to take. I do not condemn, to the same extent, his policy as regards the Americans, and I admit they have always shown themselves very selfish in all matters of trade policy, but I warn him that he is exposing great and important interests, in thus rashly throwing down the gauntlet to 44,000,000 of our best customers. And, when, in addition to that, we consider the most striking feature of his policy, the fact that he has given serious and grievous offence to a large number of persons who do much to mould public opinion in England, he will see, and the House will see, I cannot go one step too far in warning him that the greatest possible perils lurk in these propositions. As, Sir, later on we will have an opportunity of going into detail and of showing the crudities, the inconsistencies and the absurdities with which this tariff abounds, I will say no more at present ; but I still hope, in spite of the more than half intimation of the hon. gentleman, that, long before the tariff has reached its final stage, he will see occasion very materially to modify some of the most exceptionable and objectionable provisions which this tariff contains.

MR. MACKENZIE asked the hon. the Finance Minister if his amended proposals were brought in the shape of a new resolution to be printed in the Minutes?

MR. TILLEY : No, I merely gave notice.

MR. MACKENZIE : Will it be printed in the Minutes as a notice tomorrow?

MR. TILLEY : I can have them printed and distributed, though I do not know that it is necessary to have them distributed.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he would like to make a suggestion. It was a matter of the greatest importance that the country should be put in possession of the fullest information as to the working of this tariff. Hitherto, only a meagre statement had been published in the *Gazette*, giving a few of the leading articles. He would suggest, in future,

now that all these articles were put on different lists, that they should all be published in the *Gazette*. The cost would be trifling, and the importance to the country very great. In fact, he thought such a statement as was usually furnished to the Customs Department should be published, as in England, in a detailed form.

MR. PLUMB said it had not been his intention to address the House at this late hour of the night, but, after what had just been said by the hon. member for Centre Huron, he did not think the rash and reckless statements made by that hon. gentleman should be allowed to pass unchallenged. That gentleman had accused the hon. the Finance Minister of addressing this House in an excited manner, of thumping his desk, as he expressed it. He (Mr. Plumb) had never been more impressed in his life than he was by the calm and statesmanlike manner in which that hon. gentleman had addressed the House in exposition of his tariff policy. He had been astonished at the hon. gentleman's calmness, considering the provocation that he had received when he was not upon the floor of the House to answer for himself. He had been surprised at the manner in which he ignored the vile attacks that had been made upon his policy, and addressed himself to the business before the House, as every Finance Minister ought to do; for he (Mr. Plumb) considered that it was not proper for a Finance Minister to indulge in violent harangues, and he could not avoid drawing a contrast between his hon. friend's presentation of his facts, and the shriek, as he might call it, which they heard in 1874, when his predecessor made his Budget speech. Everyone remembered the tirade of abuse then heaped upon that gentleman's predecessors, and the extravagant statements which he made in regard to the financial position and liabilities of the country. He said, then, that he regretted there was no one upon the floor of the House to answer him, though he (Mr. Plumb) considered that he was able to answer by the present Minister of Public Works. He (Mr. Plumb) had ventured to say, last year, that the time would come when the hon. gentleman would probably stand face to face with

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

the gentleman whom he had so misrepresented and maligned, and that his statements would be answered. They had been answered; though he was not at all surprised that they had not convinced hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, for they did not want to be convinced. He (Mr. Plumb) had been an attentive reader of the newspaper in the Province of Ontario which shaped the policy of the Reform party, which was, in regard to that party, the power behind the throne, which was greater than the throne itself. The country had been told by that paper, immediately before the election, that the Grits would gain 13 seats in Ontario; three days after the election they were told that the prices of property had not been advanced. The next day it complained that the tariff had not been announced; a few days after this, they were told that one of the clerks in the public offices could prepare a tariff in a few hours; and so he could, if it was one similar to that introduced by the late Finance Minister, who proposed to increase the 15 per cent. list to 16½ per cent., because, he said, all they would have to do then would be to divide one hundred by six and it would be all right, forgetting all the mines that would follow, and that a hundred could not be divided by six. Then he made a sort of horizontal tariff of 17½ per cent., and now he said there was something so sacred in that, that if it were meddled with no one could tell what would happen.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The skies are to fall.

MR. PLUMB said we were to sever our connections with England, and the United States were to bring reprisals to bear upon us if we meddled with that sacred 17½ per cent. Anyone who knew the condition of Canada during the last few years would have known that the struggling people were holding out their hands and imploring the Government to act with the view to revive the depressed and dying industries of the country, and that they on the then Opposition side of the House would have been willing to sacrifice any political advantage in order to sustain the late Government in giving relief to the country. But the party lately in

power were first made mad and then destroyed ; and two men who were more responsible for this condition of things and for the ruin of their party than any others were the hon. gentleman who had just addressed the House (Mr. Cartwright) and the power behind the throne, who, on the eve of the elections, assured his party that there was absolute certainty, not only that the late Government would be sustained, but that it would be greatly strengthened, and so misled his friends and aided the Conservative party in securing their recent triumph. And this gentleman, who had accumulated a deficit of \$7,000,000 in four years, talked about the injury the credit of the country had sustained at the hands of the Conservatives ; he who, in his first Budget speech, had done everything in his power, by the manner in which he presented the affairs of the country, in his desire to bring obloquy on his predecessors, to destroy confidence in the public credit, and who had been repeating his statements in his picnic harangues, when he was not restrained by the trammels of debate in this House. The hon. gentleman had permitted deficit upon deficit to accumulate, without provision to meet them, and, at last, in endeavouring to secure the triumph of his party, he allowed the most favourable occasion to pass, when a great portion of the public debt was falling due, at a critical moment, without making provision for its payment. In the month of June, after the close of the Berlin Conference, when money was a drug on the London market, that was the time to obtain the money required. His hon. friend on the other side of the House had said that we did not then need the money, and yet that same hon. gentleman, in November, 1876, made a 4 per cent. loan, and said the time was so critical that, if he had not made it then, there would have been a difference of several per cent. Fancy a financier talking about a difference of several per cent., but it only showed the recklessness of speech that characterised the hon. gentleman. And it would be found that he did not want the money till the next summer. The payments were scattered from November till the following July ; it was a 4 per cent. loan, and the hon. gentleman got net 87½ per cent. for it, at a time when money was a drug in Eng-

land, at less than 1 per cent. interest. But, when they brought up the case of Australia and other countries, which had negotiated loans on more favourable terms, the hon. gentleman laughed at them, but now he brought in the same argument himself in attacking the Finance Minister. The Conservative party had always been willing to take the chances of a fair public competition, such as that to which the late loan had been submitted. The hon. gentleman opposite said he had lost his election by rushing about the country in order to secure the election of his friends, and he saw by one of the papers published in the Maritime Provinces that he was asked to go down there to show himself. He went, but it was a most unprofitable exhibition for his party. They saw the hon. gentleman face to face, and the result of the elections in Nova Scotia might be regarded as some test of the appreciation with which the public there regarded the exhibition. As to the loan, whatever it had cost the country, as compared with other loans, was due to the fact that the late Finance Minister had not made it at the time when foreign loans had fallen into discredit, and when it was therefore a favourable crisis for us. He (Mr. Plumb) could not understand why the hon. gentleman insisted that the present Finance Minister should have used a larger amount of the Imperial guarantee. We did not know what times we were coming to. The 4 per cent. guaranteed loan, unused, was equal to gold in our coffers, and we ought not to use it more than was absolutely necessary. The Finance Minister, however, could not avoid using some portion of it. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) spoke of negotiating the loan himself after the election. He could not have raised a loan after the 17th September. His Government was moribund, and all it had to do was to wrap its robes about itself decently, and to die. After that date, no capitalist in London would have received a proposition from the late Finance Minister, after the overthrow of his Government. His (Mr. Plumb's) hon. friend the present Finance Minister was forced, by this gross neglect of duty, to go into the English market at one of the most terrible mone-

tary crises that had ever occurred. The failure of the City of Glasgow Bank, in the first instance, had given a shock to public credit such as had seldom been known in England, and the consequences of the unlimited liability of shareholders had proved so disastrous that they could scarcely be measured in figures or described in words. Following that came the failure of the West of England Bank, and he was informed that gentlemen who were prepared to bid for the Canadian loan were afraid to do so, and consequently only about half was taken up on the first day. It must be remembered that it was on the morning of that day that the news of the second disaster came on the Stock Exchange, and paralysed it. He thought that, under all the circumstances, his hon. friend the Finance Minister was to be congratulated on the success of the loan he made on that occasion. He (Mr. Plumb) thought it showed that the credit of Canada stood upon too firm a basis to be injured by any political or financial charlatan. Now they heard that the tariff was introduced to ruin the manufacturers, to destroy the labouring classes, and to utterly ruin the farmers. At all events, it was introduced by gentlemen who had had some experience in public affairs, who had been returned by majorities which showed that the community had confidence in them, and yet it was said they were about to commit political suicide by bringing in this tariff of abominations, or, as the late Finance Minister called it, this tariff of rings. It would be found, however, that this tariff would add enough to the public revenue to make up the deficit which stared his hon. friend in the face when he took charge of the Finance Department. He was bound to deal with that unless he chose to be a fly on the wheel, like those who had lately been brushed off.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: So much the better for the public weal.

MR. PLUMB said, but for the lateness of the hour, he should be glad to discuss this tariff in its details. It was only going back to the position which we held some years ago in relation to the United States, when we could sell them every-

MR. PLUMB.

thing and they could sell nothing to us; but it could not be expected that the Opposition would change front at this late hour. They were fully committed by their leader in Ontario to a blind rejection of any scheme which the present Government might propose. They had been committed to their present course in advance, committed to it blindly, and they dared not recede from their position, although they knew that it might cost them their political lives. Many of them knew that they were rushing upon certain destruction, a few were wedded to a theory which was utterly opposed to the practical needs of the country. No argument could be addressed to them with the least hope of modifying their inveterate prejudices. Prominent among these was the hon. member for Bothwell, the philosopher who had need to summon all his philosophy to enable him to bear the fearful reverse which had befallen him, and to bid a long farewell to all his greatness. His pet theories had been refuted a hundred times; but he returned to them with the obstinate persistency with which a hen went back to the profitable occupation of sitting on a nest-egg of china or of chalk. No matter how absurd and contradictory were the arguments of the gentlemen opposite, they seemed to be accepted with perfect complacency by their associates; but at every struggle they sank deeper and deeper into the mire, and they, on his side, could well afford to look on with amusement, as they certainly did without serious anxiety. Prior to 1874, a 15 per cent. duty on the general list was sufficient for revenue, and we did not require anything for Protection. That was the position of affairs when hon. gentlemen opposite entered upon their brief career of office. We had a large surplus, the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite having managed the affairs of the country with an amount of prudence and economy which would contrast most favourably with the recklessness of the past five years. At that time we had a surplus, and our credit was upon a firm basis. Now we had had five years of the rule of the gentlemen on the other side of the house. He was glad we had. He had said that a little healthy

adversity would not do his party any harm, and now that the country had learned to measure the practices of hon. gentlemen by their professions, they found a tremendous shrinkage and a vast difference between one and the other. In the management of the Department now presided over by his hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), he had learned from the late Government how not to do it. They had the Pacific Railway with already half the amount expended on it, for which the previous Government proposed to build the whole road—with 110 miles running into the wilderness in one direction, and 109 miles running into the wilderness in another direction, and a gap of 184 miles between the two, without any attempt being made to fill it up, while millions were expended there which produced no interest, and were not likely to do so for some years to come. Had it not been for the enterprising firm of Kitson & Co., emigrants would not have been able to get to Winnipeg at all. He heard constantly that their friends across the border had been ruined by the tariff. He did not defend their fiscal arrangements, for he never had approved of the high tariff which was adopted in 1861. Under the tariff of 1846 and 1847, which was referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which he called a Free-trade tariff, and which ranged from 25 to 100 per cent., the country was in a highly prosperous condition. That tariff was repealed in 1857, and, during the time of its existence, the country redeemed the whole of their public debt at an enormous premium. He maintained that the financial distress of the United States had not arisen from their protective system. The close of the war was a period of enormous inflation. Enormous profits were made by shoddy contractors and others, who were flushed with success, and in consequence every kind of industry was stimulated. The crash was inevitable, and the successful speculators opposed the resumption of specie payments, preferring an inflated paper currency. He had a letter from a gentleman who was a great authority on financial questions in the United States.

Mr. ANGLIN: Who is the writer?

Mr. PLUMB said he was the editor of the Albany *Evening Journal*, Mr. George Dawson, who was one of the first political writers, if not in the United States, at least in the State of New York. He had another letter from a gentleman who had been the greater part of his life a near neighbour of his hon. friend the First Minister. He said this tariff was universally popular amongst farmers, and that some of the leading ones who had hitherto professed opposite views, were, a little ashamed to own the fact. He would not be at all surprised if that was the case with many others. He would reserve an opportunity of addressing the House again on the subject, and of bringing forward other facts which he was not prepared to produce at this moment, when he trusted he would receive the same kind indulgence he had received on the present occasion.

Mr. KILLAM said he would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Finance for the information he had promised regarding drawbacks upon articles which were to enter into the construction of ships and the manufacture of other articles in the Dominion. Although they were very much pleased with his speech, yet there was some practical information which they required, and which he promised to give them, which they had not yet received. If the hon. gentleman, according to his promise, would enlighten them on the way in which he proposed to pay his drawbacks out of this taxation, they would be glad to know the amount of the different drawbacks.

Mr. TILLEY: This is a question which is at once difficult and not difficult. The principle may be plainly stated in this way: Anything manufactured in the country in which the article is imported, and pays duty—I think, generally speaking, we may say that that duty, upon the article being exported, would be refunded. We will take sewing machines, for instance. Many of the materials used in their manufacture pay 17½ per cent. Needles also go with the sewing-machines. When these machines are exported, upon satisfactory proof being given a drawback would be allowed to the extent of the duty paid. With reference to ships, there is one difficulty

in the application of that principle, and I think it will be necessary to make some regulation with regard to this branch. In the matter of sails we would have to exercise discretion, because we might deprive our own people of legitimate employment. The general principle will be that in case of any article imported and entering into manufacture, being exported and which has paid duty, that duty will be refunded if satisfactory evidence of its payment be given.

MR. KILLAM: I should like to know, and some gentlemen interested in the manufacture of ships in the hon. gentleman's own Province would like to know, whether the duty is to be refunded not only on the articles which have paid duty, but on other articles which might have paid duty had they been imported. I understood my hon. friend to convey that idea, and many shipbuilders understand that to be the case. They understood that some sort of drawback is to be given on all articles used in the construction of ships, equal to the duty paid on all articles imported entering into their construction. Does that apply to every ship built in the country, whatever its tonnage, or whatever its use? In what manner will this drawback be given? Are we to show when a ship was launched, or sent out of the country, that certain articles in her paid duties, or will a specific duty per ton be returned on the vessel? Will this be done by an Order in Council, from time to time, or by a law of the country, and will the hon. gentleman include it in these resolutions?

MR. TILLEY: My hon. friend is of an enquiring mind, and when he rose I thought he was seeking information, but he seemed to be making rather a criticism on the resolutions. No one could suppose that on articles made in the country, and which, if imported, would be charged duty, an amount equivalent to that duty would be refunded. The intention of the Government is that everything that enters into an export which paid a duty on the import of the raw material, the duty will be refunded. All descriptions of vessels, whether built and sent out of the country, whether they never returned, or navi-

MR. TILLEY.

gated our inland waters, will be served alike, except in the case of steamboats, whose machinery will not come under this head. The mode of returning this drawback has not yet been decided.

MR. MILLS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Government business should have precedence immediately after Routine Proceedings on Thursdays during the remainder of the Session.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Ten minutes before
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 27th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read *the first time* :—

Bill (No. 63) To grant certain powers to La Société Permanente de Construction d'Iberville. —(Mr. Mousseau.)

NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

FIRST READING.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) introduced a Bill (No. 64) To amend the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 57, respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.

MR. MACKENZIE asked the mover to explain the Bill. It was a Bill, as he supposed, promoted by certain stockholders. He would like to know.

MR. WHITE said it was intended to increase the number of directors in the interest of the stockholders.

MR. MACKENZIE said that was what he had supposed, and he desired to call the attention of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government to this Bill. It was well known that the Northern Railway Company, so far as the stockholders were concerned in its management, was many years ago practically obliterated. They still, however, retained a fair representation on the Board of Directors, but the English bondholders were given the same voice in the affairs of the company as the shareholders. As they represented almost the entire capital of the company, they elected a large proportion of the directors. The late Government were obliged to take measures and make legislation to enforce the rights of the Crown against that company. They had obtained a final settlement, and the bondholders had, since then, raised enough money to complete their undertaking. This was a Bill to interfere in the internal economy of that company in defiance of the rights of the great mass of persons who had put their money into it, relying on the good faith of Parliament, and he felt it incumbent upon him to say that such interference would be extremely mischievous. This was not only a wrong, but a violation of a solemn compact made by the Government with the English bondholders, and would tend seriously to injure the credit of Canada in the English market, and to seriously affect the credit of every company that went to that market to raise money for any public enterprise. Although it was not usual to offer serious objection to a Bill on its first reading, yet he felt bound to do so in the present case, because the Bill was a mischievous one, and an unwarranted interference in view of the facts of the case.

MR. JONES (South Leeds) said the Bill had better be discussed before the Railway Committee.

MR. ROBINSON said the hon. gentleman knew, when he said that the stock of the Northern Railway was obliterated, that he had no fact to give in support of his assertion.

MR. MACKENZIE said that what he had stated was that it was practically obliterated in relation to giving the stock-

holders the control of the company, as it had passed into the hands of the bondholders by the act of the Legislature.

MR. ROBINSON said he 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. A proposition was made to them, and their agent, Mr. Cumberland, went to England and induced the bondholders to invest another £250,000, in order that they might receive dividends on the £250,000 previously invested. He remembered perfectly well, for he was then connected with the road, that the shareholders were equally anxious with the bondholders to take the same action. He was one of a deputation to the Government on the question as to whether the road should be put up to auction or not. He would like to ask the hon. member for Lambton, who now appeared in the interest of the bondholders, a question.

MR. MACKENZIE: Order. I desire to say that no bondholder ever approached me in any shape on the subject, good, bad or indifferent. I am moving in the public interest.

MR. ROBINSON said he might be wrong, but did the hon. gentleman know of any other road in England, the United States, or Canada where, after the bondholders had received their interest, the management and control of the road remained in their hands? The bondholders in this case obtained their interest, 6 per cent., and it seemed to the stockholders very hard that this state of things should continue to exist. The shareholders could get nothing until the dividends of the bondholders were paid; but was it reasonable that, after the interest of the bondholders was paid, the shareholders should get no interest whatever? This Bill was intended to remedy the present

state of things, and he appealed to the sense of fairness of the hon. gentleman in this relation. It was in order that these facts might be brought before the Railway Committee that the shareholders appealed to the justice of the House. The hon. member for Lambton had spoken as if the shareholders had no rights in the company. The petition presented to the House for the present Bill was signed by those who represented from \$250,000 to \$300,000 of stock. He was perfectly satisfied that two-thirds of those interested in the road resident in Toronto and Simcoe would support the petition in favour of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he cordially agreed with everything that the hon. leader of the Opposition had stated as to the inadvisability, as a general rule, of interfering in any way with the privileges of bondholders, who advanced their money under a certain state of the law, without their consent, and there was still greater objection to doing this against their positive remonstrances. No doubt the hon. gentleman's statements would be considered fully before the Committee on Railways. It was alleged that, so long as the bondholders got interest, that was all that they cared for, and that the shareholders had no chance whatever of securing any return or dividend in any way. One could quit; understand that it was a very comfortable thing for the bondholders to have a nice road with the interest on their bonds sure, while, as the shareholders alleged, the road was run on an expensive English system. Such was the allegation of the shareholders, and it would have to be examined by the Committee. If, however, it were proved that the road had been managed extravagantly, and that, if it were conducted on more economical principles, there would be a residuum left, the appointment of an additional shareholders' director would not help the shareholders much if they were still in the minority. He did not at all mean to say that Parliament should sacrifice the interests of either class; but he did believe that the matter could safely be sent to the Railway Committee, which would hear statements on both sides.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said that, as the Government of Canada had a claim of
Mr. ROBINSON.

something over three millions against the road, the shareholders were not entitled to come before this House as if it was really their own money that had been sacrificed.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he knew nothing about the road since it was the business of the late Government to investigate its affairs, which they had done thoroughly. What he was anxious about now was this, that, since the settlement had been arrived at, the English bondholders had invested a large amount of their means in order to complete the undertaking, and it would be a mistake for this Parliament to interfere now, even to redress alleged wrongs. The county of Simcoe had now a director, which was more than it was entitled to, according to the amount of money it had invested. He believed the Canadian shareholders had now directors enough, and surely the First Minister did not mean that he would give any assistance to a scheme to enable the minority to outvote the majority. If such legislation was had, it would make our country a by-word and a reproach to the English money-holder.

Mr. GUTHRIE said he thought, if the private shareholders had possessed a larger degree of control over the affairs of the company their revenues would not have been wasted in the way they had been. The only care of the management, at least up to two years ago, seemed to be to pay the bondholders, and keep up the road in good condition, and then scatter the balance in any way and every way, in champagne, helping political friends, etc. No one could dispute the position now taken by the hon. member for Lambton. On the strength of the settlement of two years ago, money had been obtained in large amounts from the English markets, and it would be against the interests of Canada to interfere and to re-open the question now.

Bill read the first time.

QUEBEC GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
INCORPORATION BILL.

(*Mr. Fortin.*)

FIRST READING.

Mr. FORTIN introduced a Bill (No. 65) To incorporate the Geographical

Society of Quebec. He said that this Society might have applied to the Quebec Legislature for an Act of incorporation; but, as the Local Legislature did not go beyond Provincial matters, whilst this House transacted business respecting the whole Dominion, and even the whole world, it had been thought proper to apply to this House for an Act of incorporation; for it would be well understood that a Geographical Society of this kind did not confine itself exclusively to the study of the geography of the Province, but rather embraced the whole country and the whole world, so as to extend and facilitate commercial and diplomatic relations between our own country and the neighbouring countries, as well as the other nations of the globe. The Quebec Geographical Society was already affiliated to some foreign societies, whose bulletins it received, and with which it was in constant communication, namely: The New York Society, the Royal Society of London, the Societies of Paris, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Bremen, and St. Petersburg. The Quebec Geographical Society had, therefore, thought fit to apply to this Parliament for an Act of incorporation. Since the scope of the Society was general, since its aim had reference not only to one Province, but to the whole country, they had thought that this House would not refuse an Act of incorporation. On the other hand, they had thought that, if they applied to the Quebec Legislature, the Act of incorporation would have been refused, as the Society's field of labours was not limited by the Province, but extended over the whole Dominion. He thought that there would be no objection raised to the introduction of this Bill.

Mr. CASGRAIN said he believed that his hon. friend should have applied to the Local Legislature in order to obtain an Act of incorporation for this Society. The Quebec Legislature had full powers in this matter, as it was merely a civil right, an ordinary incorporation of a scientific society that was asked for by the hon. member, and he did not think that he could go out of the Province to ask for it. He confounded the right to incorporate with the extending of the operations of the Society to the whole Dominion, which seemed to be

contemplated. He did not oppose the Bill or its contents; the Bill in itself was good and praiseworthy, but he thought that the hon. member was mistaken in asking this House for an Act of incorporation. He would have done better to apply directly to the Quebec Legislature.

Bill read the first time.

WORKING OF THE SUPERANNUATION ACT.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

SIR JOHN A. 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; the Committee to be composed of the following members, namely:— Messrs. Costigan, Cimon, Cameron (South Huron,) Geoffrion, Mills, Plumb, Ryan, Richey, Wallace (South Norfolk)."

Motion agreed to.

RECEIVER-GENERAL AND MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS BILL.

(*Mr. Tupper.*)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the offices of Receiver-General and Minister of Public Works.

(*In the Committee.*)

Resolutions *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolutions *reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.*

Mr. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 66) Respecting the offices of Receiver-General and Minister of Public Works.

Bill read the first time.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS BILL.

(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider certain proposed resolutions on the subject of Census and Statistics.

(In the Committee.)

MR. MACKENZIE said it was unfortunate the two subjects were mixed together, the taking of the next census, and the general power of a very extraordinary character contained in the few clauses with reference to gathering statistics. There was nothing in the Bill about the mode in which those statistics were to be collected. He hoped the hon. gentleman would introduce a separate Bill for statistics. In one of the clauses, the Criminal Statistics Act, which had worked tolerably well, was repealed. He would like to have the reasons given for repealing it.

MR. POPE (Compton) said the two were practically separate. It was only taking power to commence the operation and some must be taken, before any system could be carried out. In beginning a thing, this was the proper system to take.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, in the Speech from the Throne, allusion was made to the taking of the census, and the collection of vital, criminal and general statistics. The two subjects were cognate. The statistics could be conveniently collected at the same time, and by the same officers, as the census. It might be found well, before they got through, to divide this subject into two Acts of Parliament. One of the resolutions provided specially for that. The 4th resolution provided that the salaries should be provided for in any Act authorising the collection of statistics. There was nothing in passing these resolutions to prevent the subject being divided hereafter by way of Act.

MR. MACKENZIE said, while he pressed the objection to the two subjects being combined, he wished to point out the extraordinary authority taken. The Minister of Agricul-

MR. TUPPER.

ture might, from time to time, make such regulations as appeared necessary, for the purpose of collecting, abstracting, tabulating and publishing—that was, the entire work of preparing vital statistics. No further explanation was given, or plan provided. It was a serious matter collecting the census returns, and Parliament had always been jealous of confiding extensive authority to any Minister or Government. The full plan should be laid before the House before authority was taken. Suppose the Governor-General in Council, before the Session ended, decided upon a system of vital statistics collection, and that Ministers brought down a vote of \$100,000, and distributed it as they pleased according to this Bill? There was no kind of restriction; Parliament had not to be consulted about the mode of obtaining this information. He (Mr. Mackenzie) was quite willing, if the House and country desired this undertaking, to discuss the matter with a view to making it as thorough and complete as possible. He doubted himself, however, whether they should enter upon the collection of vital statistics further than gathering what could be obtained under existing Provincial laws. He doubted whether they had any right otherwise to deal with the subject; but he did not think it was fair to ask the House to give the Government such extensive powers as the Bill proposed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said objection was taken to a Bill not yet before the House. They were considering only resolutions with a view to a Bill in relation to the census. The hon. gentleman's suggestions, however, were worthy of, and should receive, consideration. The resolutions might be allowed to pass, and the hon. gentleman could discuss the Bill to be founded on them.

Resolutions *ordered* to be reported.House *resumed*.Resolutions *reported*.

MR. POPE (Compton), introduced a Bill (No. 67) Respecting Census and Statistics.

Bill *read the first time*.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND THE TARIFF.

QUESTION.

MR. MACKENZIE: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the hon. the Finance Minister a question, of which I gave him notice privately. The tariff resolutions are silent as to the treatment to be accorded to Newfoundland fish. I would be glad of some information on that subject.

MR. TILLEY: I may say that our Government are at present in telegraphic communication with that Island on the subject, and have been for two or three days, and, as soon as any decision has been arrived at, we will be happy to communicate it. Our propositions will depend somewhat upon the result of those communications.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion to agree to the resolutions relative to the duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th).

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said that, if anything were wanting to satisfy his mind that the resolutions submitted to the House by the hon. the Finance Minister were not popular, that want would be supplied by the speech delivered last night by the hon. gentleman. He thought he could see, in the countenance of the hon. gentleman, traces, clear and unmistakable, that the mighty wave that rolled over the country on the 17th September last, and which floated himself and colleagues to the Treasury benches, was gradually receding, and that the sound second thought of the people was beginning to assert itself. He thought he could also notice that the countenance of the hon. the Finance Minister, usually "child-like and bland," was last night worn, weary, and sad-looking, showing that he was beginning to realise fully and thoroughly, that dealing with the tariff in the wholesale and revolutionary manner proposed, was not the most agreeable and pleasant occupation in life. He thought he could perceive, in the face of

that hon. gentleman, when his (Mr. Cameron's) esteemed friends from West Middlesex and North Oxford (Messrs. Ross and Oliver) were speaking, and driving home point after point, and indicating inconsistency after inconsistency in the tariff propositions, clear indications that those points and remarks were telling forcibly on the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Cameron) fancied he could observe, from the uneasy attitude of the Finance Minister in his place in the House, and from the large drops of perspiration that were gradually rolling down his face, that the points made by his hon. friends were beginning to tell, unmistakably, on the mind and body of that hon. gentleman. He thought he could see traces clear and certain in the otherwise jaunty air of the hon. gentleman, that the numberless telegrams, petitions and deputations that had disturbed his peace during the last two weeks were beginning to make an impression on his physical frame; and no wonder, for his steps had been dogged from his home to his office, and again from his office to his home, by importunate complainants of the hon. gentleman's propositions; and they all knew that the corridors leading to his office had been to-day crowded with anxious and persistent delegations, urging changes in this model tariff. One thing was manifestly clear, that, if the tariff had done no other good, it had proved a mighty source of revenue to the telegraph, railways and hotels. At the hotel where he stopped it was impossible to find accommodation for one-half the delegates here, from the east and west, the north and the south, opposing the tariff. He did not wonder that the hon. gentleman looked weary, worn and sad, considering the burden he had carried, and of which he must long to be relieved. He (Mr. Cameron) was a little surprised at the Finance Minister's line of argument. Usually careful and calm and deliberate, as became a Canadian statesman, last night he became passionate and violent, and gesticulated considerably. He appeared to have forgotten the injunction of the Royal Dane to the actors: "Not to saw the air too much." Last night the hon. gentleman, usually so placid and calm, became violent and a little personal, even passionate, and must again have forgotten

the advice of the same Royal Dane to the actors: "Not to tear a passion to tatters, to very rags." He pitched into hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House in a measure somewhat refreshing; but, apart from this, some of his observations appeared to him (Mr. Cameron) of the most extraordinary character. He had listened to the same style of arguments in the log school-houses in the back concessions, but some of his arguments were worthy of that region, and of that regional nature—were certainly unworthy of the position that hon. gentleman occupied in this House and the country. When he found a Finance Minister of his reputation gravely telling Parliament, in so many words, that the exporter paid the duty on exports, and that the balance of trade was always a sure indication of the prosperity or depression of a country, and telling Parliament that he proposed taking out of the United States the larger portion of the \$2,400,000 wanted, he began to think he was not in Parliament at all, but with his hon. friend discussing the question in the constituency of South Huron. The hon. gentleman made some of the most extraordinary statements he (Mr. Cameron) had ever heard in Parliament. For instance, he stated that he wanted to get some revenue from the duty of 7½c. a bushel on corn. Perhaps his expectations would be realised. At the same time, he remarked that he had just received a letter from a friend in New Brunswick, stating that an American firm had offered to sell corn-meal in New Brunswick at 35c. per barrel less than before the introduction of the tariff. Did it strike the hon. gentleman, before he made that statement, that if, by putting 7½c. a bushel on American corn, he could reduce the price of corn meal by 35c. per barrel, he ought to have put on 15c. a bushel and reduced the price per barrel 70c. ? It was one of the stock arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite during the canvass, before the fall elections, that putting a duty on oats would benefit the Canadian farmer. But the hon. gentleman told them last night, however, that it was not going to benefit him, because they all knew that the larger portion of the oats imported was to be made into meal and exported to the Mother Country, and that they could import in

bond without paying any duty. Would he tell the House and the country, if the duty of 10c. a bushel on oats would not increase the price to the farmer—and it could not if they were bonded, ground into meal and exported—what advantage would accrue to the farmers from the proposed change? The hon. gentleman opposite ran the elections on Protection principles, appealing to the people from one end of the country to the other on this great question, and said that, from the Pacific Coast down to the Atlantic Ocean, the constituencies, to a large extent, by an overwhelming majority, pronounced in favour of that policy. He led the House and the country to believe that he was elected upon that principle. The hon. gentleman was again mistaken, unless he had incorrectly reported himself. It was true, in the western part of the country, Conservatives were in favour of a reciprocity of tariffs with the United States, and they were told, if the Yankees built a Chinese wall round their country, that we would also build a Chinese wall around ours. We were bound to have Canada for the Canadians. A grand and glorious future was predicted for the country. We were to be Robinson Crusoes with our own little island to live in, wearing straw hats, straw breeches and straw boots. We were to have no commerce outside ourselves. Hon. gentlemen knew well that, in other sections of the country, that was not the plank on which they went to the people, or the style of argument addressed to the electors. Hon. gentlemen knew well that the doctrine proclaimed in Ontario, from house-top to house-top, and hill-side to hill-side, was not the doctrine proclaimed in the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman, last evening, in a strong and powerful speech—if the use of strong language entitled a speech to be properly characterised as strong and powerful—in that speech made on the floor of the House, prided himself on the position he took, and the position his colleagues and supporters took in the elections. He said that, on the 17th September, the people laid aside party principles, and, by an overwhelming majority, supported the policy of the Government,—a policy

averaging 35 per cent. on everything imported into Canada. Was that the policy the hon. gentleman presented to his own people in the Province of New Brunswick? He had been favoured with an extract from a speech to the hon. gentleman's constituents, and they could imagine how the speech would take, especially in the Province from which the hon. gentleman came. This address would enlighten the House in regard to the line of action the hon. gentleman took in New Brunswick, which line of action he repudiated on the floor of Parliament. In addressing his constituents, the hon. gentleman said:

"I am now going to touch upon a delicate question, and I am well aware that I will be held responsible in Parliament for any expression of opinion that I may now give. If I had been in Parliament (referring to Mr. Cartwright's increase of 2½ per cent. on non-enumerated articles)," I would not have voted for increasing the duty on the non-enumerated articles from 15 per cent. to 17½. The Government supporters have been spreading the report all through the Dominion that the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald and his followers is to increase the taxes of the country. It has been stated that Sir John even named the rate to which he proposed to increase the tariff as 35 per cent. No such idea entered into his head or any of his followers."

In view of these clear and distinct utterances of the hon. gentleman delivered to the people of the Province of New Brunswick, he did not wonder that the hon. gentleman was elected to Parliament, although only by a very narrow majority of seven, and there was some doubt as to how he got that seven majority, but the hon. gentleman's address to the electors of New Brunswick, and his utterances in Parliament were wholly irreconcilable. When the hon. gentleman delivered his Budget speech, he (Mr. Cameron) took down his exact words; and in the *Globe* and *Mail* newspapers, he found reports which corroborated his (Mr. Cameron's) recollection and memorandum of what the hon. gentleman said, as to who paid the duty on exports. The press, throughout the length and breadth of the country reported that he proposed to take a larger amount of the \$2,400,000 deficit out of our American neighbours than out of England. When his hon. friend from North Oxford read that in an earlier stage of this discussion, the hon. gentleman jumped up in his place and denied that he ever said so.

MR. TILLEY: No; the hon. member said that I said we would take \$2,000,000 out of the United States. That was what I denied. I said we expected to.

MR. CAMERON said he accepted the hon. gentleman's correction, but it made no difference to the argument. If the hon. gentleman could make any capital out of that, he (Mr. Cameron) was satisfied. The hon. gentleman said he expected to get the larger part of the \$2,400,000 out of the United States, and the balance out of England. That was exactly confirming the proposition he (Mr. Cameron) mentioned, a few moments ago - namely, that the hon. gentleman argued that the person who exported the article had to pay the duty. That proposition he denied. No reliable work on political economy took that view of it. But there were no arguments he could use, there were no authorities in the Library of Parliament he could cite, that would convince hon. gentlemen that they had made a mistake in propounding that doctrine, and that after all the parties who paid the duties were not the exporters, but the consumers. But he would produce a witness whose testimony the hon. gentleman would not dispute. He would place this witness on the stand, ask him a simple question, and then leave him in the hands of the Finance Minister himself, in order that he might cross-examine his own witness. He referred to the hon. gentleman's colleague, the Minister of Public Works. He desired, in passing, to express his entire concurrence in what the hon. gentleman said in delivering his Budget speech, that the speech of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tupper) was an able, powerful, clear, and logical statement of the financial condition of the country in 1874, as he viewed it. He (Mr. Tilley) congratulated himself that, although he had not the honour to sit in Parliament then, there was one man who had the honour of sitting in Parliament who justified the course of conduct he (Mr. Tilley) had taken there; and he congratulated himself that that hon. gentleman was a match for the Finance Minister in dealing with the question. The hon. the Finance Minister, therefore, could not dispute

the evidence of the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tupper) as to who paid the duties. The hon. member would recollect that, in 1874, his hon. friend proposed increasing the duties somewhat upon some articles imported into this country. The hon. gentleman would recollect that he (Mr. Tupper) denounced, in the strongest possible language, the course then pursued by the Minister of Finance. He said that, "before deciding to extract from the toiling millions of Canada," not Yankeeedom, "by additional taxation, a large sum of money, the Finance Minister was bound to look the question fairly in the face, in order to see if he could not find some other remedy for the financial condition of the country." The language used by the hon. gentleman then was applicable now to his colleague who was going to extract from the toiling millions of this country, in the eloquent language of the Minister of Public Works, more than \$2,400,000; and it became necessary for the hon. gentleman to consider whether there was not another remedy for the supplying of the deficit. The hon. gentleman knew there were other remedies by which he might meet the anticipated deficit, such as a reduction in the expenditure in carrying on the Government, the abolition of the franking privilege, and the reduction of the salaries of Ministers and the allowance to members of Parliament. Instead, however, of meeting the deficiency by practising economy, the hon. gentleman preferred, in the language of the Minister of Public Works, "to extract it from the toiling millions of Canada." There was another statement the hon. gentleman had made, which was confirmed by the document he had read. The hon. gentleman said that, if he had been in Parliament in 1874, he would have voted against the increase of the tariff by $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The hon. gentleman wanted to convince the people of the Maritime Provinces that he was always opposed to an increase in the tariff, and that the Government of which he was Finance Minister were pledged to oppose an increase in the tariff. He would put another witness into the box, whose evidence he did not think the hon. gentleman would controvert. He would ask the hon. leader of the Govern-

MR. CAMERON.

ment to step on the stand. He would ask him one question, and the hon. the Finance Minister could afterwards pursue the enquiry. The leader of the Government in Toronto said that the Government of which the present Minister of Finance was a member intended to have increased the tariff in 1874, if they had remained in office. The hon. the First Minister, on that occasion, spoke as follows:—

"Protection, still further, was indicated in 1873 by Mr. Tilley, at present Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, then his (Sir John's) Minister of Finance. He then said, 'We have a surplus, and there is no need for additional taxation. Next year, however, we are going to push along our public works, and must have money, and next Session we shall come down with a tariff so adjusted as to give protection to our industries while adding to our revenue.' That was his Government's pledge, and if they had not been defeated they should have brought that tariff in, and would yet do so."

The hon. the Finance Minister's assurance to his constituents does not agree with the leader of the Government's speech at Winchester, when he used the language already quoted. Let hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches reconcile the differences between themselves—both could not be right. Another statement he regretted the hon. gentleman made, because he could not see that it was going to benefit our position at home or abroad. He said they should never say anything in this House that would create dissatisfaction or discontent in Great Britain. He agreed with that proposition unless, indeed, they felt it to be their bounden duty, in the interest of the country. They should say nothing in Parliament that would tend to create discontent at home or discredit to the country abroad. He asked the hon. gentleman who started that line of discussion in this country. The hon. gentleman opposite imported into his Budget speech the previous day a comparison between the condition of this country in 1874 and 1879. The hon. gentleman said:

"Then, Sir, I could point with pride and satisfaction to the increased capital of our banks and the large dividends they paid. To-day, I regret to say, we must point to depressed capital and small dividends. Then I could point to the general prosperity of the country. To-day we must all admit that it is greatly depressed. Then I could point with

satisfaction to the various manufacturing industries that were in operation throughout the length and breadth of the country, remunerative to the men who had invested capital in them, and giving employment to tens of thousands. To-day many of the factories and their machinery are, in many cases, idle. Those that are in operation are only half the time employed, scarcely paying interest at that, and many of them giving no return whatever. Then, Sir, we could point to the agricultural interests as most prosperous, with a satisfactory home market and satisfactory prices abroad. To-day we have a limited market, with low prices, and anything but a satisfactory market abroad."

He (Mr. Cameron) denied that the country was any more depressed in 1879 than in 1873. Even if it were so, was it a fair and proper argument for the hon. gentlemen to use in Parliament? From his position as Finance Minister, everyone knew that what he said on the floor of Parliament would be repeated from newspaper to newspaper, from one Province to another, until it reached the public press of England. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had formerly stated that this kind of argument was calculated to strike down their credit in the money markets of the world. He asked if the statements made by the hon. the Finance Minister were not calculated to injure the credit, the character and the reputation of this country at home as well as abroad? There was another point which the hon. gentleman ought not to have made, without consulting his own followers in Parliament and his organs in the country. He said they ought to do nothing that would affect the connection between Canada and the Mother Country. He agreed with the hon. gentleman, and challenged him to prove that, in the press of the Liberal party, a single word had been printed, or that, in the Liberal party, a single utterance had been given, which was not of a most friendly character and tone to England. But, if the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to read his own organs, he would find that language of an insulting and aggravating character to England had been made use of. One organ, controlled by a Conservative candidate for the Local Legislature, used strong and offensive language with respect to the relationship existing between Canada and England. That organ spoke of Canada's attachment to England "as sentimental drivel about

the old flag." That candidate said "I do not give a d—n for England;" and, yet, the Liberal party were taunted with giving utterance to sentiments unfriendly to England, when the hon. gentleman's own supporters were the parties guilty of this offence. The organ-in-chief of the great Conservative party, the party of loyalty, as they called themselves, in speaking of this difficulty which crept up between Canada and England, in relation to this tariff, and with respect to which the English press, and English statesmen had recently given the word of advice, and uttered the sound of warning, went further, and said that, if "British connection would suffer by the National Policy, so much the worse for British connection." If gentlemen on his side of the House had given utterance to expressions of that kind, they would have been denounced from one end of Canada to the other as disloyal and traitors. He would now turn to the objections against this tariff. He proposed dividing his objections into two parts. First, that the tariff would prove injurious to particular classes, and, second, would prove destructive of particular industries. His hon. friend the Finance Minister, last night, said that this tariff would be most beneficial to the farmers, mechanics and labourers of the country, and that, after it had been sanctioned by Parliament, it would induce thousands, who were seeking employment in the populous centres of the Mother Country, to find a home in Canada, in the great North-West. He painted in flowing language the destiny of that great country, with millions rushing in to possess its vast prairies; he painted a picture cheering, no doubt, to his own mind. But he (Mr. Cameron) thought that, if the hon. gentleman would carefully consider the matter, he would find that this policy was perfectly inimical to the great industries of the country. He would now see what the hon. gentleman proposed to do for the farmer who had been, to his mind, so carefully provided for. There was not an article that entered into consumption in the farmer's household, that the hon. gentleman had not undertaken to deal with, and deal with in such a way as to be burdensome to the farmer. On agricultural imple-

ments, he had undertaken to increase the tariff from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 25 per cent. Drain tiles and pipes, which, in this age of advanced and scientific farming, were a prime necessity, had been increased from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 20 per cent. Nails, which no farmer could possibly do without, had been increased something like 50 per cent. He was told that there were only two nail factories in the Dominion, and perhaps this was an industry which the hon. gentleman was interested in building up. The hon. gentleman undertook to protect the farmer, and did so by adding to the costs of every article required on the farm. The hon. gentleman also undertook to protect the manufacture of barbed fence wire. The only one of the kind we had was in Montreal, and the proprietor came from Massachusetts on a promise that the Government would protect him in the industry he was about to establish. Under the tariff of the late Minister of Finance, this man was protected to the extent of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., with a drawback of 5 per cent. on the raw material, making a clear protection of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The hon. gentleman undertook to deal with this interest, and he paralysed the whole industry, by increasing the duty from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 25 per cent.; so that this man, instead of having a protection of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., had no protection whatever; and the last he (Mr. Cameron) had heard of the man was that he intended to return to his Massachusetts home. The hon. gentleman was not satisfied to stop there. Every movement made by him was a blow at the Canadian consumer, and especially the Canadian farmer, and, as if the tariff already brought down was not bad enough, he must, to-night, bring down a further proposition intensifying its obnoxious features. They undertook to protect the farmer, and they did so, not only by increasing the price of the articles already enumerated, but by imposing an additional tax on the manure, the land-plaster used by him on his farm, and on the very buttons used by himself and his family, and that in the interest of one small manufactory in the county of the hon. member for South Waterloo. The hon. gentleman claimed that they were protecting the farmer. Why, they were striking the most fatal blow at the success and

prosperity of the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman undertook to deal with another class in the community—the mechanics and labourers—but every turn that the hon. gentleman took, every movement he made, every item in the tariff he undertook to deal with, was not in the interest of the mechanic and labourers, but directly in opposition to them. On every tool that the mechanic used in his daily toil, the hon. gentleman had increased the duty from $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 30 per cent., carpenters' tools, coopers' tools, and cabinet-makers' tools were all taxed. And, as if that did not go far enough, the hon. gentleman had inserted the sweeping clause, "and all other mechanics' tools not enumerated, from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 30 per cent." He taxed the poor man's tools—the implements of his trade—he interfered with the industries through which he obtained a livelihood. He raised the tax on the farmers', mechanics' and labourers' household furniture from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 35 per cent. The hon. gentleman did not stop there. He also taxed the clothing which his wife and children must wear. And still further, he raised the tax on the poor man's cotton from 5 per cent. to 35 per cent., while the rich man's cotton was only taxed 20 per cent., and his woollens in the same proportion. Then, as if the blow struck at the farmer, the labourer and the mechanic was not sufficiently powerful, he undertook to tax their food. He put upon their beans—and the hon. gentleman knew, coming as he did from the Maritime Provinces, how valuable pork and beans were—a tax of 15c. a bushel; their oatmeal—and the hon. gentleman, being a Scotchman, knew how valuable this article was—a tax of 40c. a barrel; their flour, 50c. a barrel; cornmeal, 40c. a barrel; their sugar, 1 to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per pound. And, as if it were not enough to tax their tools, their furniture, their clothing and their food, he actually taxed the coal with which they cooked their food. The hon. gentleman had left nothing untaxed. From the cradle to the grave, the hon. gentleman followed the consuming masses. He followed them beyond the grave. He even taxed the shroud in which they were wrapped, and the coffin in which they were buried. The hon. gentleman,

last night, undertook to deal with the question of pianos, and to explain the discriminating tax thereon. He would leave the House to say if they were any wiser, when the hon. gentleman got through with his explanation, than when he began. The hon. gentleman denied that this tax was a discrimination against the poor man, and in favour of the rich. He thought the following figures would show differently. On an instrument, which cost, say, from \$170 to \$200, there was from 35 to 40 per cent. duty; but, on one that cost, say, \$800 to \$1,000, there was only 15 to 20 per cent. If the hon. gentleman denied it, he appealed to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). If the hon. the Minister of Finance would go into the reading-room, he would find, in the *Montreal Gazette*, of the 21st March, an article bearing on this very duty, by H. J. Shaw, pointing out what he (Mr. Cameron) had referred to as one of the discrepancies and discriminations in the hon. gentleman's tariff. His hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had stated that this tariff was framed in such a manner as to injure almost every branch of industry in the country, without any equivalent. The hon. gentleman was mistaken. There were equivalents, or what the Finance Minister was pleased to consider equivalents. The hon. gentleman had forgotten the fact that, while there was cheap beer and dear whiskey, there was also cheap poison with which to adulterate the poor man's beverage. Foxglove, nux vomica, henbane and arsenic were all admitted free of duty. The hon. gentleman having administered cheap poison and dear whiskey, now provided the usual stomachic, and accordingly admitted gentian root and ginseng root free of duty. The hon. gentleman further prescribed for the body politic, by administering the usual laxative, and he admitted senna leaves and julap root free of duty. These were some of the equivalents that the hon. gentleman had undertaken to give to the great body of the consumers. He was willing that these articles should come in free, but he was not ready to admit that their admission free was an equivalent for the obnoxious and oppressive taxes imposed on the farmer. But this was not all. There was something further, which, no doubt, the hon.

gentleman considered an equivalent. He asked the hon. gentleman did he consider the additional tax of \$90,000 upon the tea consumed by the toiling millions; the tax upon the old woman's tea caddie, cream jug and tea-pot; the extra tax of \$20,000 upon breadstuffs; the extra tax of \$275,000 on coal, and \$100,000 on cotton, as in the interest of the farmer, mechanic and labourer. And, yet, these were the equivalents which the hon. gentleman provided. He had a letter in his possession from a leading man in a western town, which showed the damaging effects of this tariff. The letter pointed out that oatmeal mills, grist mills, and mining industries, would necessarily be shut down, and that, in fact, some of them were now being closed up. The hon. gentleman knew, or he ought to know, that dealing with these mills in the manner he was doing, would result in their being compelled to close, and no person would suffer more than the Canadian farmers thereby. There was another equivalent which, no doubt, the hon. gentleman considered still more important. He admitted fossils into this country free. If there was a single article coming into this country more than another that ought to be taxed, he thought it was fossils. They had them in abundance on the other side of the House, and they could very well afford to export a large quantity without the country being any the worse of it.

MR ROCHESTER: Read the letter you refer to.

MR. CAMERON said it was as follows:—

"N.P. working badly here—Big mill will shut down. H. says, as he cannot get any more western wheat he will keep what he has for home consumption. International salt well reduced wages this week from 75c. per day to 50c. I wonder how many employés of either would now vote for the N.P."

He, also, wondered how many employés of either of these works would now vote for the great National Policy. Under this tariff the expensive machinery that was used in the mills, factories, and other works in this country, and which were not made in Canada, were taxed by the hon. gentleman, so as practically to prohibit their importation.

Before the hon. gentleman proposed these taxes, he ought to consider well what he was doing. He knew quite well that, in many of our manufacturing industries, we had to import the machinery we required, and, in the large mill he (Mr. Cameron) had referred to, some of the most extensive and valuable machinery had to be imported from the States. In that gigantic industry that was now being carried on in his own county, he referred to the salt mining there, the gentleman engaged in that industry, required to import into this country, something like \$35,000 to \$40,000 worth of machinery. Did the hon. gentleman mean to destroy an enterprise like that, by the imposition of this oppressive tax? During last year we had imported into this country \$432,000 worth of machinery, and the hon. gentleman proposed to deal with that, and to put a tax upon it, that in his opinion, would be destructive of some of the manufacturing industries of this country. He would appeal to the colleague of that hon. gentleman, the Minister of Public Works, whose testimony on this subject he would not dispute. This was what the Minister of Public Works said on this question of a tax on machinery, when he was dealing with the tariff of the late Government, in 1874. That hon. gentleman said :

"He (Dr. Tupper) would draw attention to one matter of no little importance; he meant the tax on machinery. Never had there been an act more calculated to stimulate manufactures among us, than the remission of the tax on machinery used in manufactures, and there was no more retrograde movement than the abolition of that policy."

If these words of the hon. the Minister of Public Works were true in 1874, they were equally true in 1879. Another item which the hon. gentleman proposed to deal with, was the item of whiskey. The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that, when we reached a certain point in the Excise or the Customs duty on whiskey, we could not with safety go beyond that point. If we did in the first case, we encouraged the manufacture of illicit whiskey, and in the second, the smuggling business. In 1874, the hon. gentleman from Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) proposed to change the tariff upon this article, and to raise the duty from 80c.

MR. CAMERON.

to \$1.20 a gallon. What did the present Minister of Public Works say on that occasion? The language he used was quite applicable to the present case. He said :

"He had no objection to the hon. gentleman's raising the duty on liquors, but he doubted that a large duty could be levied without causing a large illicit distillation and a large amount of smuggling."

And, again :

"He desired to ask the Finance Minister whether it was not likely, in getting a revenue from increased duty in spirits, he would have to expend a large sum in protecting the long boundary line between Canada and the United States."

The same argument applied now, and the same reasoning used by the Minister of Public Works, in 1874, was applicable to the present proposition of the Minister of Finance. Another interest the hon. gentleman had undertaken to deal with was the salt interest. If there was one interest in Canada which, more than another, deserved the grave and careful consideration of the hon. gentleman, and which ought to escape uninjured from the hands of the Finance Minister, it was the salt interest. Did the hon. gentleman know the importance of this industry? Did he know the amount of capital invested in that interest? Did he know that there was over \$1,000,000 invested in it on the shores of Lake Huron, extending from Kincardine down to New Dublin? That industry gave employment to a vast number of men, and turned out an immense quantity of salt. Within the last ten years it had saved to the people of Canada over \$5,000,000 in the article of salt alone. When salt was first found there it was selling at \$1.75, while it was now selling from at 65c. to 75c. per barrel, delivered at the door. The hon. gentleman, in dealing with this question, had not only paralysed that interest but had given it a fatal blow. They had wells there that could produce every barrel of salt that the hon. gentleman undertook to exclude from the Canadian market in ten days, and therefore, his policy could in no way help the salt manufacturers. The industry was already languishing, and the hon. gentleman had killed it. It would never revive until he changed his policy. More than this : he had put a

tax upon every article used by salt makers engaged in this business. He taxed the boiler plate that was used in the manufacture of pans, and increased the tax upon rivets, and tubing to 35 per cent. ; upon bricks used in building their furnaces and chimneys ; upon the cottons used in packing the salt. He had a letter from a supporter of the hon. gentleman, who informed him that the effect of the tariff was to increase the cost of manufacture by 10c. per barrel, and that would crush this industry out of existence. The hon. gentleman undertook to protect it and destroyed it. He undertook to be liberal with the people of Western Ontario, and destroyed one of the most important industries of that section of the country. But the hon. gentleman did not stop with taxing boiler plates, tubing, rivets, bricks, etc., but he put a duty of 50c. a ton on coal, and this alone added 3c. to the cost of manufacturing a barrel of salt. All he could say, he supposed, would be of no avail in checking the career on which the hon. gentleman had entered—to tax, tax, tax ; he only asked the hon. gentleman to let this industry alone. If he could not deal with it in the same spirit in which he had dealt with the other industries of the country, he asked him to mercifully spare it, and, at least, allow it to live. He would like to speak about some other industries, although he supposed it would be of no avail. If Solomon himself came from the other world, and undertook to enlighten the hon. gentlemen opposite they would turn a deaf ear to his warnings and entreaties. There was no use to talk with them now, but the people would have an account to settle to with them five years hence. He wanted say a few words upon the tea and sugar interests for the purpose of showing the opinions of the hon. gentleman's colleagues on this subject a few years ago. When his hon. friend (Mr. Cartwright) undertook to deal with this industry, the present hon. Minister of Public Works arose in his place in Parliament, and, with his usual vigour and eloquence, denounced the late Minister of Finance in the strongest possible manner, for even proposing to deal with an article of prime necessity, that entered into general consumption. He would just read one sentence

of the hon. gentleman's speech on that occasion, in order that hon. members in the House might understand what he had said, and how vigorous his protests were against increasing the price of sugar to the consumers :

“ We come now to what were articles of prime necessity for the poor, and if ever a policy commended itself to the people, it was the policy of reducing the duty on tea and coffee. There were no articles of human consumption more required by the poor, and he regretted to see that these were to be taxed at a higher rate.”

And again, and in the same connection, the hon. gentleman said :

“ Again, with regard to the additional tax on sugar, there was hardly an article, with the exception of the one mentioned (ships), that could not better bear taxation than this, and he could not envy the feelings of the Finance Minister when he found that the Chancellor of the English Exchequer had abolished the duty on sugar that he himself had proposed to reimpose here.”

If that language was wise and applicable in 1874, it was equally applicable and equally wise in 1879, and accurately described the position in which the hon. the Finance Minister found himself to-day. There was another interest that the hon. gentleman undertook to deal with—he meant the shipping interest. All knew the importance of the shipping interest in this country. An immense number of vessels were owned by Canadians ; according to the last trade returns, dated 31st December, 1877, 7,362 vessels were owned by the people of this country representing 1,310,468 tons, worth \$40,000,000, in round numbers. The hon. gentleman had not let this industry alone. He undertook to protect it, and how did he do so ? It was true he had not taxed the raw material entering into the original construction of ships, but he taxed the articles used for repairing them 20 per cent ; sails were taxed 20 per cent. ; cordage from 5 to 15 per cent. in addition, as well as other articles that were used in repairs. Now, as the hon. gentleman well said, last night, we were spending immense sums of money every year in encouraging the carrying trade of the country on our canals, railways, etc., and yet the hon. gentleman undertook to deal with these in a spirit exceedingly injurious to the best interests of Canada,

and so as seriously to affect the whole carrying trade of the country. He would again quote the hon. gentleman's colleague against the proposition of the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Cameron) had the greatest possible respect for the hon. gentleman's colleague (Mr. Tupper). He never exaggerated, he never over-estimated anything or any proposition; he always stated what was correct, and, when the hon. gentleman's colleague laid down a proposition or a principle, the hon. gentleman might, with all safety, stake his reputation on its correctness. He would quote from a speech made by the hon. gentleman's colleague, when he was denouncing, in the strongest language, any interference with the shipping interest and the carrying trade of the country. In 1874, the hon. gentleman said:

"He came now to another matter to which he was bound to take still greater exception, and that was the proposition of a tax upon ship-building at the time when Canada was suffering most for revenue; the policy of the late Government had been to take off the tax, do everything that was required for the construction of ships, and the result had been fraught with a degree of advantage which no man could over-estimate; and now it appeared that that policy was, at a single blow, to be struck down. He had no hesitation in saying that this tariff would strike dismay into the shipyards of the Dominion. If the hon. gentleman had searched his tariff from end to end, he could not have selected one tax which would be more detrimental to the country."

And, in a subsequent part of the same speech, the hon. gentleman said:

"If the hon. gentleman had searched, from end to end of the Parliamentary records of Canada, he would find no more sectional legislation than this. Let the hon. gentleman look at the neighbouring Republic, and he would find that the policy of that country had swept their flag off the seas, and had given to others the carrying trade of the world."

He (Mr. Cameron) would say that no more appropriate language could be used to describe the effect of this tariff on the shipping interest, and the carrying trade of Canada. There was another question which the hon. gentleman spoke of last night, the question of immigration. He pointed out that, although we were imposing heavy burdens on the people, and extracting from their pockets a large additional taxation, it would all be recouped to them by the vast influx of immigration

from the Mother Country, and from other centres of population in Europe, who would rush in and take possession of the great North-West Territory. We were told by the hon. gentleman, in his own glowing and striking language, of the advantages that were likely to flow from an increased tariff on the necessities of life, by thus encouraging the flow of the tide of immigration towards Canada. He (Mr. Cameron) would again call on the hon. gentleman's colleague to answer the hon. gentlemen. The Minister of Public Works, in 1874, denounced any increase in the tariff, because it tended to retard the tide of immigration. If the policy was a bad one then, it could not be a good policy now. If it retarded the tide of immigration that was flowing from the Mother Country into Canada in 1874, it must have a similar effect in 1879. Here was what the hon. gentleman's colleague said on that occasion, when he was addressing the House against a proposition made by the then Finance Minister, making some slight modifications on the tariff. He quoted from the *Hansard*—he found the *Hansard* a very valuable work—out of which he again proposed bringing hon. gentlemen to book. He had altogether changed his opinion about the value of this record of Parliament. The Minister of Public Works, on the occasion referred to, said as follows:—

"The Finance Minister had made a most fatal mistake when he had taken away from our immigration agents the strongest and best arguments they could use to induce immigrants to leave their homes and come out here. The mere reduction of the duty on tea and coffee and on other necessaries, would do more than any expenditure of money accompanied with taxation, to induce people to come and settle amongst us."

The view of the case thus presented by the Minister of Public Works was clear, logical, convincing, profound, and deserved the consideration of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The arguments he (Mr. Tupper) then made use of, were just the arguments he (Mr. Cameron) made use of now. The hon. the Minister of Public Works went further, and said: "The Finance Minister had made a most fatal mistake." He (Mr. Cameron) would repeat the language of the hon. the Minister of Public Works: "The Finance Minister

of 1879 has made a most fatal mistake," and the sooner he retraced his steps the better for the country. He made a fatal mistake when he took away from us the strongest possible arguments we could use to induce immigrants to come to this country. The arguments that were so cogently and so powerfully presented to the House in 1874, by the hon. gentleman's colleague, were equally powerful and cogent to-day. He (Mr. Tilley) knew that, in almost every centre of population in the Mother Country, there was a body of immigration agents, paid by the Government, whose business it was to point out to intending immigrants that this country was dealing liberally with them, and that here they would find employment in abundance, at fair wages, and that it was a cheap country to live in. The policy which the hon. gentleman was now pursuing—a policy of taxation—would, undoubtedly, check all immigration. The hon. gentleman's propositions were also objectionable, because they arrayed one Province against the other, class against class, interest against interest, industry against industry, the west against the east and the east against the west. Here was what the hon. gentleman's colleague had to say on this subject. The Minister of Public Works, in 1874, said :

"He believed that if, the Finance Minister's ears were not altogether closed from suggestions coming from him, it might be worth his while to draw attention to the fact that the tax the Finance Minister was bringing on them, was only the iron heel of the Finance Minister of Ontario pressing on the people of the Maritime Provinces."

He was somewhat surprised at the turn the discussion took last night, especially at the speech of the hon. the Finance Minister himself, and his attempted justification for his present course, that it was the one in accordance with the vote given on the 17th September last. The issue, he said, was presented fairly and squarely before the electors. It was a question of Free-trade or Protection—of building a Chinese wall around us, and excluding our American neighbours from commercial intercourse with us. For the purpose of convincing the electors, on every hustings, everywhere, in every section of Canada, hon. gentlemen opposite constantly drew comparisons be-

tween the condition of Canada and the United States, depicting the prosperous condition of the Americans under Protection and the depressed condition of affairs on this side of the line under a revenue tariff. He had examined the subject, and found that those industries in the United States, which ought to have benefitted most under Protection, were not as prosperous as they should be, if the statements of those hon. gentlemen were correct, that Protection always fostered and established manufacturing industries in every country in which it was tried. Nothing would show the prosperity or adversity of a country more clearly than the price of labour. If Protection was a good thing for a country, then the price of labour should have increased year by year in the United States. It had, on the contrary, persistently gone down for the last six years. In the *New York Bulletin*, of 1878, the price of labour for printers and bookbinders was quoted at \$12; in 1872 and 1878, it was quoted at \$10. Manufacturers of pianos, 1872, \$18, in 1878, \$14; steam engine workers, \$15 in 1872, in 1878, \$12; and so on through the whole list, the wages gradually became lower; but, according to the theory of hon. gentleman opposite, these wages ought to have materially increased, or remained stationary. The hon. the First Minister had stated, in one of his speeches, that values had increased, and that stocks were higher in the United States, under Protection, than under a revenue tariff. He (Mr. Cameron) had examined into the correctness of that proposition, and found that, in the Eastern States, where there were stocks of all kinds, and where, if Protection ever improved the condition of a country, that section of the United States ought to have improved, the depreciation of values had shown a marked contrast with that of Canada. The comparison was very decidedly in favour of Canada. The stocks of manufacturing companies alone in Massachusetts had fallen from 200 million dollars to something like fifty million dollars. We were told that, in every State that adopted Protection as its commercial policy, its manufacturing industries had flourished. If the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to ex-

amine the statistics for the State of Massachusetts alone, he would find that, in nineteen cities of that State, in 1878, there were 8,500 skilled artisans, and 13,250 labourers, unemployed; that one half of the mills were idle, the other half working at half time. In Ohio, in which were large manufacturing industries, and salt and iron fields, one paper said the condition of the miners was deplorable; 1,500 workmen were then on the verge of starvation in one centre of trade there. In Pennsylvania, which ought to have benefitted by Protection, if any State would, with its vast iron fields and gigantic coal mines, there was more poverty and wretchedness than in the whole Dominion. Out of two hundred furnaces there, 140 were idle nearly all the time. From one end of the States to the other, there was nothing but depression, poverty, indebtedness and misery.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. CAMERON said he now came to the second point in connection with this line of argument. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, not satisfied with confining himself to the hustings in his exaggerated statements with regard to the depression in Canada, and the blooming prosperity in the United States, told them here, with all the responsibility attaching to his position as a Minister of the Crown, that, "where wealth and happiness formerly existed in Canada, now reigned depression and distress." He (Mr. Cameron) denied that statement. He supposed the hon. gentleman would not take his (Mr. Cameron's) word that the statement his colleague had made was wholly unwarranted, and, to satisfy the Finance Minister's mind on that point, he would invoke the assistance of the hon. gentleman's leader to prove the incorrectness of the Minister of Public Works—this vile slander on the country of his birth. The right hon. the Premier, in a speech that he made on the 4th July last, at Weston, county of York, at a non-political gathering of his private friends, where he would be supposed to give expression to his honest

MR. CAMERON.

opinions, said, with emphasis, raising his hands to heaven, that he "thanked God that this country, in the tenth year of Confederation, was prosperous, contented and happy." Which statement was correct, that made here by the Minister of Public Works that the industries of the country were languishing and everything going to ruin, or that of the Premier, at Weston, that the country was prosperous and happy? Let hon. gentlemen reconcile those differences of opinion before they asked the country to accept the Minister of Finance's revolutionary tariff. It was astonishing that the Minister of Public Works should have made such a statement in Parliament, a statement which was reproduced in the Press, and would be published in every newspaper in England, and read by the capitalists of that country. How could the Finance Minister expect to succeed in the money markets of England, where he would have to go more than once during the next two years to borrow money, with the statement of his colleague staring him in the face, that "depression and disaster reigned all over the country." What did the hon. the Minister of Public Works say, in 1874, on this same subject? When challenging some remarks made by the late Finance Minister, respecting the general depression in the country, he said it was dishonest to use a line of argument of that kind, to evoke the hostility of the United States and create great dissatisfaction and uneasiness in the money markets of England. Then, as to the balance of trade question, to which the hon. gentleman appeared to attach importance, he was amazed that a man of the astuteness of the Finance Minister who must have made himself thoroughly conversant in his youth with the principles which guided public men in dealing with financial questions, should have attached the slightest importance to this question of the balance of trade, and have proclaimed to the world that, because that balance of trade happened to be against this country, therefore it was depressed. The hon. gentleman must have read in his youth the work of Smith, who said: "The balance of trade is no indication of the prosperity or depression of any country. It may be against a country,

yet the trade that country carries on may be profitable in the extreme." The hon. gentleman in his younger days must have read Munn's theory on the balance of trade. Munn said: "Nothing can be more absurd than this whole doctrine of the balance of trade." And yet the Finance Minister declared from his place in Parliament that this country was not prosperous because the balance of trade was against it. He would take the hon. gentleman's own figures and show, out of his own mouth, that the statement he made was wholly incorrect. In his Budget speech, in 1873, he pointed out that the balance of trade theory was nothing but a theory, that it amounted to nothing in practice. He stated that there was a deficiency; that our imports exceeded our exports by 16 millions; that the balance of trade against us was that amount, and yet, that the country was prosperous and everything blooming like the rose. Now, however, the country was depressed and going to ruin, because the balance of trade was $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions against us. The hon. gentleman could not blow hot and cold. He could not say at one time that, because the balance of trade was against us, we were prosperous, and again, because the balance of trade was against us, we were impoverished. He left him to reconcile those two statements. There were other statements made by the hon. gentleman, which appeared to him to be altogether unjustifiable. He had told them that opinions in the United States differed upon the question of the prosperity of the country, of the success of Protection there; that they would find one class of men pronouncing the country prosperous by reason of Protection, and another that the country was depressed by reason of this policy of Protection, and he made bold to assert that the great body of the thinking men of the United States were, to-day, satisfied that Protection was a failure. The hon. gentleman had said that Protection had made the United States a great and glorious country, and that France and Germany were equally prosperous under Protection. He would ask the Finance Minister to point out a country that, from mere choice, adopted a policy of Protection, except Canada; necessity, and necessity alone, induced any country

to adopt that policy. Everybody knew that the United States did not adopt it in its entirety, till exhausted by its civil war,—until millions of her able-bodied men were sacrificed in the field of battle, and until countless millions of money were spent in a fratricidal war; in fact, until her resources in men and means were at the lowest possible ebb, and when it became the financial necessity of the hour; but not till then did the United States adopt a Protectionist policy; and so with France, which resorted to it only after the misfortunes and losses of the Franco-Prussian war; so with Germany also. If the Finance Minister had based his Protection resolution on the same ground, the financial necessity of the hour, he could have understood it. Had he said the country required \$2,500,000, and must have it, he should have said: "All right, if you cannot get the money otherwise than by additional taxation." But, to take money from the people under false pretences that they were going to build up the industries of the country, when all history showed that, almost in ten cases out of ten, Protection ruined every interest attempted to be built up by it, was wholly indefensible. He would quote from the utterances of an American statesman, a Protectionist himself, who, discussing the question last year, pronounced those memorable and cogent words:

"The loom and the spindle were standing still. The mine was unwrought. The fires were out in the furnaces. The captains of industry, by thousands, were passing into bankruptcy, and labouring people, by millions, into want, if not pauperism. They were not permitted to endure the primal curse, and earn their bread by the sweat of their brow."

This was the opinion of Mr. Kelly, of Pennsylvania, who was largely interested in the iron mines there, and in maintaining Protection, if it was a correct principle. He would read one other extract, from the remarks of General Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, whose opinion on the question he commended to hon. gentlemen opposite, who saw nothing but success in the policy which, in his judgment, had struck a fatal blow at the credit and prosperity of the United States. General Ewing said:

"Look abroad over the land, from Maine to Florida—from Cape Cod to the Golden Gate.

What do you see but ruin, idleness, starvation, and beggary of labour, a pestilence of insolvency, business stagnation, enterprise dead?—and all in the midst of every bounty by a kindly Heaven can pour on its favourite land.”

This was the opinion of a gentleman of large practical experience, whose views were worth a great deal more than those of gentlemen opposite, who were launching this country on a sea of uncertainty, and nobody could tell the result. The statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, during the late elections, that Canada was suffering under commercial disaster, and that the United States were prosperous, by reason of Protection, no doubt withdrew a large number of votes from gentlemen on the then Ministerial side, and gave hon. gentlemen opposite the victory; but it was singular that, the very moment the elections were over, both themselves and their organs began to “hark back” on Protection; the people were warned by them not to expect too much from that policy foreshadowed during the political contest then ended. He would read an extract from the *Hamilton Spectator* to show the style of “harking back” adopted by hon. gentlemen, and which they instructed their organs to scatter broadcast among the people. Thus ran the rede:—

“A period of depression does good service in removing the romantic notions which become widespread, in good times, with regard to the existence of a royal road to wealth in the large cities. Modifications of the Dick Whittington yarn are very pleasant reading for boys in the country. Not unfrequently they delude the readers, even when the facts are as truthfully stated as those brought out in the life of Horace Greeley, or the adventures of Benjamin Franklin.

“Since the late elections a good deal of nonsense has appeared in the newspapers about making all the people rich by legislation. The idea is too absurd to have produced any very deep impression. Those who get rich must do so either by their own labour or the labour of others, and if their own labour is not the chief factor in their prosperity, they must either be dishonest or the objects of charity.”

That is what the party organs said on the subject, and he would leave to hon. gentlemen opposite the reconciliation of the statements of hon. gentlemen before the elections and of the organs of hon. gentlemen after the elections. In conclusion, he would say that he was opposed to the tariff, though he was at one time a Protectionist himself. He had got older,

and as an hon. gentleman had said of himself, thank God he had got wiser; but regretted he could not say the same thing of hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House. He was opposed to this tariff because it was a legalised system of blackmailing the consuming millions for the benefit of the few; it would press harshly, unevenly, and unjustly on the great mass of the people. He was opposed to it because it was a tariff ostensibly to protect and foster the manufacturing industries of the country, really to extract \$2,400,000 of additional taxation out of the pockets of the people. It was a tariff that would unsettle and derange commercial transactions. It was a tariff that would evoke and provoke open hostility with the United States, and that would end in a war of tariffs with that country out of which Canada could not expect to escape unscathed. It was a tariff that, not openly, but not the less surely, was aimed at and levelled against British interests, British commerce, and, he feared, British connection. Already, the tone of the British press, and the language of British statesmen, was clear and unmistakable against the policy of hon. gentlemen. There was the word of advice and the sound of warning, and, as if to leave the drift of the policy which hon. gentlemen were pursuing beyond a doubt, they had the organs of hon. gentleman, within the last few days, telling them, in clear and unmistakable English, that, if in the struggle for commercial supremacy, “British connection suffers from the National Policy, so much the worse for British connection.” The leader of the Government told them, in 1876, when discussing the Supreme Court Bill, that to deprive a Canadian of the right to appeal to the English Privy Council, to prevent him from carrying his grievances to the foot of the Imperial Throne, was the first step towards severing the connection with England. He would tell that right hon. gentleman that, when the Tariff Bill passed—as pass it no doubt would, as hon. gentlemen were so intoxicated with their success on the 17th September last, and so elated with their numerical strength in the House, that the calmness and deliberation which should characterise statesmen in the face of a grave and serious peril, was not theirs,—he would

tell that right hon. gentleman that, if this Bill passed, the last link that bound Canada to England would receive such a violent wrench that nothing but the most skilful management could prevent us from drifting from our ancient and honourable moorings, and landing us in the arms of the United States, and that no loyal and patriotic Canadian could desire.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said that the resolutions that had been submitted by the hon. the Finance Minister were, to his mind, exceedingly satisfactory, and, as a whole, met the requirements of the country. It was a very gratifying thing to be able to know that the word of promise upon which the elections were won upon the 17th September had been faithfully kept and honourably performed. If this policy was not a sound policy, they knew that the responsibility of it did not rest with the few, but upon the shoulders of the people themselves. They had asked for, and ardently solicited it, and had now obtained it through the aid of those who felt the pulse and desires of the people, and who knew the necessity of those changes which the tariff was going to produce, he hoped, happily, for the future of the country, and to secure a return of that prosperity which, during the last few years, had been seen to be passing away, the country being reduced to a condition which they all had lamented to witness. This tariff was a protective tariff in only one sense; it was still, in the main, a revenue tariff. As he understood it, not one farthing was asked that was not needed for the requirements of the country. It was an essential condition of the existence of the Government that about \$24,000,000 should be annually raised, a large amount of which was required to pay the interest on the public debt, and the cost of Civil Government. In fixing the terms of that tariff, it was but proper there should be discrimination that would protect their native industries; that was the object, to a great extent, of the tariff, but so far only to that extent. Beyond that, they had not even by this tariff a system of Protection. But it was contended that they were departing from the commercial policy of England, and establishing here a policy foreign to

hers, and that this was a disloyal policy, which would establish such a wrench, according to the hon. gentleman who had just spoken, of the relations between this and the parent country as would lead eventually to the severance of the colonial bond. He (Mr. Cockburn) denied the correctness of this proposition. At the time of Confederation, the great argument used to induce the different Provinces to unite was that they should have an inter-provincial trade, rendering them independent, commercially as well as politically, of the United States. That argument was used to persuade Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario to enter the union. Ontario was told that her breadstuffs would be carried to the Maritime Provinces as her market, should she be denied a market on the other side of the line; and Nova Scotia was told that her coal, and New Brunswick and Quebec that their particular products, should have their markets in Ontario. At that time, the Reciprocity Treaty was about to expire, and they were threatened with its abrogation. That question was discussed in the old Parliament of Canada, where one of the sponsors of Confederation spoke on it in prophetic language, and which, with the light of their experience since, would almost seem to imply that the speaker and all those who were the fathers of Confederation had in their mind's eye the possibility of this present state of things, when it should become necessary that Canada should devise a policy of her own. He would read an extract from a speech, delivered in the Parliament of the old Province of Canada by the Hon. George Brown, who, speaking of the possible abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, said:

"The Americans, hitherto, have had a large portion of our carrying trade; they have brought us our goods, even our European goods, and taken our produce, not only to Europe, but even to the Lower Provinces; and I say one of the best features in this union is that if, in our commercial relations with the United States, we are compelled by them to meet fire by fire, it will enable us to stop this improvidence and turn the current of our own trade into our own waters."

That was the sentiment of one of those who inaugurated the great scheme of Confederation, and who looked, at that time, to the possibility of the present condition of

things, viz., the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty and the contingency then apparent to all their minds, that it would then become the true policy of Canada to have a commercial policy of her own. But it was said that this was an objectionable policy as regarded England; that we were departing from that Free-trade policy which England, within the last five-and-twenty years, had established as the policy of the Empire. It was never, for one moment, supposed that they were bound to follow any particular policy of Great Britain. They were just as free, at the time of Confederation, to follow her old traditional policy of Protection, as they were now to follow her Free-trade policy or a protective policy, as they saw was best. Their attention had been called to words of sharp criticism and menace used in the English House of Commons and in the English press. But what was said in the British Parliament when they launched the scheme of Confederation, and could they find any reason to suppose that the sentiment of England had changed? Were they to be less free to carry out their own laws, or less free to legislate upon those subjects which had been specially accorded to them, or less free to control their trade and system of taxation? When this subject was discussed in the Imperial Parliament, Lord Carnarvon, in a very able and interesting speech in the House of Lords, on the British North America Bill, said :

“ My Lords, I must not pass over another and a plausible objection to the policy of this measure. It is said that, while the commercial policy of Canada has been of a Protectionist, that of the Maritime Provinces has been of a more liberal character, and it is further argued that, when once the union of these Provinces shall be accomplished, the protective system of Canada will become uniform, and that we shall find ourselves excluded from the comparatively free markets which we have hitherto enjoyed.”

After pointing out certain reasons which led him to conclude that Ontario and Quebec would yield on this question to the wishes of the Maritime Provinces, His Lordship proceeded thus :

“ And, therefore, we have some right to hope that a Free-trade, rather than a Protectionist policy, will be the result of the union of Canada with the Lower Provinces. But even if it were otherwise, I could never ask this House to bargain with Canada and to withhold

its consent to a measure on which the hearts of our colonists and fellow-subjects are set, until they had adjusted their tariff to our liking.”

The right of Canada to adopt whatever trade policy she pleased was fully admitted and acknowledged. What, then, did these gentlemen in the English House of Commons mean by criticising the action of this Parliament, in regard to their present trade policy? Canada cost England nothing; not one shilling. Our position, in regard to the Mother Country, was different from that of the old colonies. He trusted that connection would long continue, and that they would ever feel proud of the tie which brought to Canada all the glory and prestige that belonged to a nation with a noble history. But, apart from that, apart from any sensational views, they had to look at the question from a standpoint of pounds, shillings, and pence. What was the position of Canada in regard to England to-day? They were told that they were looked upon simply as a distant colony of the Mother Country, having some relation to her material interests, and to be valued accordingly. It was said that, by adopting this tariff, and by, to a certain extent, excluding, as it were, British merchandise from entering into competition here, Canada touched upon the money interest of the Mother Country. Some of the colonies were a source of great annual expense to England, as for instance Natal and British India. But Canada, who cost her nothing, was one of her best customers. The exports from England to the colonies were as follows :— To the whole of British India, \$120,000,000 per annum; to Australasia, \$95,000,000; Canada, \$45,000,000; Natal, \$25,000,000; Hong Kong, \$17,000,000; West Indies, \$10,000,000. Taking the foreign states of the world, they found the exports were as follows :— Germany stood first on the list, \$115,000,000; the United States second, \$105,000,000; France third, \$80,000,000; the Netherlands fourth, \$70,000,000, and Canada, with her \$45,000,000 of imports, was therefore, at the present moment, one of the best customers England had for her merchandise. Now, the Finance Minister asked the House for \$24,000,000 of taxes for this year's expenditure. The interest on the

public debt was a very large item, and for what was it incurred? They found there were upwards of \$30,000,000 incurred for canal, river, lake and gulf improvements. Every sixpence of this had been expended in such a way that the British merchant, the British shipowner and navigator had a direct benefit from it. They had expended besides \$70,000,000 in the construction of great railway lines, all pointing to a commercial intercourse with the Mother Country. This large expenditure, amounting to somewhere about \$105,000,000, the great bulk of the debt of Canada, the English people, if they thought at all, must see was greatly to the advantage of British commerce. It had given them a highway to the great West for their goods and merchandise, and offered homes to their overcrowded population. Canada, to-day, occupied such a position, from an Imperial point of view, as entitled her to be considered in a more favourable light than any other colony or dependency England had throughout the world. The Finance Minister had told them that, from a variety of causes, there would be a deficiency unless new taxes were imposed. The expenditure of the country could not be met unless additional revenue was procured. How was this to be obtained? They found, last year, that \$30,000,000 worth of free goods came into the country, which did not contribute one sixpence towards the revenue: \$25,000,000 from the United States, and \$5,000,000 from Great Britain. When they knew that these goods entered into competition with our own farmers, manufacturers and labourers; when they found that such was the case, he thought they had a right to say: "It is but just to our own people that these goods should bear their proportion of the duties which are necessary to carry on the government of this country, and pay the interest upon her public debt." It would be monstrous if it were otherwise. The fact that American producers had been allowed to take advantage of our markets without contributing to the revenue had been the first great cause of the demand for a National Policy. At the same time, the United States had imposed heavy duties against us. They heard a great deal about Free-trade; but

what was Free-trade if it was not free on both sides? Free-trade had become a hard and fast creed with certain political economists in the Old World, and certainly they seemed to be followed very closely by certain gentlemen in Canada, by whom the same political theories were sought to be inexorably maintained, although it had been conceded that absolute Free-trade was unsuited to the conditions of a new country, and that there were circumstances, especially where trade on one side was forced or helped by legislation, the country with whom the trade was being carried on, if that forcing were against the ordinary natural laws of trade, could properly adopt a protective policy. That principle had been recognised by such eminent men as Mr. Gladstone, and the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Northcote, when this theory of one-sided Free-trade was brought home to their doors. It was found to be a falsity, a theory which, tried by the hard logic of facts, was found to be ruinous to their people, disastrous to the manufacturing, farming, mining and industrial operation of this country. If all the nations would join cordially and heartily in carrying out a system of Free-trade, and said they would sell in the best market and buy in the cheapest; that they would meet them without any restrictive laws; that they would not legislate against the natural laws of trade, then this theory of Free-trade would be a good one. But they were not able to look at this matter from the same point of view as the Mother Country, because, from their insular position, the people of England were not exposed to have these trespasses committed in having their market made a slaughter market by refuse foreign stocks being thrown in and their own manufacturing interests killed, as they had been in Canada. England had not had the hard pinch of that experience that this country had felt, and, therefore, the knowledge that England had was theoretical only; but the practice was ours. We had to put our experience against that theory, which might be sound, no doubt, as a theory, and one which hon. gentlemen of the Opposition had ably contended for; but, as a theory, it would not stand the test of that experi-

ence felt in this country, and which our people had suffered under. When the attention of the Mother Country was drawn to this view of the case, and it was one, he thought, which could hardly have been considered when that little discussion took place in the English Parliament the other day, when the constitution of this Parliament to deal exclusively with this matter was questioned, which ought never to have been discussed, because those words of menace were not reserved by this country. Ever since the commencement of their career of quasi-independence, which they might claim under the Act of Confederation, when, under the guarantee and sanction of the British Queen and Parliament, they were given full, complete and absolute control over these subjects, they had been most careful not to use that power to England's detriment; still, as the question had been raised, as it would, no doubt, be still further discussed in the press, had they, he would ask, fully considered the position of the trade of the Mother Country with Canada? Because it was simply in the commercial sense that they spoke. The consideration of loyal affection to their colony, their regard for them as being of their own flesh and bone, as inheriting their great name, and all their historical privileges and their freedom, was apparently ignored. But they should have considered that, under the late trade policy of the country,—which was now fortunately passing away, now that that tariff might be said to be repealed,—trade with the Mother Country was gradually, year by year, falling off. Four years ago it was double what it was now. Last year, the imports from Great Britain, in round numbers, amounted to something like \$39,000,000, whilst four years ago the amount was nearly, if not quite, twice that sum. What would be the result if they were to go on for another four years in that way? The trade with Great Britain, he took it, would almost entirely cease and have become absorbed in the trade with the United States. Since the civil war, or shortly after,—say since 1873,—the tendency had all been in that direction; but, hereafter, it might be hoped that this trade would be stopped at the boundary line. England had to consider that, under the

old policy, she was losing Canada as one of her best customers. But they were adopting, to-day, a policy that would bring them back and put them in the position of a country carrying out the original intention of its Constitution. They were adopting a policy which would restore Canada to herself; which would, in a great measure, shut out and keep out the large quantities of American goods they had had thrown, as an unwholesome drug, on their markets. But, apart from that, he thought it was clearly shown by the Minister of Finance that they would continue to be a good paying customer of the Mother Country. It had been shown, in the figures which that hon. gentleman presented to this House, the additional revenue required for this year was in the neighbourhood of \$2,000,000, that a little over \$1,000,000 of that sum would be levied upon the American trade, and that \$500,000 of it would be obtained from the additional duties that were imposed on goods imported from Great Britain, the residue being made up from excise and domestic sources. This was all in favour of the Mother Country, and he trusted it would have a result which no one could grieve over. The Americans had not dealt with them in a generous spirit, and, notwithstanding all the efforts that had been made time and again to bring about a renewal of a fair reciprocity treaty, they had had those efforts spurned and the question ignored in a way that was not of that courteous character that should be used when speaking of a neighbouring and friendly people. But, whilst they spoke of the feeling in England, and he trusted they would always think of that, if it were said that the feeling in England was against such and such a policy proposed by either of the great political parties in this country, that party would be weighed down by the knowledge that they were advocating a policy that was inimical to that of the Mother Country. It was a happy thing to know that their people would not willingly entertain a measure that was unfavourable to the interests, commercial or otherwise, of the people of Great Britain. They knew that the party which would advocate such a policy, with such a weight as that upon it, would

have a very hard struggle to maintain their position. It was well it should be so. England, when she spoke through her Ministers and statesmen about our legislation, spoke always wisely and generously, and they knew she was generous to the extreme. They had seen that lately in the Royal Instructions to His Excellency the Governor-General. One restriction had been withdrawn, and that condition was an important one. It was one of those clauses in the Royal Instructions always heretofore required from the time of Confederation up to the present period, that the Governor-General should reserve all Bills imposing differential duties, and that restriction had been withdrawn. The Governor-General was now perfectly free, and had no condition imposed upon him as to any such legislation, the power of ultimate disallowance by Her Majesty being deemed a sufficient protection for Imperial interests. Under the auspices of the present leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, an effort was made in 1874, by Her Majesty's Government, to open negotiations for a new reciprocity treaty with the Government of the United States, and that new treaty would have had a most important influence upon the future of this country. It had fortunately fallen through and passed away, and was almost forgotten, but still they might look back to it, because it taught a useful lesson, as showing in what spirit even a treaty of that kind could be entertained by the Queen's Government. That treaty had for its purpose the establishment of a Free-trade system between Canada and the United States, and there was to have been a sliding scale by which the duties on each side the line should be reduced one-third each year, until, at the end of three years, the duties would be entirely removed, and trade between the two countries made perfectly free. But one of the conditions imposed on Canada as the price for that treaty was that she had to incur an enormous expense in constructing new canals, and in deepening her present canals within a limited time, and one of the results that would flow from it would be to carry our great trade to the Hudson and New York. His hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance, the other night, taunted his suc-

cessor, the present Minister, when he said that this tariff would have the effect of destroying all the expenditures that had been incurred in our railway system to Halifax. There would be no need, he said, of the Intercolonial Railway if we should shut off the British trade by these increased duties, and thus exclude the British merchant from bringing his goods to our country. That was the line of argument adopted by his hon. friend, who thought that he had made a strong point against the Minister of Finance. But let them consider what would have been the effect of his treaty policy of 1874, had that been carried out. The expenditure of the \$22,000,000 on the Intercolonial, the cost of all the navigation at and below Montreal would all have been lost, according to the same argument; but, with tenfold force, the taunt might be returned, for, beyond a doubt, we should have had the whole Canadian trade from the West carried through the Caughnawaga Canal into Lake Champlain, and then down the Hudson, thence to New York, which would have become the great out-port for the Dominion of Canada, and the future of our connection with England would have been a very delicate question indeed. It must have required all the strong, loyal sentiment of the country to have withstood the moral effect of our commercial relations being centred and identified with a people speaking the same language, though under a foreign flag. But, notwithstanding all that, what did England say? It was not with John Bright and the men of the Manchester school that we had to deal — men of the Cobden club, with whom his hon. friend delighted to fraternise as being the advocates of England's Free-trade policy. It was not such men as these whose opinions we should care for, because they had invariably been opposed to colonial connection. They had never been friends of the colonies; they had said otherwise when it was necessary for them to say so, when they winced under the charges that they were disloyal to the Empire. They had then repudiated that sentiment, but their acts and invariable course of dealing with the colonies had been those of unfriendliness, and especially of unfriendliness to Canada. We need not fear what they said, but we might go on

confidently dealing with our own interests, knowing that, whilst we were dealing with our own interests, we were building up on this continent a British power that would remain true to England, and loyal to the Crown. But what did England say then? Even under all these adverse circumstances surrounding that policy, which he had thus indicated, Her Majesty said this, in proroguing Parliament on the 8th of August, 1874:—“Negotiations have been undertaken for the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty formerly existing between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America. These negotiations, commenced at the desire and in the interests of the Dominion, have been temporarily suspended by the adjournment of the American Senate. They will be revived at an early date, and it may be hoped that they will lead to an increase of commercial intercourse between our Colonial subjects and the citizens of the United States.” Notwithstanding that, England must have felt and seen, and known that, by that policy, she was to suffer; her trade was to suffer, because, if by that treaty Canada was to be benefitted by improving the facilities of her trade with the United States, then it followed that England must have suffered, because we should have ceased to become one of the great buyers of English goods; and yet, notwithstanding that, the Queen then recommended to her Parliament the favourable consideration of that question. But, to-day, we were told that our policy was received unfavourably by England, when it was clearly seen that that policy was the only one that this country could pursue which would enable Canada to continue her commercial connection and her trade with the Mother Country, and without which our trade would have gone on and drifted into the hands of the American manufacturers, shippers and merchants. He did not intend to discuss the tariff resolutions in detail; they had been ably discussed by several hon. members. There were, perhaps, one or two inequalities which should be corrected, and which, he trusted, would be corrected before the vote of concurrence was taken. Especially there was one pointed out by the hon. member for Centre Huron, the inequality of duties between wheat and flour. That might make

no difference in an ordinary year, but in a year of scarcity it would make a material difference. It would give to the American miller the whole milling business, if we had to look abroad for our food supply. He trusted that resolution would be amended. He would say again, in conclusion, that he regarded these resolutions as a faithful and honourable performance by the hon. the Finance Minister of those promises that were made during the recent election, and upon which that election turned. In his own constituency, and in the adjoining constituencies, almost the only question during the contest was that of protection to our native industries. He thought the people had begun to feel that we should have a change of party in the government of the country. And the parties had been changed. The party now in power was the really liberal and progressive party. Without that trade question, we should probably have still been wrangling over the Pacific Scandal, and perhaps the Neebing Hotel Scandal, and all the lesser scandals. It was a fortunate thing for our politics that they had been lifted out of that groove by this tariff question, which had deeply moved every interest and every class. His vote should be cordially given for these resolutions, which the country demanded.

MR. GIGAULT said that the new tariff should be considered as a whole. The Minister of Finance had had a difficult undertaking to fulfil, having had to take into consideration the different interests of the country, and to secure to Canadian producers our own market. This measure should be judged without any spirit of jealousy. He would have desired, and he still desired, certain modifications in the tariff, yet he believed, in the general interests, that it should be adopted. When a similar question was being discussed before the American Congress, one of the speakers, the most illustrious of them all, Henry Clay, a statesman in whose honour his countrymen had erected monuments out of gratitude for the great services he had rendered to his country, said to his opponents, who sought to raise sectional prejudices: “I know no north, no south,

MR. COCKBURN.

no east, no west, but I know my country." The tariff now submitted should be judged with the same spirit of patriotism. The hon. the late Minister of Finance had stated that prosperity was reappearing in the United States; that we should see better times in Canada. If that were the case, the prosperity that might exist in the greater number of the parishes would have a still more salutary effect upon the less favoured ones. The proposed measure would infuse new life into our inter-provincial commerce, which would be untrammelled and free. The main objections raised by the opponents of the new tariff were that it would, first, considerably reduce the Customs revenue; and, secondly, raise the price of all articles of consumption. They should examine and see whether these reasons were well founded, and whether a Protective tariff had produced this result in the United States. According to statistics published by Mr. Spafford, the Librarian of the American Congress, it was seen that the Customs gave, in 1823, the year that preceded the adoption of a Protective tariff, \$19,088,433; in 1832, \$28,465,237; in 1863, \$69,059,642; in 1878, \$130,170,680. These figures would show that the opponents of Protection were in the wrong. The neighbouring Republic had been, like Canada, the theatre of a long struggle between the partisans of Free-trade and the advocates of a National Policy. In 1771, Dr. Franklin, one of the most enlightened and eminent statesmen of the time, was in England, and, observing the happy results derived from the manufacturing industries in that country, wrote as follows:—

"Every manufacturer encouraged in our country makes part of a market for provisions within ourselves, and saves as much money as would otherwise be expended to pay for the manufactures he supplies. Here, in England, it is well known and understood that, wherever a manufactory is established which employs a number of hands, it raises the value of land in the neighbouring country all around it; partly by the greater demand near at hand for the products of the land, and partly by the plenty of money drawn by the manufacturers of that part of the country. It seems, therefore, the interest of all our farmers and owners of land to encourage our young manufactures in preference to foreign ones imported among us from distant countries."

It was this patriotic idea which, put in practice in 1824, produced the

splendid results that any traveller might admire in the neighbouring Republic. In 1832, South Carolina having wished to repeal the protective system, this was how Henry Clay, always the ardent advocate of Protection, depicted the position of his country before 1824:

"Eight years ago, it was my painful duty to present to the other House of Congress an unexaggerated picture of the general distress pervading the whole land. We must all yet remember some of its frightful pictures. We all know that the people were then oppressed, and borne down by an enormous load of debt; that the value of property was at the lowest point of depression; that ruinous sales and sacrifices were everywhere made of real estate; that a deficit in the public revenue existed, and that our commerce and navigation were threatened with a complete paralysis. In short, Sir, were I to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present Constitution, which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and devastation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the tariff of 1824."

This description could be equally well applied to the present condition of Canada. This was how the same speaker described the happy revolution brought about in the country by a protective system:

"I have now to perform the more pleasing task of exhibiting an imperfect sketch of the existing state of the unparalleled prosperity of the country. On a general survey, we behold cultivation extended, the arts flourishing, the face of the country improved, our people fully and profitably employed, and the public countenance exhibiting tranquility, contentment, and happiness. And, if we descend into particulars, we have the agreeable contemplation of a people out of debt; a ready, though not an extravagant market for all the surplus productions of our industry; innumerable flocks and herds browsing and gambolling on ten thousand hills and plains covered with rich and verdant grasses; our cities extended, and whole villages springing up, as it were, by enchantment; our exports and imports increased and increasing; the rivers of our interior, animated by the perpetual thunder and lightning of countless steamboats; the currency sound and abundant; the public debt of two wars nearly redeemed, and, to crown all, the Public Treasury overflowing embarrassing Congress, not to find subjects of taxation, but to select the objects which shall be liberated from the impost. If the term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which the people have enjoyed since the establishment of their present Constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824. This transform-

ation of the condition of the country from gloom and distress to brightness and prosperity, has been mainly the work of American legislation, fostering American industry instead of allowing it to be controlled by foreign legislation, cherishing foreign industry. The foes of the American system, in 1824, with great boldness and confidence, predicted the ruin of the public revenue, and the augmentation of the price of objects of consumption. Every prediction which they made has failed, and utterly failed."

Further on, he stated that the beneficial effects of the American system, although they might have been of various degrees, had, however, made themselves felt in all parts of the Union, and that the objects protected were bought at less cost than before the introduction of the tariff. Speaking of the latter proposition the same speaker said :

"And is the fact not indisputable, that all essential objects of consumption affected by the tariff, are cheaper and better since the Act of 1824 than they were for several years prior to that law? I appeal to the farmer of the country, whether he does not purchase on better terms his iron, salt, brown sugar, cotton goods and woollens, for his labouring people? The wholesale price of bar iron, in the Northern cities, was, in 1828, \$105 per ton; in 1829, \$100; in 1830, \$90; and in 1831, from \$85 to \$75, constantly diminishing. The cotton cloth, which sold in 1817 at 29c. per yard, was sold in 1823 at 17c.; in 1825 at 14½c.; in 1827 at 13c.; in 1829 at 9c.; and in 1831 from 10½c. to 11c. The average price of flannels, in 1826, was 38¾c.; in 1827, 38c.; in 1828, 46c.; in 1829, 36c.; and in 1831, 32½c. Brown sugar, during the years from 1792 to 1802, with a duty of 1½c. per pound, averaged 14c. per pound. The same article, during ten years, from 1820 to 1830, with a duty of 3c., has averaged only 8c. per pound. Nails, with a duty of 5c. per pound, are selling at 6c. Window glass, 8 by 10, prior to the tariff of 1824, sold at \$12 or \$13 per hundred feet; it now sells for \$3.75. Three cents were laid as a duty upon a pound of lead, by the Act of 1828. The prices at Galena, and the other lead mines, afterwards fell to 1½c. per pound. Now it is obvious that the duty did not, in this case, enter into the price, for it was thrice the amount of the price. What produced the fall? It was stimulated production at home, excited by the temptation of the exclusive possession of the home market."

It was astonishing to observe all the quibbles, the sophistry, the contradictory arguments resorted to by the opponents of Protection in their powerless struggle against the wise and enlightened policy of the Conservative party. He held in his hand a copy of a Quebec Liberal paper, published on the 24th inst. In an editorial article he read the following :—

MR. GIGAULT.

"The multiplication of manufactures will exceed the wants of consumers, and our too limited market will be soon so glutted with cotton goods that the manufacturers will be obliged to sell at a low price. What Mr. Hudon apprehends and foresees for his manufactory, is what will equally happen to all the other protected industries."

Further on, in another column of the same journal, great pity was expressed on account of the poor man, who, according to this writer, would be obliged to pay exorbitant prices for all objects of consumption. Among other articles, this writer placed cotton goods, for which the unhappy poor man would have to pay from 40 to 50 per cent. more on account of the present tariff. Was it possible to contradict one's self in a more absurd manner? And yet that was how certain papers gave a political education to the people. In one column the editor maintained that cotton goods would be sold at higher prices, and in another that they would be sacrificed at low prices. In the Province of Ontario, the Reform members stated that the duty upon American wheat would not in any way help the Canadian farmer, and that the price of wheat and flour would not be raised. In the Province of Quebec, the Liberals claimed that the price of the poor man's bread would be greatly raised. Who was to be believed? It was evident that their only desire was to overthrow the Conservative party, and that to attain this end any argument might be made use of. A protective system, far from overburdening the people, rendered the burden of taxation less heavy. In Free-trade England, the Customs revenue was, in 1875, \$100,027,165, whilst Excise duties amounted to \$189,009,305. In the United States, during the same year, the Customs revenue was \$154,554,982, whilst the Excise duties only amounted to \$110,545,154. It should not be forgotten that England had, for a long time, been under a protective system, and that it was through a protective tariff that her manufacturing industries had been started, that they had lived and prospered. It was only after these industries had been firmly established that England adopted Free-trade; and did not France follow a Protectionist policy, and had she not the right to congratulate herself upon it? By means of high duties on foreign

sugars, Napoleon I. and Napoleon III had succeeded in making prosperous the sugar industry that put into circulation millions of francs. That was why the country of their ancestors had been able to pay a debt of five billions to Prussia, to recover from the disasters of a terrible war, and to give to an astonished world a new proof of her public wealth, and of the advantages of a wise and enlightened policy. But Free-trade Prussia, after having received the ransom of her enemy, was, to-day, preyed upon by Socialism, and beheld her workingmen asking for work or for bread. These facts were conclusive evidence in favour of a protective policy, and it was not surprising to see Prince Bismarck, who had been a life-long Free-trader, become a Protectionist, and endeavour to introduce modifications into the fiscal policy of Germany. The great advantage resulting from a protective policy was, in the first place, to reduce duties upon goods that we could not produce, to augment duties upon goods that might be produced in the country; in the second place, to give revenue to the country, and to allow, at the same time, Canadian producers to sell their goods, in preference to foreign products, or at more remunerative prices. The policy of the Liberals was to make the people pay light duties on goods that could not be produced here, and to place the country in such a position that we were obliged either to keep our goods, or to sell them at a sacrifice. With the experience of the past as a guide, no one should hesitate a single instant to pronounce in favour of a protective policy. That was the means of retaining in Canada millions of capital now sent to foreign countries for merchandise that could be produced here. He knew that the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec contended that the duty upon wheat and flour was contrary to the interests of that Province.

MR. BÉCHAND: Hear, hear.

MR. GIGAULT said he heard the hon. member for Iberville say, "hear, hear." Why was the hon. gentleman surprised at the words that he (Mr. Gigault) had just spoken? Had the hon.

gentleman not proposed, last year, to impose an import duty upon cornmeal and oats, because he thought that it was unjust that the farmer should pay duties on manufactured goods coming from foreign countries, whilst the Americans could compete with him without having any duty to pay? Undoubtedly, in order to remain consistent with himself and with the principle laid down by him, he would be in favour of the protection granted to the farmer by the present tariff, especially if he reflected that the country produced relatively more wheat than corn or oats. Last year the exports of wheat and flour from Canada had exceeded the imports by upwards of five millions of dollars. Seeing that Canada produced more wheat than was required for consumption, the conclusion must be arrived at that the greater part, if not the whole, of the duty imposed upon American wheat would be paid by the producer in the same manner as the Canadian farmer had to pay the duty upon the oats that he wished to sell upon the American market. The only thing that might make Canadians pay a few cents more per bushel for wheat would be that, the importations being less abundant, and the quantity offered for sale diminishing, the prices might rise. But, supposing that the Canadian farmer should be obliged to pay a few cents more for American wheat, he would be fully compensated therefor by the other advantages that would necessarily result from the adoption of a protective system, and by the fact that he would be enabled to sell his other grains and his vegetables with more facility or at higher prices. Within the last few years especially, the system of cultivating the soil in Canada had undergone marked improvement, and he had reason to believe that the wheat crop would become plentiful enough to supply all the wants of the country. During the coming spring, the Canadian farmer would walk with more courage, because he knew that his interests would be protected, and that the American farmer would not be allowed to compete with him, and take from him the fruit of his hard labours. He would have the certitude that if he could not go on the American market, at least the Canadian market was reserved for him. Speaking of the state of the manufactories in the

United States before 1824, an American writer had said :

"In travelling through New England, we perceive great and spacious buildings, gloomy, silent, without activity, the windows broken, the shutters down. The wind passes through these buildings calling for Protection."

Here, not only the elements and the population asked for a change in our fiscal policy, but, if one listened to what was transpiring over the border, one would hear 500,000 expatriated fellow-citizens begging for the adoption of some measure which should facilitate their return to their well-beloved country, that they left with regret in order to seek elsewhere the work and the bread that was refused them here. They were begging of this House to adopt a policy that would give them the same advantage in Canada that they found in the United States, so that they might come and swell the ranks of the Canadian people, enjoy the benefits of British institutions, and fight with their brethren the battles of a common country. The inconsistency of the Liberals was not to be wondered at. In 1872, the leaders of the National party had advocated Protection. To-day, with very few exceptions, they were Free-traders. On many occasions, the Liberal party had given the proof that, in order to combat their political opponents, they were always ready to violate the principles they had before proclaimed. After having been opposed to the abolition of the *tenure seigneuriale*; to the construction of our great railways now built and being built, and without which no country could prosper; after having been opposed to all these great enterprises of the Conservative party, it was fitting that the Liberal party, in order to crown their anti-national policy, should oppose the adoption of a protective tariff. But the Conservative party, faithful to the promises that they had made to the electors, and always desirous of working for the welfare of the people and of increasing the public wealth, were going to give to the country a new legislation that would produce happy results, and for which the people would contract another debt of gratitude to this party.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said, with reference to the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr.

MR. GIGAULT.

Cockburn) that the policy which the Finance Minister had brought down had been foreshadowed at the time of Confederation, that no such policy was then contemplated or foreshadowed; on the contrary, the tariff existing in Canada, prior to Confederation, was reduced to meet the views of the promoters of that Union from the Maritime Provinces. This tariff was framed to benefit a certain class, which seemed to have many advocates in this House, and which embraced alone the manufacturers of the Dominion. In the Lower Provinces, the tariff was being forced upon them as an experiment. The Finance Minister had himself said he could give no correct idea of the revenue to be derived from it. The remark of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) that it was a violation of the compact under which the Maritime Provinces entered Confederation, was perfectly correct. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) said the people on the 17th September last had pronounced in favour of Protection, and against the views taken by the then member for Richmond. In the speeches of public men, supporters of this Government, delivered in the Lower Provinces during the recent contest, and in the speeches of the Minister of Public Works, delivered at Shelburne and elsewhere in the Maritime Provinces, no such policy as that brought down was ever foreshadowed. When he (Mr. Robertson) told the people of his county that the policy of the Conservative party of Ontario was Protection, his opponent, a supporter of the hon. gentlemen opposite, contradicted that statement and produced the letter of John Boyd to the Editor of the *St. John Telegraph*, which contained his telegram to the right hon. the Premier, and the latter's answer thereto which was as follows:—

"THE 35 PER CENT. POLICY.

"ST. JOHN, July 19, 1878.

"SIR,—In your issue of the 16th inst., it is stated that, at a meeting in London, Ontario, held the other day, Sir John A. Macdonald said 'that he thought a general tariff of 35 per cent. would serve to meet the requirements of the people of Canada;' and you comment on it thus: 'He does not propose a 50, 80, or 100 per cent. tariff, but merely a tariff of 35 per cent.' In every issue since, this has been repeated and commented on. In justice to Sir John, and fearing that some ignorant people

might really believe the absurd statement, I telegraphed him last night, as follows :—

“ Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald—

“ The Government Press here state that you propose to raise the tariff generally to 35 per cent. Can I contradict this ?

“ JOHN BOYD.”

“ This reply came promptly, this morning, as follows :—

“ TORONTO, July 19.

“ To John Boyd, St. John :—

“ It is an absurd falsehood ; neither at London, or elsewhere, have I gone beyond my motion in Parliament, and have never proposed an increase, but only a readjustment of tariff.

“ JOHN A. MACDONALD.”

“ I hope that you will in all fairness give the direct statement of Sir John as prominent a place as the original statement of which it is such an unequivocal denial. For all, in these matters, there is nothing like the truth ; that only will prevail in the end.

“ Until Mr. Tilley makes his public statement as to policy of the next Government of the Dominion, of which he will be a distinguished member, it is only waste of time to discuss the matter, and it is not quite fair to charge the leaders with holding, or giving expression to views, wholly opposite to the past, present and future policy of the Liberal-Conservative party of this Dominion.

“ JOHN BOYD ”

That letter was flaunted in the face of every revenue-tariff man in the Lower Provinces during the recent elections. He would now read an extract from the leading Government organ in Nova Scotia, the special organ of the Minister of Public Works, dealing with the subjects referred to in the card addressed by Mr. Patrick Power, the late member for Halifax, to the electors of that constituency in which the statements in that card were treated as misrepresentations. Hon. members must remember that this extract was from a Tory paper, which was the only explanation necessary for the language used.

“ MISREPRESENTATION NO. 3.

“ Mr. Power says :—

“ Let us consider what the effect of an increase of the tariff to 25 per cent. (Sir John Macdonald talks, it is said, of 35) would be to this Province.

“ (a) It is dishonest in Mr. Power to assume that 25 per cent. is the tariff likely to be adopted by the Opposition. No such tariff has ever been suggested by any authorised exponent of Opposition policy.

“ (b) It is dishonest in Mr. Power to say that ‘ it is said ’ that Sir John talks of 35 per cent. It is not said, save by a lying reporter

on the London *Advertiser*, and by the lying papers which support Mr. Power’s candidature. It was promptly contradicted and exposed by Sir John in his telegram to John Boyd of St. John, and he was satisfied ; and he is an abler man than Mr. Power, and certainly not less honourable.”

To strengthen his position, he would refer to the election circular over the signature of James Thompson, to the electors of the county of Halifax :

“ The question which most affects us is the tariff. Shall there be a revision of the tariff or no ? That is the question to be determined at the polls. It is not a question of Protection or not. Neither of the opposing parties are Free-traders.

“ While nearly one-third of the goods imported into the Dominion are free, and others pay duties ranging from 5 to 350 per cent, and the tariff by its operation creates manufactures and gives large profits to manufacturers, it cannot be pretended that the tariff has been prepared solely for revenue purposes.

“ Banishing, therefore, the question of Protection for the present, let us calmly consider which of the two parties it will be most for our interest, as Nova Scotians, to support.

“ The present Government is mainly upheld by the influence of Ontario, the most powerful, most selfish, and, as respects her own interests, the most far-sighted Province in the Dominion.”

This gentleman was, until the last elections, a warm supporter of the late Government, but, because they did not recognise his eminent legal abilities and give him a position on the Supreme Court Bench of Canada, he deserted that party and issued this circular. He (Mr. Robertson) had reason, therefore, to say that the question of Protection, as announced by the hon. the Finance Minister, was never considered at the polls by the people of the Lower Provinces. He would ask attention to the speech of the Finance Minister on nomination day in the city of St. John, as reported in the *St. John Sun*, his special organ in that city, in replying to a charge that he advocated cheap rum to the poor :

“ He had advocated no such policy. What he did object to was that, in increasing the duty on brandy, wine and whiskey, brandy, the beverage of the rich man, was increased only 5 per cent. on the value, while on rum and whiskey the increase was 15 per cent. This he objected to on the ground that the increased taxation on the beverage of the rich should have been at least as great as on that of the poor man.

“ So with reference to the duties on tobacco and cigars. The same objection lay to the

mode in which the duty was levied on tea, bearing, as it does, unequally on the people of the Maritime Provinces, and upon the persons who use the cheaper description of tea. He then referred to the sugar question, and to other changes in the tariff, which he condemned, especially to the increase on unenumerated articles from 15 to 17½ per cent."

His first act, when he became Finance Minister, was to increase the duties upon rum and brandy in somewhat the same proportion as had been done by the late Finance Minister, and which had been so strongly objected to by Mr. Tilley when a candidate for parliamentary honours. The duty on tobacco and cigars remained the same, though, before he became a member of the Government he was deeply interested in "the poor man." The same objection held with regard to tea, the duties bearing unequally against those who used the cheaper descriptions. The tariff might be changed in favour of the ordinary tea, but the change was so slight it would hardly be noticed. He had not simply increased the duties on unenumerated articles from 17½ to 20 per cent., but had taken the most important articles from that list, increasing the duty upon them from 17½ to 30 and 35 per cent. He desired now to speak briefly on a few of the interests of the Maritime Provinces, which, he believed, would be seriously affected by this tariff. He had received a letter from a prominent mill-owner of Nova Scotia, objecting to the National Policy, asking how it was possible to carry on that trade, when, in addition to the tax imposed by the Americans on lumber entering their market, our Government taxed everything that entered into the manufacture and production of lumber. If the Finance Minister desired to protect all our varied industries, why did he not protect the lumbering interests? Why should walnut, chestnut, oak, etc., be admitted free, for the benefit of the manufacturer? It might be said the articles were not produced in this country, but the coal miner was protected by a tax on anthracite, and the lumberman should be protected on the same principle. The mills and the machinery employed in the manufacture of lumber were heavily taxed, the tariff gave it no protection whatever. Its price depended altogether on foreign markets, beyond the control of this Government. In the

MR. ROBERTSON.

year 1878, the total exports from the Dominion amounted to eighty million dollars; the produce of the forest alone contributed nearly quarter of that, namely, twenty million dollars. Take the shipping interest. Although the Government had actually increased the cost of ships from 20c. to 80c. a ton, and had allowed a drawback to that amount, upon new ships only, still, while allowing that drawback, they charged an extra five per cent. on cordage used. That was not specially for the benefit of shipbuilders, but to reward Mr. Starrs, of Halifax, for patriotic services rendered the Conservative party during the last election. Why should the articles used in the manufacture of fishing boats, nearly one thousand of which were annually added to the fishing fleet in the Maritime Provinces, be taxed? This important industry was as well entitled to protection as that of shipbuilding. One of the hon. gentlemen opposite, from British Columbia, said the correct policy to be pursued was that every article that entered into the manufacture of ships should be produced in the Dominion. He (Mr. Robertson) had referred to the statistics of the shipbuilding industry in Nova Scotia last year, and found that something like 50,000 tons was added to the registry of that Province, while the additions to the registry of British Columbia, last year, were two vessels of 45 tons. This fact displayed the reason of the patriotic interest of that gentleman in this industry. The most important industry in the Maritime Provinces, that of fishing, had certainly not been benefited by this tariff. He noticed, in the evening papers, that a delegation—and all changes in the tariff seemed to be obtained by delegations—had visited the Finance Minister to obtain protection for the fishermen, and the result had been, he believed, that the duty on cotton duck, or canvas, and sail-twine was lowered. The duty placed on breadstuffs would entirely destroy the business between the Maritime Provinces and the ports of Boston and Portland. There were certain classes of fish, canned and pickled, that found markets largely in the United States, the carrying trade of which was a remunerative business, because freights were obtained both

ways. Under this tariff the business became one-sided—the produce from the United States, taken in exchange for the fish, being shut out of our market. Since that tariff was brought down he had been informed that no less than two vessels had determined to withdraw from that trade. There was no likelihood of this loss of trade being replaced by an increased trade with Ontario, because Ontario bought but a very limited quantity of their fish. According to the trade returns of Nova Scotia, the imports of flour from the United States last year were 97,500 barrels; Indian corn, 75,000 bushels; meal, 106,000 barrels; peas and beans, 2,000 bushels. The duties on these imports last year, had this tariff been in existence, would have reached the sum of \$100,000; this year, the Finance Minister expected to receive a revenue, from breadstuffs alone, of \$250,000, of which a very large proportion would be paid by the people of the Lower Provinces. They were told that the fishery award was to go into the general fund, and not to be spent for the special benefit of the Maritime Provinces. Thus, while refused their fair proportion of this grant, they were taxed on every article that was used in the prosecution of the fisheries, or consumed by the fishermen. This tariff was framed, it was said, in the interests of the manufacturing industries of the Dominion. He had discussed this policy with numbers of the manufacturers of Nova Scotia, who all said they would be perfectly happy if Sir John's Chinese wall were built along the proposed route of the Baie Verte Canal. The only competition they feared was that given by the manufacturers of the Upper Provinces. Take the article of boots and shoes, of which only \$27,000 worth were imported from the United States into Nova Scotia, under the old tariff, 17½ per cent. This was increased to 25 per cent. to give, it was said, the manufacturers of Nova Scotia the entire command of their market; but the increased duty would simply place the manufacturers of the Upper Provinces in a better position to undersell the struggling manufacturers of the Lower Provinces. Stoves and castings, last year, imported from the United States, reached only \$37,000. Still, the Finance Minister increased the tariff from 17½ to 25 per

cent. for the sole purpose of excluding that amount. Wooden and cabinet ware, whole importations into Nova Scotia, \$39,000, on which the increase in duty was from 17½ to 35 per cent. This change would not benefit the Lower Provinces, but only the Western manufacturers, who were now flooding those Provinces with their goods. Of brooms and brushes, there was an increase to 25 per cent.; the imports into Nova Scotia, last year, were but \$2,727. The duty on coal was alleged to be wholly in the interest of Nova Scotia; but even the warmest supporters of this policy asserted that 50c. a ton would not give her the Ontario markets, which representatives of the coal mining constituencies believed. He did not consider it a right policy to compel the people of Ontario to pay that duty, which they alone must do, and if he were compelled to vote solely on that point he would oppose it, because the people of the Lower Provinces were asked to give more than they received from such a duty. It was said the Nova Scotians would be able to control the markets of Ontario by placing coal as cheaply in Toronto as the Americans. This it was proposed to do by building a special class of vessels, suited to both the sea and the canals. The holders of this opinion, however, did not consider that those vessels would be idle five or six months in the year, and during that time the people of Ontario would be at the mercy of coal rings, in the absence of the coal vessels of Nova Scotia. The Inspector of Mines for Nova Scotia, in his report for the year 1878, had advocated a policy by which coal should be taken by the Government to Ontario for the Intercolonial; he said that the greater proportion of the traffic over that road came from the Upper Provinces, which sent very little return freight to Ontario and Quebec, and that something like 4,000 cars passed over that road into the Upper Provinces. He proposed that coal should be carried to Toronto for \$20 the car load, and believed that this, with the imposition of a dollar a ton on the United States coal, would give Nova Scotia control of the Ontario market. It had been held that Protection, as proposed by the Finance Minister, would give prosperity to the Dominion; but he believed that the only

genuine prosperity that could come was a revival of trade in foreign countries, by which the \$7,000,000 worth of annual products of their fisheries, the \$23,000,000 of the products of our forests, and the \$27,000,000 raised by their agriculturists, could find profitable markets abroad; this, with the million and a half tons worth of shipping in receipt of remunerative freights, would alone give lasting and permanent prosperity. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) said there was not much to find fault with in the National Policy, as, by it, the fishermen were very well protected. He (Mr. Robertson) did not believe that any protection was given the fishermen. He himself acknowledged that the coal duty would not benefit the coal miners in any way, and that the lumber interest did not receive adequate protection; while speaking as if the only industry engaging the attention of the people of Nova Scotia was coal, protection to which would appear sufficient to bring prosperity to all the other industries of the Province. But coal-mining was only a secondary interest compared with fishing and ship-building. The course that hon. gentleman pursued did not surprise him (Mr. Robertson); but he was a little surprised, on the day of the Budget speech, at the statement that he contemplated resigning the seat, so thoroughly disgusted was he with that Budget and the Finance Minister; but, after considering the matter twenty-four hours, he determined to support the whole thing, whether obnoxious to his constituents or not. An hon. gentleman from British Columbia said that the tariff was the proper policy for raising the funds to build the Pacific Railroad, and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) said he deemed it would give the death-knell to reciprocity. Well, if it did, it would be to the disadvantage of the Lower Provinces, whose every representative should vote against it, because their people knew well that their greatest prosperity would alone come from the freest trade relations with the United States, and that they were never more prosperous than during the years of the Reciprocity Treaty. The member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), prior to the elections, had dilated upon the sufferings

MR. ROBERTSON. .

of Nova Scotia, promising relief in the case of Conservative success; but now, in power, and strongly entrenched upon the Treasury benches, he endeavoured to place the people of the Maritime Provinces under a most obnoxious tariff, such as he himself had strongly denounced in 1874. Two statements were always made by hon. gentlemen opposite, in this discussion: One, that they had gained a great victory on the 17th September last, which was so as regarded placing them in power, but which would not redound to the prosperity of this country; and the other statement was that everyone was pleased with the National Policy. But they had seen the lobbies of this House and the approaches to the Finance Department thronged with delegations, representing every industry in the Dominion. This dissatisfaction reached even to Nova Scotia Conservatives. Mr. Lightgrow, the Nova Scotian Phipps, announced, over his own signature, that he was not satisfied with the tariff, and Mr. Bremner expressed the same view, though he believed it might benefit certain industries in which he was himself interested. He (Mr. Robertson) believed that gentlemen now approving the tariff would come here and ask amendments in a year or two. In five or six years its result would be great wrong to the public, the enrichment of the manufacturers at the expense of the consumers. For those reasons, and those alone, he felt called upon, by the interests of the people he represented, to record his vote against the proposed tariff scheme.

MR. SHAW said he had been elected on the principle of protection to home interests, but had great diffidence in placing his views before the House on account of the representations made by hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, who seemed to think that members who occupied the back benches should have nothing to say in regard to the policy of the country; that only the few gentlemen who occupied the first seats should have all the say, and guide the policy of the country. That, however, was not the policy of the late Reform party, who used to think that there was no man so low or humble who could not, and should not, come forward and

advocate his opinions before the country and Parliament. Since that time, however, the party had been in power, and looked with great contempt upon the back-bench members, though they should know that all could not occupy the front benches, and that the elections on the 17th September last so reduced their number that they could all have front benches, or be assembled round the table; but they should have some consideration for the party whose large numbers compelled it to occupy the back benches as well as the front. Hon. gentlemen opposite had consideration neither for members on the back benches nor the Finance Minister, whom they seemed to treat with the utmost contempt, while scorning his Budget speech. They thought that all they had to do was to find fault. He (Mr. Shaw) had felt great interest in this discussion, and expected to hear something new from hon. gentlemen opposite—that they had arrived at certain conclusions, and that it might appear to some, though to him it seemed impossible, that they had some standing ground before the people on this question; but he had been sadly disappointed. The discussion seemed to have resulted in the advocacy of no great principle. Their line of argument seemed to have degenerated into a kind of guerilla warfare and personal criticism of the Finance Minister. This line of argument, he thought, was unfit for the House, and that greater dignity ought to be observed by members towards one another than the treatment of the Finance Minister of a nation of four millions had exhibited. They accused him of all sorts of things, and said he had been burdened, or bored, by delegations. No doubt he had had a great deal of trouble to contend with; a vast amount of work and care, and it was no wonder—he (Mr. Shaw) thought it to his credit—that he should have felt the responsibility that rested upon him in the introduction of this measure. Very different, indeed, had been the conduct of the former Finance Minister. When delegations waited upon him, it was said they were treated with contempt, and left his presence with no kindly feelings towards him or his Government. With regard to the condition of the country, there had really existed a feeling, not

only that the country was not in a prosperous state, but that it was absolutely necessary, on personal grounds, that a change in the Government should take place. The late Finance Minister turned a deaf ear to the appeals for a change of his policy, being moved by neither the representations of friends, nor the cries of enemies. That was not the proper position to have assumed. No wonder there was a real desire for a change, to put the finances of the country in a better position. What could be said of a Finance Minister who, when the country was not prosperous and he perceived that millions were being added to millions of public debt, yet stood still, making no effort to overcome the difficulty? It seemed he was willing to sit like a fatalist, awaiting the final collapse. He should have made some effort to remedy that state of things. He admired the ex-Finance Minister's mood, and somewhat the man, who could patiently look on and see all the world against him, and pursue his own way notwithstanding; but that was a sad thing for the country—a country of limitless resources, vast forests, extensive prairies, and mines rich in every valuable mineral, embracing industries which that hon. gentleman, instead of assisting and helping to develop, neglected, allowing, meanwhile, millions of deficits to roll up in the absence of a single effort to overcome the difficulty. It might be supposed that he enjoyed the extinction of our industries, and in contemplation heard the tinkle of the cow-bell, and saw the shepherd with his crook where had existed the rattle of machinery and the hum of industry. Now, that was not the position the Finance Minister should have taken, nor was it the position an active young country like this expected of its Finance Minister. The hon. member for South Huron, in commenting upon this question of the tariff, said the method of discussion adopted by the Finance Minister might be heard in the back school-houses of the country, and that the method of advocacy was similar to that adopted in the country. That was no great compliment to the constituents of that hon. gentleman. It was his duty, and the duty of every hon. gentleman in the House to have placed this question before his constituents in a fair and proper manner.

A candidate should present the same views to his constituents as he would to the House after he was elected, in order that they might arrive at proper conclusions regarding them. He had no doubt this was done throughout the Dominion, and that the last election was as fair an election as had ever taken place in this country. It had been admitted that less money had been spent in these elections than in any previous elections that had taken place for a great many years. A great political question had been discussed fairly and upon its merits. Some hon. gentlemen had said that our Protective policy would affect our relations with England. Those gentlemen must know that the representatives who had been sent to support a Protective policy reflected the vast majority of the people of the country by whom they had been elected. And, when they charged his hon. friends with disloyalty in bringing forward this tariff, they charged, in a manner, the people of the Dominion with disloyalty, because it was their view that a Protective tariff should obtain in Canada. The question of loyalty and disloyalty was one which should not have been introduced into this discussion, nor should it be advanced at all in this House. It was a discussion which would not read well in the United States, nor in England, nor in any other country. The member for South Huron had also said that the Finance Minister had made statements in the House which would be injurious to the financial standing of the country, that the country was not in a prosperous condition, and that these statements would lead to a want of confidence in our credit. But surely the former Finance Minister did worse. He made speech after speech, in 1874, abusing the previous financial policy of the country. That hon. gentleman admitted that, when he went to England to borrow money, he was prepared to show the bright side of the shield. The hon. gentleman was highly successful in his mission, and it was evident that the bright side of the shield was the side believed in there. And this was brought about by the evil conduct of the Liberal-Conservative party. It was, however, certain that the country was not as prosperous now as it was a few years since, that our people were leaving the country

MR. SEAW.

and going to the United States, and that our manufactures had not been in active operation. What was the remedy to be applied? The late Government encouraged emigrants to come from the Old Country when there was nothing for them to do, and after they had been in Canada a short time they were compelled to go to the United States. Offices were filled by them, and offices were created. The expenditure was increased, and no effort was made to lessen the annual deficits. No financial policy which would better the state of affairs was propounded. Now hon. gentlemen told them that the United States was not prosperous, but they knew that, although there had been a great deal of depression in that country, an improvement had been going on for some time. There had been a very large emigration from the Eastern States to the prairie lands of the West, and we looked to bringing about a condition of affairs which would enable us, when a depression occurred again, to have some place to which our unemployed could go. He was satisfied that, with regard to the depression in the United States, Protection had had nothing to do with it other than to act as a stimulus to manufacturing. The depression there was caused by over-production. That, however, was no reason why competition should not prevail in Canada, or why our home industries should not be encouraged and fostered. What they said was that the industries of the country should be fostered, and that competition should take place here instead of on the other side of the line. If we had an over-stocked market, let it be over-stocked by our own manufactures. They could not direct how many should engage in manufactures. They could only open the gates to industry. Those gates would undoubtedly be opened by the present tariff. Hon. gentlemen had charged them with having, in the canvass, gone from house to house, and constituency to constituency, telling one story in one place and another in another. They seemed to think that the farmers had been very easily humbugged, but it appeared to him (Mr. Shaw) that the farmers understood the question very well. Hon. gentlemen had said that the farmers had been bribed by appealing to their selfishness.

He did not know how hon. gentlemen themselves got in, unless it was by appealing to the self-interest of their constituents. Their constituents did not return hon. gentlemen because they loved them, nor did they return them on account of some inherent qualities they possessed. They were not elected on account of their intellectual accomplishments. Were they not elected for the purpose of advancing the interests of their constituents, and for no other purpose, and were they not consequently representative men? He believed the majority of that Assembly were representative men. He believed, perhaps, there were some prominent gentlemen opposite who had been in power a long time, and had taken part in public affairs and possessed a great deal of personal influence, who might have been elected on personal grounds. That had it not been for that personal influence, perhaps, there would not have been a man of them present. If so elected, they were not representative men; they were not elected upon principle, but upon personal grounds. They, at all events, had no right to complain that the majority of that Parliament were not representative men. The constituents had a right to have their will carried out, and they were there for that purpose. Hon. gentlemen told the House that a tariff of over $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was a mere tribute to manufacturers, and that it was legalised robbery. Did hon. gentlemen mean to say that, if the requirements of this country necessitated a higher tariff than $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., we should not have it? Did they mean to say there was some magic in the number $17\frac{1}{2}$? He maintained that, had the late Government been in power it would have been necessary for them to raise the tariff, unless they had determined, as apparently the late Finance Minister had determined, to sit still and wait for the final catastrophe. The tariff had to be raised to $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to meet the requirements of the country in 1874, and there was no doubt that an additional duty should be imposed, if it were required. And it was admitted all round that the revenue derived from a $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. tariff had been, and was, insufficient to meet the requirements of the country. Deficit had followed deficit, and, therefore, it was necessary that something

should be done. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not attempt to meet the exigencies of the position whilst they were in office, and, when the country was so much dissatisfied, instead of attempting to alleviate the condition of the country they brought over emigrants for whom there was no work, and they went over themselves for money, with which they tried to make up the deficits. Now, a country could not go on in that way for any great length of time. The leader of the present Government said that something ought really to be done, and he brought forward a resolution last April, before a moribund Parliament, presided over by a Ministry of decay. When that hon. gentleman brought forward that resolution, the new policy which it developed flashed like lightning from one end of the Dominion to the other, finding favour everywhere. The Young Canadian party, from whom many hoped much, accepted this policy, and their former champions lost all control over them, one of the most notable of them, (Mr. Blake), having been defeated. He (Mr. Shaw) mentioned this only to show the strength of the storm which laid low the foremost man of the Reform party, a man who he (Mr. Shaw) regretted should be absent from this House. The Young Canada party eagerly supported that resolution, believing that, if acted on, it would open up a future to Canada. They were attracted by the ability of the right hon. gentleman who promulgated this resolution, and they gave him their support. The right hon. gentleman perceived this element of the population, and how it could be politically utilised, and opened up the Liberal Conservative party to receive them, and they were now acting together. It could not be said that this question was not discussed throughout the country, because hon. gentlemen opposite spent the whole of last summer in going from constituency to constituency discussing it. In his own riding they had appeared, and, at one time, he had intended to suggest that the Local Parliament of Ontario should hold a Session there, because the members of that House seemed to be there in great numbers, but they had left as soon as the elections were over, and he had heard nothing of them since. He recollected the late Finance Minister

discussing in his (Mr. Shaw's) county the question of Free-trade and Protection, when he stated, at the village of Teeswater, that he did not believe in bolstering up large cities by the accumulation of wealth therein. He (Mr. Shaw) did not know, at the time, whether the hon. gentleman was sincere or not. He presumed he was, because he had seen afterwards that the speech he (Mr. Cartwright) had delivered there had been printed in the book called "Pic-nic Speeches," which had been so extensively distributed through the country; and he presumed it was distributed with that gentleman's consent; and he had heard now from him, on the floor of this House, similar statements. He (Mr. Shaw) was always under the impression that the accumulation of wealth meant the advance of civilisation. He had read that, in the early ages of the world, in Mesopotamia and Egypt, all rich countries had become powerful through their wealth; and with wealth came civilisation. He had read that the manufacturing cities of Tyre and Sidon had colonised different parts of the world, and it was just this accumulation of wealth that enabled them to retain their colonies, and become great and powerful. He had also seen that the States of Greece had planted colonies in Italy, Sicily and Asia Minor, and that no civilised country ever did plant new colonies unless she was possessed of wealth. Sometimes a purely agricultural population became conquerors, but they eventually merged in the populations they conquered. They never planted civilised colonies. One would have supposed that the late Minister of Finance had read of these things, but it appeared that, if he had, he had forgotten, or did not understand them; whilst the young men of Canada did. Canadians knew that, without the accumulation of wealth, and without the establishment of large cities, they would never be able to establish themselves in the North-West. Hon. gentlemen said, respecting the proposed policy, that the Government were going to establish industries at the expense of Great Britain, that they were discriminating against that country, and that the resolution brought down by the hon. the Minister of Finance provided for a reciprocal trade with the United States, with-

MR. SHAW.

out any such provision in favour of England. Did hon. gentlemen mean to say that they should barter and bargain with Great Britain? Did they not know that they were one with Great Britain, that they were connected with her, and that they were ready at any time to lay down their lives to support the Mother Country in any enterprises in which they could assist her, and they did not require to bargain with a country of which they were a portion? But they did require to make this proposition to the United States, which was a foreign country. That was the reason the resolution had been pointed in that direction. It was stated, further, by those hon. gentlemen, that this policy would tend to separation from England. What had they done when they were in power? Although the country was in a bankrupt state, they had been doing their very best to obtain emigrants from England. Was that acting in the interest of Great Britain to take from her what was of most value to her—her population? They established extensive agencies over there, and did all they could to divert the population of that country hither. Canadians were prepared to concede to Great Britain every right she properly deserved, but, at the same time, they did say this was a matter in which they were interested as well as she. If we had lands in this country on which they could settle, it would be very proper to try to bring emigrants over, and, as this country became strong and wealthy, they would be able to aid Great Britain. They must do the same thing in regard to France and Germany. He did not intend to go over the whole tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to have done this merely for the purpose of ridiculing it and laughing at it. He did not believe their actions in that respect could do any good, either to their party or to the country. They must see that their conduct, in regard to the tariff, could not be productive of any good. He presumed they had to express their views, if they had any fixed views,—for their opinions now differed from those they formerly held,—before the country; but it seemed to him that the conduct of the hon. gentlemen opposite was like the conduct of the condemned man, who danced on the scaffold in order to divert his mind from impending des-

truction. There was another view of this picture. Suppose they were able, by a proper use of this tariff, to accumulate in this country a very considerable amount of wealth; suppose they were enabled, by the fostering of their industries, to construct the Pacific Railroad, and induce emigrants to settle in the great North-West, they certainly would have a greater chance of progressing than going on in the way followed by the late Minister of Finance. With our schools in operation, the Pacific Railroad complete, we could afford to place a large population on our Western prairies, our young men trained in our laws, and accustomed to the circumstances of the country, could go out there and take the lead in directing the energies of the thousands of emigrants who could find a home there. If that took place, and he believed it would, under this tariff, we had a great future for this country, and he did not think it would be a source of annoyance to England to see these localities filled up, a large and rich country filled with a population springing into existence, in connection with Great Britain, ready to give her assistance if required. Holding these views, he was very much pleased to support this tariff. As a whole, he was satisfied with it; but he must admit there was one point in which he regretted that some slight change could not have been made, which would have benefitted a certain class of the population in the western part of Ontario. He thought the salt interest might have been protected by having a duty put on it, and he trusted the Minister of Finance would yet be able to see his way to some change in that direction. They had very extensive salt formations along the shores of Lake Huron. The people of the United States had placed a tariff against Great Britain exactly similar to the tariff proposed between Canada and the United States, and it seemed to him a tariff might be placed on English salt coming into this country for other purposes than to be used in the gulf and sea fisheries. There could be no doubt of the purity of the salt produced in this country. There could be no better proof of it than the fact that it was purchased by the largest pork-packers in Chicago,

and he thought it was only a question of time for salt to rank as one of the greatest industries of the country. He read an extract from Sir William Logan in reference to salt produced at Goderich Harbour, which showed that it was of the very purest. The United States had placed a tariff against British salt going in there, and there was no doubt that the American salt was much less pure than ours; yet, we used their salt very largely; in fact, a great deal of it came into Canada some time since, and some even now. The following appeared in a Report on the "Goderich Salt Region," by T. Sterry Hunt, LL.D., F.R.S., Chemist and Mineralogist, addressed to Sir William E. Logan, F.R.S., late Director of the Canadian Geological Survey, a report taken from the General Report of the Geological Survey of the Dominion of Canada for 1867-69:—

"The quantity of bitter salts in the Goderich brines, however, is insignificant when compared with those of most other salt-producing regions."

And again, at p. 18 of the same report, Mr. Hunt said:—

"The present brine of Goderich is not only one of the most concentrated known, but also one of the purest, if not the purest, at present turned to practical use for the manufacture of salt."

There was a great deal more to the same effect, and he thought the salt produced in this country could be used just as well as the salt imported from Liverpool, and he trusted the Government would see fit to alter the tariff so as to afford it a fair measure of protection. As he had stated before, he would support the tariff as a whole, believing that the Finance Minister had met the general requirements of the country. As a whole, he had great pleasure in supporting these resolutions, and hoped that every hon. gentleman sent here as a supporter of a Protective policy, would support these resolutions.

MR. KAULBACH said the subject now before this House was one in which he took a very deep interest, affecting, as it did, every branch of trade, industry, and commerce. The Minister of Finance was certainly deserving of very great credit for formulating a re-adjusted tariff to protect all branches of trade and

industry, suitable, with some few exceptions, to all within this vast Dominion. The objection that some offered to this tariff, and with which he joined issue, was that his hon. friend had not exercised the feeling of retaliation towards our Republican neighbours to the extent that was certainly due. For instance, that, on the article of coal, upon which a tax of 75c. a ton was imposed when going into their market, we should place the same duty, or, in other words, a reciprocal tariff. The reduction of duties on the articles of molasses and tea, necessary commodities for the use of the poor man, would be very acceptable to the people, and generally approved of. Some would say, and did say, "Give us Free-trade; England upholds it, and therefore, her dependencies should uphold it;" which he conceived to be a fundamental error. The mistake, he considered, lay here: England had an immense population within a small territory, immense manufactories in full blast, in fact, was the machine-shop of the world; it was, therefore, England's interest to admit food and raw material free, to give as subsistence and material for work to her teeming millions. Canada, on the other hand, had a small population in a boundless territory, with fine arable soil. Canada's interest, therefore, was to compel her people to raise their own bread, and to work up their own raw material, and to admit only such things free. This policy contemplated all this, and, therefore, it appeared to him essentially necessary at this time. It was monstrous to suppose that a young nation, owning half a continent, must follow in the wake of an old nation in a small island. We had Free-trade; that was, we had inter-provincial trade. What we wanted was to encourage home industries, with home markets for home produce, and be an exporting, manufacturing people, instead of, as at present, an importing country. Sugar-refining, in this country, would give immense employment to the people, and more than any other manufactures. Ships would be employed, and men to sail them; coal giving employment to colliers, and vessels to carry it; barrels would be needed, boxes, nails, machinery, horses, trucks, and men to use them, each tending to pour prosperity

MR. KAULBACH.

into the country. Had this branch of industry been encouraged earlier, we would not have seen, as was witnessed some few days ago, the immense import of the article of sugar into this Dominion from the United States. He had been surprised to learn, yesterday, when looking over a statement showing the relative volumes of imports, according to value, from Great Britain and the United States, that, in 1872, the value received from Great Britain was \$1,382,370, while, from the United States that year, it was only \$640,713. But what did they find in 1878? The value received from Great Britain was \$2,763,022, while, from the United States that year, the startling quantity amounting in value to the sum of \$3,026,425. And still more startling was the fact that, within the last six months ending December last, the imports of this article from Great Britain was only \$376,589, whilst, from the United States, the value of the article imported into this Dominion reached the immense sum of \$2,141,966, proving most conclusively that, had we permitted this trade to continue much longer, the United States would have had the entire monopoly of our market. He regretted that the sad, sudden and unexpected call away from this House to pay the last honours to an honoured, loving and loved father, prevented his being present when the debate arose on the fishery award, under the Washington Treaty. He certainly must state that he should much have liked to be present on the occasion, inasmuch as he was desirous of showing the greater claim the Provinces bordering on the Atlantic had to the award, and more particularly Nova Scotia, conceiving that it should go to the fishing population who had suffered the loss, and not to the people of the West. That Nova Scotia was really requiring the assistance she was hoping to obtain from this award, was undoubted, when they carefully reviewed the memorial of the Provincial Secretary (H. S. Holmes), to this Government on the subject. Whilst referring to this subject, he would express the hope that a better protection might be offered to our fishermen visiting the Labrador coast in the summer season, from the inroads of American fishermen illicitly taking

fish in purse-seines and bag-nets on that shore, and dressing them on the shore soundings, to the exclusion of the natives and British vessels, the latter being driven away, in many instances to their sacrifice, with part voyages. Now to the important subject engaging the attention of this House at the present time. That a Protective tariff, under our peculiar position, was needed to pay interest on borrowed money, deficiencies incurred by the late Government, but more particularly to encourage trade and industry, was indisputable; but that it was to continue for any length of time would depend upon its working. Possibly, through a change of circumstances, Free-trade might become the new basis of this commercial and industrial policy of this country, but certainly it could not be expected for many years to come. That this tariff was a perfect one, no person would pretend to state for one moment. Rome was not built in a day, and he did not expect to see this perfect at once; but he had this confidence in his hon. friend the Minister of Finance, that he would be quite willing to amend, in detail, any want that might exhibit itself whilst it was in practical working. Without this policy, he believed that the country would be in that depressed state that they would be compelled to see their young men remove from their comfortable homes, and expatriate themselves from this country to seek the employment abroad which was denied them at home. In was to be hoped that Canada would no longer be a commercial dependency, but would take her place as a leading manufacturing and commercial nation, a position which her inexhaustible natural resources, and the perseverance and industry of her people well qualified her to assume. He quite endorsed the principle of a Protective tariff, so necessary under our peculiar circumstances, and whilst supporting this, as he hoped to support every measure which, in his judgment, was calculated to uphold the honour, elevate the character, and ensure the advancement of this noble Dominion, he should have, under peculiar circumstances affecting the interests of Nova Scotia and the county of Lunenburg, which he had the honour to represent, whose interests he held most dear, and where were centred his affec-

tions, his property and his hopes, to take exception to some of the articles of breadstuffs, and would offer his reasons for so doing when the subject was brought before this House in detail. He had listened with some degree of amusement to his hon. friend from Shelburne claiming that he represented the majority of the people of the Lower Provinces, but could not understand what the young man was driving at. Was he not aware that the House knew better than to believe such a statement. Was he not aware that in his county on the 17th September last, no less a person than one of the members of the late Ministry, no less a person than the Hon. Mr. Coffin, was defeated by a large majority. How the hon. gentleman could say he represented the majority of the people of the Lower Provinces, it was impossible to understand, unless he considered he was a host in himself, a *multum in parvo*. Perhaps some brighter light might more clearly pourtray the idea.

MR. KING said he intended to consider this National Policy, so called, as it affected some of the principal industries of the Maritime Provinces. He regretted to have to express himself in direct opposition to the principles laid down in the introduction of this tariff by the Minister of Finance. He entertained feelings of the highest respect for that gentleman, and had been in accord with him, socially and politically, for a lifetime. It was true that he had been a moulder of public opinion in his native Province. In matters connected with the temperance movement his name had become a household word. As a temperance man, New Brunswick was proud of him; and it, to-day, that Province was foremost in adopting the Canada Temperance Act, it was fair to say that the hon. gentleman's consistency, as an advocate of temperance and prohibition, was being felt in that movement. It was likewise true, that in the Province of New Brunswick the feeling was largely in favour of a revenue tariff, as opposed to the Protectionist principle. If, to-night, he stood an advocate of Free-trade principles, it was largely due to the fact that he had taken lessons from the hon. gentleman,

who, it was safe to assert, had been, during his administration of public affairs, a prominent advocate of those principles. It had been urged that gentlemen from New Brunswick, who had heretofore been followers of the Minister of Finance, should be prepared to support him on this occasion. Did anyone suppose that, if the hon. gentlemen were to effect a change of base on the temperance question, those in sympathy with him in that great movement would be expected to go and do likewise? Hon. gentlemen opposite had referred to the honour conferred upon them by members of the late Government visiting their counties, in order to influence the elections. His county had been equally honoured by a visit from the Finance Minister, who came for the purpose of assisting in the selection of one of a number of gentlemen, who were anxious to be sacrificed on the altar of their country, in the interests of the then Opposition. In a speech delivered on that occasion, the Minister of Finance attempted a definition of the so-called National Policy. He informed the audience that it was not intended to increase the taxes of the people, that articles which were not produced in the country would be admitted at a low rate of duty, while protection would be afforded to manufacturers by a readjustment of the tariff, but certainly there would be no increase. He (Mr. King) was proud to be able to say that the great Liberal party in that constituency were not influenced by the statements then and there made, and which had been proved by the introduction of this tariff to have been made without foundation. He had examined the tariff carefully, and was unable to discover anything like a readjustment, except in one case, where a small reduction had been made on the article of molasses, and a larger amount put upon the article of sugar. It was true that a great many articles which were formerly in the free list were now subject to duty. Among those were flour and cornmeal, which the people were assured by his opponent would not be taxed. He would remind the hon. gentleman that the tax on cornmeal, while it would not strongly affect his (Mr. Tilley's) constituency, would be oppressive in the rural districts, especially among the poorer classes. It

MR. KING.

had been said that a duty on flour would not increase the cost to the consumer. This point had been settled by the speech of the Finance Minister, when, in showing this House the amount he expected to receive by way of revenue from the increased duties, gave it as his opinion that two hundred and fifty thousand dollars revenue would be derived from this tax on bread alone. He maintained that, looking at the National Policy as a whole, and as applied to New Brunswick, the time chosen for its introduction was inopportune, so far as that Province was concerned. The principal industries there were farming, lumbering, ship-building, fishing, and the carrying trade. These industries were, many of them, at the present time, struggling for an existence. The cause of this, he contended, was not to be found in the Dominion, nor in the legislation of this Parliament, but was due to the fact that our customers in Great Britain and foreign countries were too poor to purchase our staple articles of export from us at remunerative, or even paying, prices, and the consequence was that prices had run down at fearful rates, and our people were embarrassed. It was true that our manufactures were not, at the present time, as prosperous as we could wish, and we did not need to go far to find the cause. It was not that they were unprotected, but was due to the fact that the leading industries were paralysed for the time being, and the people, in consequence, were unable to purchase the goods produced by the manufacturers. He did not think that the Minister of Finance would tell this House that it would be possible, by legislation in this Parliament, to raise the price of our lumber or other articles of export in the markets of either Great Britain or the United States. He would now show how two of the principal industries named would be affected by this tariff, and, as he had the honour to represent a constituency that was more immediately connected with the business of farming and lumbering, and he himself was more conversant with these than any others, he would confine his remarks to them. The Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, had reminded the House and the lumbermen of the country that in the readjustment, so-called, their

interests had been guarded. He (Mr. King) had carefully looked into the matter, and would give the result of his calculations. He would apply the increases under the proposed tariff to the different descriptions of goods made use of in the lumber business. In order to make this plain, he would base his calculations on the average quantities of different kinds of supplies affected by the increase, and necessary to produce say 1,000,000 superficial feet of lumber. First on the list he would place 1,000 bushels of oats, on which a duty of 10c. had been imposed. It might be that the increase on that article would amount to half the duty, or say \$50. This he doubted. Then, on four barrels of beans, increased duty, \$2: thirty barrels of cornmeal at 40c. duty, amount \$12; fifty barrels of flour at 50c., amount \$25. Then, if labouring men were not to be injured by the National Policy, it was but fair to assume that their wages must be increased, or, otherwise, they, too, had been deceived. It would be found, at the present time, the labour required to produce the quantity of lumber referred to and place it alongside a mill at St. John or elsewhere in New Brunswick, would amount to \$2,500. An advance of 10 per cent. on this amount gave them the sum of \$250. The additional tax on iron, steel-chains, rope, axes, nails, blankets, stoves, tenting, augers and tinware, might safely be put down at \$50, giving a total of \$389. He would now, in order to give the Minister of Finance fair play, deduct from this amount the decrease on, say, 200 gallons of molasses, and 100 pounds of black tea, which would be found necessary in this bill of supplies, and it would be found that the great concession amounted to less than \$5 in all, which, deducted from the total, as shown, left still a charge of \$384, or a sum very nearly equal to 40c. per thousand. Then, in addition to this amount, he would say that, if the manufacturers were not to be injured by this tariff, they would require at least 10 per cent. additional on the manufacture of said lumber, which, added to the increased cost of the log, footed up a total increase of 60c. per thousand superficial feet. Now, let them apply this to the production of all kinds of lumber in New Brunswick,

which, reckoned as deals and other descriptions usually exported, amounted to 400,000,000 annually. To this might safely be added 100,000,000 for home consumption, making the total 500,000,000 superficial feet, which, figured at the increased cost as shown, gave the enormous tax of \$300,000 additional on this industry alone, and yet they were told, by the Minister of Finance, that this leading industry had been cared for. He (Mr. King), on his arrival here to attend to his Parliamentary duties, was somewhat surprised to find that, in an interview had with the Minister of Finance by gentlemen representing the great lumber interests of the Dominion, they were reminded that the lumber interest was considered by him as a waning one. In the remarks made by him in delivering his Budget speech he alluded to it as follows:—"The time has arrived when we must consider whether we are to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for our American neighbours; whether we are to continue to produce more lumber than we can find a market for in Great Britain, or than the United States will take from us at fair prices." These remarks, coupled with the fact that, when the tariff was introduced, in the resolutions in which the Government asked the power from this Parliament, to arrange for reciprocity with the United States in various articles, including coal, no mention was made of the article of lumber, it being totally ignored, forced him to conclude that the lumber business was considered a waning one, and, as it was really necessary somebody should be sacrificed in the introduction of this National Policy, it had been decided that the lumbermen were the class to suffer. He would admit that the business of lumbering, like many other branches of business, had been overdone, but it was equally true that it would cure itself, and required no tinkering on the part of a Government who were powerless to aid it. It had been asserted that, under the fostering care of this tariff, the iron industry would assume large dimensions. He hoped it might; but, when the time arrived that the article of iron became a drug in our markets, in a time of depression, would the hon. gentleman, if he happened to be the then

Finance Minister, attempt to apply the principle he now applied to the lumber business, to legislate it out of existence? He (Mr. King) would now, for the sake of argument, accept the situation, and would assume that the estimate which the Finance Minister placed upon the lumber business, was the correct one; but, in doing so, would remind him that the other, and greater interest, in which his constituents were interested, had fared no better at his hands. The farmers of his county had been told by the Minister of Finance, and other gentlemen, for whose utterances he might fairly be held responsible, that, under the National Policy, they would be protected, that everything they raised upon their farms would suddenly go up in price; that articles they consumed, which were not produced in this country, would be lowered, and that the price of manufactured goods would not be increased. That a duty on flour would not be imposed, was urged upon them by gentlemen seeking their votes. They were to be protected from the Americans, who, it was said, were flooding their markets. He (Mr. King) was prepared to say to the Minister of Finance that, in so far as the county which he represented, and in which that gentleman had the honour of being born, was concerned, the promises made were a delusion and a snare, which could be plainly shown. He would call the attention of hon. members interested to a statement he held in his hand, computed from the Report of Trade and Navigation, in which he would show the amount of the increased protection to the farmers of his native Province. He would explain to hon. gentlemen that the duty on cornmeal and flour would operate as a tax upon the large majority of the agricultural classes in his Province, as in nearly every case the farmers were consumers of American and Canadian flour, and, therefore, he need not include those articles. The other agricultural products imported into New Brunswick last year, on which it was proposed to increase the duty, were as follows: Hops, lard, bacon and hams, preserved meats, animals, bran, potatoes, other vegetables, barley, oats, peas and beans, to which, if they applied the new tariff, they found the total amount of increase on Protection to

be \$9,337.40. Under the new tariff it might be supposed that their own farmers would be called upon to supply a portion of the articles referred to, provided the farmers of Ontario did not take the place in their markets now supplied by the Americans; but, giving the Finance Minister the full benefit of the measure of protection afforded to their farmers, under this new tariff, what did they find? That, dividing the sum named among forty-two thousand farmers in New Brunswick, as shown by the last census, they were protected to the extent of about twenty cents per head. It was true they would be told that the tariff had been reduced on the articles of molasses and tea, but really this reduction was so infinitesimally small in the face of the great increase on every article they consumed, that it was an insult to their intelligence to name it. If the Minister of Finance had any regard for the promises made by his party during the elections, and was himself desirous of benefitting the farmers of New Brunswick, he would suggest to him the increase of one or one and a-half cents per pound on the article of pork—the only article upon which an increase of duty would be likely to benefit the farmers. It was true that about one-fifth of all the American pork imported into this Dominion found its way into the Province of New Brunswick, and, while the duty of one cent per pound had answered the purposes of a revenue tariff, it had utterly failed in the way of protecting the farmers. He (Mr. King) did not wish to be considered as advocating Protection, but, on the principle of fair play, he would ask, for the farmers of his county, the same kind of protection the Finance Minister was willing to accord to the clockmakers of Hamilton, or the manufacturers of patent medicines in St. John. He would also remind the hon. gentleman that hides, wool, and eggs were all products of New Brunswick farms, and ought, in all fairness to the farmers, to have been subjected to duty. Farmers in New Brunswick, including their families and labourers, comprised very nearly two-thirds of the population, and would pay, if they were able, considerably more than one-half of the increased cost of goods under the new

tariff, which in New Brunswick alone would amount to an enormous sum, and for which they got no corresponding benefits. The Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, knowing, as he did, that the tariff would not be acceptable to any class save the manufacturers, deemed it prudent to make a promise for the future. In referring to the article of tea, knowing the promises that had been made during the elections, and not fulfilled, the Finance Minister now told them that, if their policy had the desired effect, next year he proposed to place tea on the free list. He (Mr. King) would say that, if the policy had the effect of lessening the importation of foreign goods by giving an impetus to home manufactures, it would certainly be found that the revenue would decrease in proportion, and, unless the Government really contemplated lopping off something in the expenditures on public works, they would most assuredly find themselves compelled to increase the duties on the necessaries of life rather than to decrease them. He would say that there had been a time in his life when he was as willing to echo the sentiments of the Minister of Finance as hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House were now willing to applaud everything he said or did, and, had he not discovered that the hon. gentleman was not infallible, or anything like it, he might yet be found willing to support him. It was true that, as the Minister grew older, he became more cautious, as exhibited by him in his closing remarks in his Budget speech a few days since, in which, while picturing to their minds the glorious future for the far west of this country, under this National Policy, he made this reservation—that, if he was not over-sanguine, and if his friends were not over-sanguine, these results would most certainly follow. He (Mr. King) would now read, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, an extract from a speech delivered by that hon. gentleman during the Confederation campaign, and reported in the *St. John Telegraph* of December 21st, 1864. Referring to the prospects of New Brunswick under Confederation, he gave utterance, at the time, to the following:—

“I repeat that I am convinced that a tariff of two dollars and seventy-five cents per head

on the whole Confederation will meet its annual necessities for many years to come. I want this to go on record. If I have any reputation in financial matters, I wish to stake it on this estimate; and I will give you one of my reasons for doing so. The expenses of government do not increase proportionate to population; but a tariff increases *per capita* on the increase of population.

“When, in 1860, the United States had 30,000,000 of people only, the revenue was fifty-four million dollars, or \$1.65 per head. Had I time, I could go into many other points.

“I will give my figures to the press, and, if anyone can discover any error in them, let him do so. I am satisfied that, as Canada now pays only \$2.40 per head of tariff, as the United States paid only \$1.65 in 1860, and as we have made provision for local legislative work, we shall find \$2.75 amply sufficient for the purposes of Confederation, for at least a quarter of a century to come.”

He (Mr. King) referred to the fact that but little more than half the time named had rolled around, and yet it was found that, before the introduction of this tariff, our taxes had increased to six dollars *per capita*, and, under the operation of this tariff, the people of New Brunswick would be compelled to pay no less than eight dollars and twenty-five cents per head, or a sum three times greater than the hon. gentleman predicted would be required of them at the expiration of a quarter of a century. Since coming here he (Mr. King) had had the honour of serving on the Committee for the promotion of immigration and colonisation. He had listened to evidence volunteered by gentlemen interested in the settlement of the great North-West. He was not aware what the Government policy was with reference to this important matter, but he could assure them that if they wished to depopulate New Brunswick, they had but to apply this National Policy. He would not detain the House longer than to say again that he regretted to have to oppose the hon. the Minister of Finance, by voting against this tariff.

MR. RYKERT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at

Twenty minutes past

Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 28th March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 68) To incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.)

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion, that the resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th), be read the second time.

MR. RYKERT said he felt some diffidence in addressing the House, after listening to the very able speech made by the Minister of Finance, in introducing the resolutions. He must confess, also, that he saw very little argument to confute in what hon. gentlemen opposite had said in opposition to the Government policy. In marked contrast to the speech of the Finance Minister, was that of the ex-Finance Minister, which was principally remarkable for its wildness and incoherence, and was certainly not the speech of a man desirous of advancing the interest of the country. He seemed so thoroughly wrapped up in the nostrums of Stuart Mill and others, who had written on political economy, that he left out of his consideration the position of this country. He had sat here during the last five years with his arms folded, entirely indifferent to the requirements of the country. He reminded him (Mr. Rykert) of a witness, an engineer, who was asked how a certain stream ran. He replied, from north to south, and upon the opposing counsel saying it cannot be, for it runs from south to north, he retorted and said that it ought to have run in that direction. The ex-Finance Minister seemed to think the people ought to have come to him, not he to the people. When

MR. RYKERT.

the hon. gentleman admitted that the Finance Minister had, in almost every respect, conformed to the pledges he made to the electors, he admitted the whole case. The hon. gentleman seemed to feel that it was not pleasant to be brought face to face with the man whom he had accused so unjustly on every platform in the country, in connection with the Estimates of 1873-4. Although the member for Cumberland had ably defended the Minister in his absence, it was a source of gratification to every member of the Conservative party that the Minister of Finance was now in the House, face to face with his accusers. He (Mr. Rykert) would have been pleased if this discussion had been carried on in a broad and patriotic spirit instead of a mere party spirit, as it had been by hon. gentlemen opposite. What reason was there for bringing into the discussion of this important question the causes that wrought the downfall of the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald in 1873. Hon. gentlemen opposite had not very ingenuously stated that one of the causes was that the expenditure had increased during ten years, under the former Conservative Government, to nearly ten million dollars beyond that of 1867-8. That argument had been used on every platform throughout the country, and certainly with but very little effect. Had the late Government introduced a single motion in Parliament to reduce the expenditure against which they so loudly exclaimed? Had they been honest, they would have shown the causes of the increase of the expenditure between 1867 and 1873; they would have shown that it was caused by extra expenditure, such as the bringing into the Confederation of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island; the assumption of the debts of Ontario and Quebec, whereby those Provinces had been relieved of ten millions of dollars; the expenditure on account of the Intercolonial Railway; the expenditure in connection with the Pacific Railway, and other items of a similar character. The best answer he could give to this fallacious statement was that the late Government never attempted to reduce the Estimates, but went on increasing, until we had the mortification of seeing a yearly deficit; instead of rolling up a surplus of ten

millions, we had a deficit of three and a-third millions. He was also glad to see that the hon. member for West Elgin had admitted that the Government had redeemed its pledges to the electors. He said he felt deeply grieved at the defeat of the late Government, at the loss the country had sustained, and would have been willing to increase taxation had the Government remained in power. The opposition to this measure, he maintained, was not of such a nature as ought to be made by men who wished to be considered statesmen. He could, had he chosen, have told the causes that occasioned the defeat of the late Government; he could have shown them it was owing to their utter abnegation of every principle upon which they assumed to take office. He (Mr. Rykert) held in his hand a declaration of the hon. the leader of the Opposition delivered in 1870, in St. Catharines, in which he very fully set forth the platform on which he would form a Government. It was as follows:—"He would never accept office upon any consideration, if in doing so he would have to abandon the least of the principles he now professed. The man who taught one thing in Opposition and another thing in power, was a demagogue in whom the people should have no confidence whatever." He would ask the hon. member for West Elgin, could he point to one single principle which the late Government had not entirely abandoned? The last principle they held, and which had great prominence in their party, was that a moribund Government had no right to appoint persons to office. They, however, after their crushing defeat in September last, when they were no longer responsible to Parliament, appointed persons to office. Thus they kicked over the very last plank in their platform. It was not alone because they abnegated their principles that they fell. Look at the composition of the late Government. In it were gentlemen of every opposing element, and of every political principle, united by one bond, the element of cohesion,—the determination to hold office irrespective of the wants of the country. In that Government were certain gentlemen who had been condemned by the power behind the throne; such as the member for

Bothwell, who received from the leader of the party, a few years ago, a snubbing because he dared to offer to the people some peculiar views with reference to the Senate; the ex-Finance Minister—a Conservative one day, and a Reformer the next—who was denounced in unmeasured terms; also, the now famous Cauchon, and the member for Westmoreland, all banded together, not for the common interest of the country, but for patronage and power. He would admit the hon. the leader of the Opposition had been consistent throughout his public career on the question of the fiscal policy of the country. He had always upon this question taken a somewhat decided view, but the same could not be said of his colleagues. The people in 1878 became alarmed at the position of affairs, and, demanded some great change, and, as on every other occasion when the wants and requirements of the country seemed to demand it of him, the now leader of this Government, Sir John A. Macdonald, stepped to the front with a policy for the people and the country, the policy laid down in his resclusion last Session, and the policy upon which the Conservative party went to the country. In opposition to this policy, the Government and their supporters raised the cry of taxing the poor man's bread, revived transactions which transpired years ago, and unearthed the so-called Pacific Scandal. They went round the country making the speeches which were repeated here by the hon. members for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), West Elgin (Mr. Casey), North Oxford (Mr. Oliver), and North Norfolk, (Mr. Charlton), The people did not believe these men. They had entire faith in the policy of the leader of the present Government. The hon. member for West Elgin, in saying the state of affairs could not be worse, made a frank admission. He admitted that the people wanted a change. After their defeat on the 17th September, these gentlemen, at once, notwithstanding they said it would have the effect of taxation of flour and coal, and all that sort of thing, raised a hue and cry in favour of the National Policy. They wanted it launched on the country, even before the members of the Government had taken their places. It

was quite evident they desired to show how the poor man would be injured by the Government policy. They knew the local elections were coming on, and that the only salvation for the Mowat Government was a question of that kind, and they desired to go to the country with a hue and cry. One would suppose from what hon. gentlemen opposite stated, that this was the first occasion a National Policy was discussed. It was discussed over and over again. On consulting the records of Parliament, it would be found that the strongest and most clamorous for the National Policy were some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that some years ago, on a motion made by Sir Francis Hincks, Finance Minister, to the duty on coal, wheat, and flour, the hon. member for North Oxford said :

"There had been a great promise as to a National Policy. One of the great objects of this National Policy was to create a trade between the two extremities of the Dominion, but that object would be completely destroyed by the removal of duty from coal and wheat."

The hon. member for South Huron, (Mr. Cameron) in 1870, on this question was also a strong Protectionist. He received a snubbing, however, from the leader of the Opposition, because he dared to speak on behalf of the farmers of Canada. The hon. gentleman on that occasion said :

"At the commencement of the Session there was a general feeling on both sides of the House in favour of a National Policy. In the early part of the Session there was a unanimous opinion inside and outside of the House, in favour of a National Policy, and protection to native industries."

Yet this hon. gentleman, when he ventured to address this House now, told them that the policy of Free-trade was more acceptable to the country than that of Protection. He would go a little further, and they would find that Mr. Workman, from Montreal, introduced a resolution in reference to that same question, which was as follows :—

"That this House deeply regrets to learn from the Minister of Finance that the Government has not proposed to this House a policy of protection to our various and important industries; and that the large amount of capital now invested in those industries, and their present depressed condition, renders such a policy necessary to restore them to a condition of prosperity."

MR. RYKERT.

He also found the hon. member for Bothwell was inspired with the idea that there was something wrong in the country and our manufacturing industries. He moved a resolution for a Committee of Parliament to enquire into the cause of our financial depression, and the condition of our industries. Upon that occasion, among the many speeches made, were those of the hon. member for North Norfolk, the hon. member for North Oxford, and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson); and in the discussion they all introduced the idea that the country required some remedy for the distress among the several industries. That was followed up by the resolution of the hon. the leader of the Government, which he had read. It was admitted on all hands there was a deficit, and that something had to be done as regarded the revenue. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) admitted that he was prepared, for one, to have voted in favour of increased taxation, had his friends retained their seats on the Treasury benches. They did not deny they would have had to increase the revenue in some way, and that way could only have been by increased taxation. And what argument did hon. gentlemen now advance? They said, You have got a policy detrimental to the interests of Canada, and are going to sever our tie with the Mother Country. They found the great organ of the party attacking the *Mail* newspaper because it used these words :

"We are not discriminating against the Mother Country, nor waging a tariff war upon her; we are simply fighting for our existence against a foreign nation."

And what did the *Globe* say?—

"This is utterly false. If our exposition of the anti-British tendency of the tariff could have been refuted, it would have been. Instead of grappling with it, the Tory organs have fought excessively shy of the subject, and, instead of rescuing the reputation of their leaders from ignominy, have contented themselves with trying to convince people who have just paid dearer for their provisions that the N. P. is not going to increase the cost of living."

Now, that was the position taken by the organs of the party, but he had yet to learn that Canada could be severed from the Mother Country by anything like a fiscal policy. He had yet to learn that

the feeling of patriotism, loyalty, and devotion which we entertained in regard to our Mother Country could be severed by such a policy. It was fresh in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that, at the time of the Trent affair, thousands of our young men rushed to the front, for the purpose of defending the integrity and honour of the Mother Country. It must be fresh, also, in the minds of hon. gentlemen that, during the time of the Crimean war, hundreds of our young men volunteered for the purpose of defending the flag of England. Canada had given strong evidence that her close relations with the Mother Country were not to be severed. This was a cry that had been raised in the hope of captivating the public. They thought that, by drawing the red herring across the trail, they would be enabled to deceive the people they had already once deceived. For years, they had had a policy which taxed the products of the Mother Country to the extent of 17½ per cent. The National Policy had not altered the principle whatever. The principle was a good one, and recognised as judicious. It was absurd to say, because we were obliged now, for revenue purposes, or in the interests of the country, to increase the duties, that we were acting in opposition to the Mother Country. He would like to know if it was not to the interest and honour of England, who was our chief creditor, that Canada should be able to pay her indebtedness. Was it not better that we should honestly pay our debts, and foster and encourage our manufactures, and thus build up and develop the country, than repudiate our debts under a policy of Free-trade? What would be the consequences in England if we resorted to repudiation? They were also told to look to the result in England. A notice of motion had been put on the table of the Parliament of England by some visionary Lord, in reference to the fiscal policy of Canada, and this was pointed to as an evidence of the unfriendly spirit in which they viewed our new policy. Then they were referred to the strictures of Mr. Bright, who had been the enemy of the colonies on all occasions, and who had done everything he could to sever our connection with the Mother Country. In his opinion,

it was perfectly absurd to quote Mr. Bright as an authority. Then they said it was not fair to have a retaliatory policy against the United States. That was an argument which rather amused him, when he remembered the various speeches made in Parliament by the leading gentlemen on the Opposition benches, in favour of just such a policy as was now being inaugurated. He proposed to put one of these gentlemen in the box as a witness, and prove the soundness of the policy. He would call upon the member for South Huron. He had a good deal of faith in the hon. gentleman's testimony. He had made a statement on a former occasion, and he desired to see whether the hon. gentleman would swear to it to-day. If not, he had a perfect right to say he would not put any confidence in him in the future, and he would leave the House and country to say in which statement they could place the most confidence. He thought it most likely the House would believe the statement made a year or two ago, while the hon. gentleman was on the Government side, and at a time when he little expected the defeat of the 17th September, in preference to one made now, while the hon. gentleman was smarting under defeat. On 27th April, 1870, he made the following statement:—

“Why should the Americans want the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty? Are not all the Canadian markets open to them, while their markets are closed against us in almost every commodity? In support of his position, he quoted from J.S. Mill, to the effect that a retaliatory policy was, in some cases, justifiable. Fortified by such opinions, they could afford to overlook that of journals which were opposed to the proposal. They heard the same thing talked of for the last six years, that Reciprocity would be sure to come immediately. He agreed, however, with the member for Cumberland, that the time had now arrived when they must pursue a policy of independence on this question, consulting their own interests, independent of what was said or done on the other side of the line. For want of so doing many interests were languishing, some were paralysed. * * * Something of the kind (application for Renewal of Reciprocity Treaty) occurred every year, and we would have the same thing renewed every year, until the Canadian Government took an independent stand, dictated by Canadian interests, and Canadian interests alone.”

Did the House believe that evidence given on a former occasion, or the lan-

guage used yesterday? The one was made under calm reflection; the other was promoted by a desire to injure the Finance Minister. He would take another impartial witness, a gentleman who, upon all occasions, in addressing this House, spoke with moderation, and no doubt measured every word he uttered—a gentleman who would not allow a single utterance to fall from his lips that would not, as he hoped, carry conviction with it. That gentleman was the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Patterson). He said:—

“I must admit that I am in favour of a defensive policy. I cannot view with complacency what we see in this country. We live beside a country with a population ten times greater than our own, whose industries have been fostered by Protection until they are enabled, even in some articles in which Britain excelled, to challenge supremacy with her. While that nation has erected against us, and other countries, a hostile tariff, we have our hands bound, and give them free and unrestricted right of trade in our market.”

Was not that in direct opposition to what the hon. member for South Huron, the hon. member for North Oxford, and the hon. member for West Middlesex, had stated during this debate? He desired now to see what another gentleman stated. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had said:

“With regard to the resolution, I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted, which would bring the United States to terms, and would, at least, protect us against slaughter invoices.”

Here they had the undoubted testimony that a retaliatory policy was the only one to prevent slaughter invoices being sent into this country. What did the hon. gentleman say the other night, “They had heard a great deal about retaliation, and he had always listened to their talk with a certain degree of nervousness.” He (Mr. Rykert) could not discover the slightest degree of nervousness, in the hon. gentleman’s former speech. He then went on to say:

“He always had a fear, when the matter was referred to, similar to the fear he had when he saw an incautious and inexperienced person handling dangerous weapons.”

He desired to quote another authority, always recognised as an authority in questions of this kind in England; he

MR. RYKERT.

referred to the remarks made by Sir Howard Douglas, in a speech delivered in the House of Commons, in which he made use of the following language:—

“Import duties imposed on one side deprive the country against which they are adopted, of the increased market, and consequently of the increased productive industry which international intercourse would create if fairly reciprocated, and the due equilibrium can only be restored by imposing retaliatory duties.”

But they were told, “Look to the United States, and to the New York *Herald*. It is threatening us in almost every direction.” If our policy had not been an evidence to the American people that we were right in proposing the present policy, and they were wrong in not giving reciprocity, we should not have heard a word on the subject. The New York *Herald*, a paper which reflected the tone of the American people, called upon the American Government to step into the breach and secure reciprocity before it was too late. The hon. gentleman said he was in favour of reciprocity, but took the position that a retaliatory policy was not in the interest of the country. It was amusing to see how they pointed out the effects of this policy in England. They say: “Surely we ought to have a Free-trade policy when they have one in England. Look what it has done for the country.” He desired to bring forward another witness on this question, the hon. member for North Norfolk. He said, on a former occasion, in this House:

“No nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufacture without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions. This has been notably the case in Great Britain; and I think that the assertion that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive powers of a nation is uncontrovertible.”

He would quote another authority, distinguished in this country as a commercial man, he referred to the late member for Lincoln, Captain Norris, and he thought that the House would accept his opinions on a question like this. He said:

“I will show that what suits one country will not suit another. I believe what gives prosperity to England is not suited to Canada. England can, to-day, be called a Free-trade

nation. Her policy has been Free-trade just as long as it was necessary. It is not a hundred years ago since she took the duties off lumber from this and other countries, and why? Because her home supply was getting scarce. It was the same with corn. She took off the duties to feed the people she had employed in her factories at small wages. When England had her manufactories established, and could compete with the world, she became a Free-trade nation."

That bore out what he had stated, that England, so long as it suited her interests, adopted either Free-trade or Protection. That she was a Free-trade nation, in the common acceptation of the term, he did not admit; because, if she were, they would not see her making treaties with foreign nations, whereby restrictions were imposed upon her manufactures, as was the case with France, the treaty made by Mr. Cobden providing that there should be a duty not exceeding 30 per cent. on British manufactures. He denied that this policy was detrimental to the interests of the country, or that it would tend to sever the connection with Great Britain. As hon. gentlemen had stated that England had prospered under Free-trade, he would like to show what was going on in that country now. He found in a letter, written by Lord Bateman to the *London Times*, which, no doubt, hon. gentlemen had seen, the following:—

"We have tried Free-trade, and it has been found wanting. We have done our best to impress other countries with the reasonableness of our policy, and in return they scoff at our blindness, and turn a deaf ear to our remonstrances. In the meantime, partial ruin and wholesale depression and distress are staring us in the face. Our local burdens are increasing, our exports diminishing. Our working classes, unsettled, are waging open war in the cause of labour against capital; discontented, because unable to find the real cause of their discontent; clamouring for their participation in profits, which can hardly be said to exist, and yet unable to account for the hesitation and inability of their employers to accede to what they consider are only their just demands.

"Why should we persist in such an Utopian crusade? Why have we cut adrift from our old anchorage to launch our good ship upon a treacherous torrent, which is hurling us helplessly to imminent shipwreck? In Heaven's name, if we are on the wrong tack, let us arrest our downward course. Don't let us, for the sake of a Quixotic theory, blind our eyes to the fact that our trade is ruinously slipping from us, and that we are sacrificing our best and dearest interests to an unacceptable idea.

"There are indications that the tide of public opinion is undergoing a gradual and, therefore, a more convincing change. I hail it with satisfaction. After all, the argument that comes home to every one's pocket is the most cogent, and is worth all the theories and all the lectures of all the political economists in the world.

"I appeal to the common sense and to the patriotism of my countrymen, and, if they are convinced how great has been the fallacy of our Free-trade policy without reciprocity, it is for them to say, as I believe sincerely they will say, whether a return to a policy of limited Protection, so far from being impossible or undesirable, is not the true and simple solution of our present difficulties, and will tend, in a more simple and natural way than any other, to retrieve our losses, increase our revenue, lighten our burdens, bring peace, contentment, and employment to our working classes, and teach them and us to bless the day which restored the old policy and the old watchword of "Protection to native British industry." With the object of bringing these views before the public, and of inviting their discussion and consideration, I have ventured to address you."

That was the opinion of a gentleman who certainly spoke with a full knowledge of the facts, who would not advance views in opposition to the interests of his own country. He found that on the 28th of November last, the following resolution was discussed in the British Chamber of Commerce, which satisfied him that there was a feeling of insecurity in England, regarding their Free-trade policy:—

"That this Chamber, whilst affirming its thorough belief in the principles of true Free-trade between nation and nation, views with apprehension the great decrease in value of British exports and manufactures, and the vastly increasing proportions that imported manufactures bear to them; and is of opinion that, as no foreign nation will, at the present time, receive our goods duty free, we should impose a duty on their manufactures of a sufficient amount as to be, on the one hand, a fair source of revenue, and, on the other, to maintain in this country the manufacture of those for which we are equally adapted, while admitting duty free all food, raw produce, and material, unassisted by bounties from the sending nation."

From that it would appear as if the question was of such vital importance to that great body that a day had actually been set apart for discussing it. That he thought ought to shake the opinion entertained by certain members of this House, and by the country, that Free-trade had done a great deal for

England, and induce them to come to the conclusion that Free-trade had run its course, and that England would be bound to raise a barrier against the United States. Germany, too, was discussing at this very moment, in her Parliament, the question of Free-trade and Protection. They found in a speech delivered by Prince Bismark, the following:—

“ I have given Free-trade a trial, and it does not seem to have benefitted the country commercially, industrially, or financially. I am overwhelmed with lamentation respecting the decline of trade and the decay of manufacturing enterprise, and with assurances—from people for whose judgment in such matters I entertain the highest respect—that partial and moderate protection will remedy those evils as if by magic. Therefore, I also propose to give protection a chance of ameliorating the condition of the manufacturing and operative classes, and of lightening the load which the Budget unquestionably lays upon the shoulder of the nation. As certain of the Ministers with whom I have hitherto worked on my former platform will not range themselves by my side on my new platform, I must rid myself of them, and put others in their place who will carry out my resolves.”

This certainly showed conclusively that some countries beside the United States were not as much enamoured with Free-trade ideas, at the present time, as they were formerly. They also found that on the 18th March, by the following telegraphic despatch, that the question was assuming a definite shape in that country:—

“ LONDON, March 18.—A Berlin despatch says the Tariff Commission seems particularly anxious to secure German industry against American competition. It has imposed heavy duties upon most articles now imported from America. Its last decision is in favour of a duty of 20 marks per cwt. on leather goods. It is now considering a proposal to tax foreign rags. The proposed duty on woollen yarns, however, provoked the opposition of the German wool-spinners. The Protectionists are now attacking the present coinage system, and recommend the issue of plenty of paper money. A Berlin correspondent hears that the Tariff Commission has finished its labours and presented the scheme of the new tariff to the Federal Council.”

All that went to show that the ideas entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite, that Free-trade was considered beneficial by all the older countries, were not quite correct. That being the case, they had a right to say, having tried both Free-trade and Protection in this country,

MR. RYKERT.

that it was their duty to adopt some policy by which this depression would be arrested. Hon. gentlemen pointed to the bad results in the United States. He could not come to the same conclusion. Figures had been quoted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, who were in the habit of quoting figures, to show that the United States was in a very desperate position, but he thought, if the public records were consulted, those gentlemen's figures were generally found not quite correct. He (Mr. Rykert) recollected hearing on a former occasion Mr. Wood, who was a Protectionist, discuss this question in this House. He said:

“ They are possessed of large capital, the best of machinery and long experience, and, to crown all, a prohibitory tariff, whilst we, as manufacturers, are but of yesterday, with little capital, less experience, and almost a Free-trade tariff.”

The best evidence of the prosperity of the United States was that during the last thirteen years they had wiped off a large proportion of the national indebtedness, a result which was creditable to the people of that country. Another strong evidence of the prosperity in the United States was that to-day a very large amount of her indebtedness was to her own people, who were gradually withdrawing her bonds from foreign markets. He thought that these two facts afforded undoubted evidence that the United States was in a prosperous condition, and that she was likely to remain so. There was no doubt that the question of Free-trade and Protection had been discussed at very great length in this House, and he (Mr. Rykert) did not intend to discuss it from his own point of view, nor did he intend to advance any of his own opinions on this question; but he intended to show what were the results of Free-trade and Protection in this country, and he hoped to be able to bring before the House evidence to show that Free-trade was not the true policy for the country. He thought that the evidence of living political economists in this House would have greater weight than anything which he might say himself, and would, therefore, select the names of a few gentlemen who had large experience on this question, and who had already given expression to their views. The friends of the new National

Policy claimed that it would bring capital into the country, that that was one of its chief attributes; and he thought they were justified in making that statement. Any person who had read the speech of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, delivered in the drill-shed at Toronto, last year, could come to no other conclusion than that the fostering of their industries would be the means of bringing a very large amount of capital into Canada. It was as follows:—

“And so it would be in Canada, if we were willing to tax ourselves, over and above what is necessary for revenue purposes, for the promotion of the interests of certain manufacturers. We would merely succeed in making a few manufacturers rich, for a few years, at the expense of the rest of the people, and so many would rush into business that the makers would produce more than could be sold.”

Now, that proved two things: First, that this policy must bring capital into the country; and, second, that prices would be reduced. He would take another authority—Mr. Wood, of Hamilton, who said:

“Protection means much more than this. It will secure the influx of a large amount of foreign capital for manufacturing purposes that would never reach us as long as our present Free-trade tariff exists.”

He recollected that this same statement he had quoted as being made by Mr. Wood had also been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and it was a statement which no man dare controvert. He did not think any man would undertake to say that the fostering of our industries would not have a tendency to bring capital into the country. He (Mr. Rykert) would say more than that, it would improve the condition of manufacturers, and reduce prices to the consumer. He did not intend to advance his own opinion to prove the correctness of his statement, although he had had some experience in public affairs, but he thought the testimony he had to adduce would show that his position was perfectly tenable. He trusted to show that the prices would be reduced to the consumer. He would take, as his first witness, the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) a gentleman of vast commercial experience, and who, as he (Mr. Rykert) had before stated, weighed well everything he had said in addressing the

House from the Ministerial benches, but he thought the following remarks of that gentleman would go a long way to damage the position he now took. He said, upon the motion for a Committee in relation to the depression of trade:

“The member for South Waterloo predicted the result of Protection would be to stimulate our industries so much that more factories would arise than the country could sustain. They would bring down prices and ruin manufacturers. If that be the case, and I believe the hon. gentleman is right, it would be the concern of those gentlemen who are asking for protection at the present time. Prices would be brought down, and customers would get the benefit of cheaper goods than they now have. It would simply remove the competition from the American manufacturers to our own, the consumers receiving the benefit all the same, but the country being enriched by the industries.”

He believed the hon. gentleman was right, that it would reduce the price to the consumer, but it was entirely in opposition to the theory of hon. gentlemen opposite. He would venture to offer the evidence of another gentleman who supported the late Government, to maintain his position, and that was Mr. Workman, of Montreal. He said:

“I came down here with the desire that every industry that was languishing, and that it could be demonstrated that it was so languishing, was entitled to an amount of protection that would help it without injury to the consumer; and I was prepared to prove that the native competition would have kept down the price to the consumer.”

That proved his (Mr. Rykert's) proposition that their industries would be benefitted, and that the prices of goods to the consumer would be reduced. He would take the opinion of another witness—Mr. Wood, of Hamilton, a gentleman who was also a Reformer and a supporter of the Mackenzie Government. He thought it very important that the hon. gentlemen opposite should know the position they had formerly occupied in the country while their friends were in power, and the position they now occupied in this House, when they found themselves in Opposition. Mr. Wood said:

“The advocates of Free-trade say that it is unfair to tax them for the benefit of a few manufacturers, some of whom have grown rich under the present tariff. They wish to buy their goods where they can get the cheapest, and to sell in the dearest market. This is

just what the advocates of Protection claim. I deny that Protection means an increase of price to the consumer, but the very opposite. Protection will secure competition amongst our own manufacturers, and this will secure fair and reasonable prices, which few object to pay."

Those were the opinions of a gentleman of experience in the commercial world. He would read the report of the Committee appointed to investigate this matter, during the time the late Government held possession of the Treasury benches. It was as follows :—

"The almost uniform testimony before your Committee was to the effect that an increased protection to manufacturers will not necessarily increase the cost of the manufactured article to the consumer; and in the opinion of your Committee, the witnesses have made out a very strong case in support of this view.

"It appears to be well established that the cost of manufacturing decreases as the quantity of goods manufactured increases. Thus a large manufacturing establishment can afford to sell its products at a lower rate than a smaller one. If, therefore, Canadian industry is relieved from the pressure of such undue competition as that referred to in the first paragraph of this report, the effect will be that the manufacturing establishments will be worked to their full capacity, and the cost of production, and the consequent cost to the consumer will be proportionately reduced."

Those opinions were never contradicted in this House, and they had great weight in the country. They were the opinions that had been expressed upon public platforms throughout Ontario, and they had great weight in placing the gentlemen who were now on the Treasury benches in the position they occupied. This policy would also prevent Canada from being made a slaughter-market, and he would refer to a statement made by the hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on that side of the House. He would first call the member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) as a witness, and take his opinion, as expressed in 1870, in this connection. He said :

"Whenever there was any excitement or uneasiness in any of our local markets, the facilities afforded to the United States manufacturers were such as to enable them to step in and offer their products on better terms than Canadians."

They found that Mr. Workman, a Reformer also, expressed himself as follows :—

"In proof of my assertion that Canada is made a slaughter-market, I will state one fact.

MR. RYKERT.

He received a letter from a firm in the United States, in which they said : ' We are anxious to get possession of the Canadian market. We will send you a quantity of our goods ; we don't care what price you realise for them. If the English goods are selling for 15c. sell ours for 14c., if for 12c., sell ours for 11c. We are determined to get the Canadian market.'

Mr. Wood also had the same opinion on this question, and expressed himself as follows :—

"It is well known that for two years past the Americans have been flooding this country with their surplus stocks, selling them at prices that make it impossible for our people to compete against, and get cost for the goods. They sell, irrespective of cost, to meet some pressing necessity, and thus keep their mills going."

That proved his (Mr. Rykert's) proposition, that the present policy of the country would be the means of preventing this country being made a slaughter-market for the United States. The Minister of Finance claimed this as the result of the new tariff, and certainly hon. gentlemen in the Opposition ought to be satisfied, by the evidence which he had adduced, that the Minister of Finance was correct in his judgment. His hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the tariff would be condemned by the Province from which the hon. the Finance Minister came ; he argued that, while these heavy burdens were imposed upon the lumbermen, no advantages would be received by them in return. He maintained that the policy would ruin the carrying trade, and that the number of persons additional who would be employed under Protection would be only five thousand. Upon a former occasion he had delivered himself differently, in 1876, when he had no idea at that time of being relegated to the Opposition side of the House.

MR. CHARLTON : May I enquire how many persons I said would be employed ?

MR. RYKERT : You said five thousand.

MR. CHARLTON : That is a mistake ; multiply it by twelve.

MR. RYKERT said he quoted his own organ, and here was what he was reported to have said :—

"The present iniquitous tariff would be condemned by the Province from which the Finance Minister came. He argued that, while these heavy burdens would be imposed upon lumbermen, people with fixed salaries, and workmen, no advantage would be received by them in return. The policy would ruin our carrying trade, and send our vessels with grain to Europe, and cause them to return in ballast, because no imports would be required. The attempt to create a home market for all goods produced under a protective policy, and also products of the soil had failed. He held that the number of persons who would be employed under Protection in this country in the production of goods, would only be five thousand."

On a former occasion the hon. gentleman talked very differently, and it seemed almost impossible to compel him to keep to the same mind very long at a time. In 1876, when his feelings were a little calmer than they had been since the defeat of the 17th September, he expressed himself in this way :—

"It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufactures without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions. This has been notably the case with Great Britain herself; and I think the assertion that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive power of a nation, is incontrovertible."

He always preferred quoting from the hon. gentleman's own organ, the *Globe* newspaper. He never quoted from the *Mail*. He had no confidence in the *Mail* on the question, where it became important to contradict hon. gentlemen opposite, as they only believed in the *Globe*. It was more convenient to quote from the hon. gentleman's own organ. They were also told that the labouring man would be robbed, but instead of that they found, on the authority of an hon. member who sat in the last Parliament, and who was a Reformer and a very strong supporter of the Mackenzie Government, that Protection would have just the contrary effect. Mr. Irving, of Hamilton, claimed that it would give work to the poor man, and reduce the price of everything which he consumed. This opinion was also endorsed by the Hamilton *Times*, the organ of the Reform party in that city. Hear what that paper said while its friends were in power :—

"Our motto from the first has been that, in so far as this issue is concerned, it is the duty of the Protectionists to let the Government

take care of itself, let the Liberal party take care of itself, and let the Conservative party take care of itself, while the friends of home industries combine to carry their point * * * We are fighting for Protection, not for the sake of the profits it will give individual manufacturers, but for the sake of the employment and wages it will give the masses of the people. The voice of those people will be listened to. Let the workmen meet together, let them organise their own meetings, have speakers from among themselves, declare their own troubles, wants and needs, and the remedies they desire to see employed. Let them make up their own case and present it, instead of leaving it in the hands of the capitalists who, though worthy of justice being done them, are not yet strong enough in numbers or sufficiently representative of labour to secure such a hearing as the Protectionist cause—as the cause of suffering thousands of honest workmen—is entitled to. * * * We know that class to be suffering, and that Free-trade maxims will neither feed nor clothe them, while a revival of their several industries will—even though the revival is brought about by defying Smith, Mill, the Cobden Club, with all their worshippers and adherents. * * * As to Mr. Wood, we learn from other journals that he is the most zealous lobbyist in the House on behalf of home industries. But they can't convert a minority into a majority."

He also happened to have in his possession a letter from a certain manufacturer in the town of Cornwall, who, during the campaign, addressed a letter to the electors as follows :—

"If workmen may indulge in the hope of higher wages, instead of harbouring the fear of lower ones, accompanied by unsteady employment, the present fiscal policy of the country must be changed, and sound Protection policy adopted. It has required such a policy to develop the manufacturing industries of every other country in the world, and the industrial condition of Canada makes her no exception. On the contrary, the necessity for Protection is greater in Canada than it is or has been in any other country."

Those were opinions that could not be controverted. They went to show that the labourer was not robbed. He was amused to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk say they were going to rob the ship builder. That was rather rich. He (Mr. Rykert) heard from his own constituency that they were strongly in favour of the policy, so far as ship-building was concerned. He would now quote, on this point, from the St. Catharines *Daily News*, though he must apologise to the House for bringing under its notice such a disreputable sheet :

"We are glad to be able to credit Sir John with one satisfactory item in his tariff. We refer to the 10 per cent. on foreign-made vessels. Under the old tariff, many articles that went into the construction of vessels paid $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. We pointed out this anomaly months ago, and are glad that it has been corrected."

Now, see the supreme impudence of this wonderful editor. He wanted to take credit for inaugurating this policy. The hon. member for North Norfolk said, in one of his celebrated speeches when he was on the Government side of the House :

"The ship building interest of the United States was one of the most signal illustrations of the benefit of a protective policy that can be produced. Under a protective tariff, ship-building in the United States had grown in 1860 to be as great as that of England."

The hon. gentleman then went on to show how that shipping had been very much injured by the war. That showed conclusively that his statement the other day in reference to the shipping interest being injured was incorrect. At any rate, he (Mr. Rykert) asked the House to take the two statements of the hon. gentleman, and to say which was correct. He asked them to look at the evidence, and also to take into consideration the un-biassed judgment of the hon. the Finance Minister. It was said that the tariff would injure the farmer. He was amused to hear that; he professed to be somewhat of a farmer himself, having been for upwards of twenty years a representative of the farmers at the Agricultural Board, and he did not think there was a single farmer, at least in his county, who was not ready to hold up both hands in favour of the policy of the hon. gentleman. He had received letter after letter endorsing the policy of the hon. gentleman, so far as the farming interest was concerned. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), on a former occasion, made use of this language: "Protection to manufactures means an extra population, and more duty will be collected from ten men than from five, as now." Then the hon. member for Lambton told the hon. gentleman that he had got no petition from his county, nor from the adjoining counties, to show that his opinion was shared by others, whereupon the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) seemed somewhat snubbed,

MR. RYKERT.

and took a back seat. The hon. member for North Norfolk made another strong statement upon that occasion. In 1876, he said: "I believe the agricultural interests of the country will be promoted by Protection, and by having the manufactures brought to the door of the farmer, and would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away." The other night the hon. gentleman had said that Protection would both diminish the price received by the farmer for the products of the soil, and increase the price of all he purchased. Another Reformer, Mr. Wood, in 1876, expressed his views on this question as follows:—

"The point I wish to make is, that, while the farming community secures better prices in the home market, where there is a large manufacturing population, they buy at prices equally as low, if not lower, than the same can be imported in consequence of internal competition."

Another hon. gentleman, the member for North Oxford, who was very apt to advance his opinions in this House on all these questions, and who was an authority on farming, a short time ago spoke deliberately in favour of Protection being a means of giving the farmer a home market, and yet the other night, when annoyed and chagrined with the defeat of his party, he turned round and declared that all he had said a few years ago was perfect moonshine. He also noticed that a day or two ago the hon. member spoke about certain employés been dismissed from a factory in the city of Toronto as an illustration of the bad effect of the National Policy. What were the facts? These employés had not been dismissed but merely suspended from their work for a short time because the market was glutted, and was likely to be so for a short time, by manufacturers from the United States. The men were put on short work in order that they might get rid of a large amount of stock which had accumulated. He believed that one of the greatest advantages of this policy would be to cultivate a friendly feeling with the Maritime Provinces. He for one was prepared to make some sacrifice in the interest of our Lower Canadian Provinces, and he believed every true Canadian would look to the interest of

his country first rather than to his own individual interests. The apparent inequalities as regarded certain duties, such as that between wheat and flour, might yet be remedied. He believed that the National Policy would be a means of cultivating trade with the West Indies, as had been mentioned by the hon. the Minister of Finance. He had no doubt whatever that the great fleet of Canada—being in point of size the fourth maritime fleet in the world—could be utilised in doing a large portion of our carrying trade. If the arguments of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) were worth anything at all, they showed conclusively that the balance of trade would not be against us provided we took into account all the benefit to be derived from the carrying trade. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) in speaking on the motion for a Committee on Depression of Trade, used this language :—

“Protection does not mean Ontario interests, at the sacrifice of the interests of the Maritime Provinces. It is to stimulate the manufactures of the Dominion, irrespective of Provinces; but, if any part of Canada could now successfully compete in our markets, I think it is Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, from the fact that they have coal and iron lying side by side. They would be able to manufacture cheaply, and compete with Ontario. What is to prevent Halifax, under a protective tariff, having its manufactures?”

There was an opinion deliberately expressed by the hon. gentleman opposite, that a policy similar to this would have a tendency to bring together the various Provinces of the Dominion. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) also spoke upon this question in 1870, when he said that immense quantities of flour were being imported into the Maritime Provinces which, if a proper duty were imposed, would be supplied by the Upper Provinces. This remark was made upon a motion of the then Minister of Finance to put a duty on wheat, flour, and coal. He was then a strong advocate for Protection upon wheat, flour and coal; he spoke as an Ontario man, and spoke the sentiments of every Ontario man, when he said he would support a duty on coal in Ontario, for the general benefit of the whole country. The hon. gentleman had said that, if a proper duty

were imposed on coal, there would be an inter-provincial traffic beneficial to the whole Dominion. But, to-day, he appealed to his friends from the Maritime Provinces to say that this tariff would take away their bread and butter. The hon. gentlemen on the other side were always talking about the balance of trade. No less a distinguished authority upon political economy than the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), had delivered himself, on a former occasion, in reference to the question of the balance of trade. But political economists did not agree on this point, any more than did hon. gentlemen in this House. The hon. member for Bothwell said, in 1876 : “We may fairly conclude that the exports of a country are a more safe basis upon which to estimate its prosperity, than the increase of its imports, and it can scarcely be considered that a country is in a highly prosperous condition if the exports are constantly diminishing.” Another distinguished gentleman, Captain Norris, said : “I think the figures must convince any person that so long as we have a large balance against us, it is utterly impossible to be as prosperous as we ought to be.” He now came to the great rallying cry of the party, “The poor man’s friend.” Hon. gentlemen opposite had declared, from almost every platform in the country, that the policy of the Government would work great injury to the poor man, and that every article he used would be taxed, even to his buttons. All these arguments were thrust before the people, and what was the result? The people had heard these men talk very differently upon former occasions. They had been educated in Protection principles by hon. gentlemen opposite. The farmers and the labourers had been taught to believe, by the hon. gentlemen opposite, that the true policy for relieving our depressed industries was a protective policy. They were taught to believe that Protection would bring capital into the country; that the consumer did not pay the duty, that the farmer, the mechanic, and the artisan would all be prosperous. The people were perfectly amazed to hear the hon. gentlemen opposite talk in so different a manner from the language they had previously used. They had heard a great deal about the poor man’s friend. Who

were the poor man's friends? The hon. member for South Huron, on 27th April, 1870, upon the question of taxation on wheat and coal, said: "We heard yesterday afternoon, with great regret, that the Finance Minister was going to exempt coal and wheat." There was a poor man's friend. In 1870, these strong advocates of Free-trade advocated the imposition of a duty on coal and wheat. They charged this Government with imposing a duty on flour, yet years ago they fought most strenuously against them, when they tried to remove it. The hon. member for North Oxford spoke much in the same strain in those days, when he formed one of a deputation that went to the Finance Minister to ask for an import duty on wheat, flour, Indian corn, hops and coal. They told the people how wrong it was to impose a duty on coal and flour, yet their own record showed they were in favour of it years ago. What was right then must be right now. The country was then in a prosperous condition, according to the evidence, in 1873-4, of the ex-Finance Minister, who went to England, spoke about our great prosperity and surplus, and paid a tribute to the financial ability of the Finance Minister. If this country were then in a prosperous condition, there was no necessity whatever to impose a duty on wheat or coal; but these gentlemen, on that occasion, were strongly in favour of it, and now they said it was wrong to tax the poor man. Going back still further, when certainly the question had not the great importance it had now, a proposition was made to impose a duty on flour, meal, Indian corn, and all grains except wheat. In amendment it was moved to remove the duties imposed on flour, meal, tea, and several other articles, which entered into consumption by the whole of the people of the Dominion, and admit them free. Among those who voted against this amendment were the member for North Oxford, and the ex-Minister of Finance. Another amendment was moved by the hon. member for Dundas, recommending a resolution for the purpose of striking out the items of Indian corn and grain of all kinds, except wheat and flour, which would remain as they were charged at present. The hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for North

Oxford voted against it. This was the only vote which he could cite against the leader of the Opposition on this question. It showed that these men, who now talked so loudly about being the poor man's friend, were ever ready, when the occasion required, to vote to tax the poor man. One hon. gentleman opposite made a wholesale charge, not only against the members on that side, but against every man in Ontario. He charged the people with being ignorant. The National Policy, he said, was carried by the ignorance of the people. Who educated these people to believe that Protection was necessary for the country? These very men who now told the people they were ignorant. It was somewhat amusing to see the member for North Oxford and other gentlemen take the Finance Minister to task—a man whose ability dwarfed all these men into insignificance, who stood far above them all. They talked about deputations coming down here. The late Finance Minister was above the people; the present one was with the people. The one was too remote and wrapped up in his own importance to consult the people. The present Minister of Finance was willing to know what the wants of the country were; he was willing to give their representatives an audience and send them away satisfied that he possessed all the characteristics of a true gentleman. The policy adopted would meet the views of the country. He held in his hand a letter from a gentleman in St. Catharines, the owner of a large property which had been lying idle for four years, in which he said: "The National Policy has begun its good work. I have just sold my factory, which had been idle for five years, to three Americans from Lakeport." The Americans, if debarred from our markets, would start manufacturing establishments here. If hon. gentlemen would only act in a patriotic manner, and rise above party, they could candidly admit that their constituents as a whole were in favour of the policy of the Government, and that the farmers particularly had every reason to feel grateful that a Ministry was in power which was ready and willing to recognise the wants and requirements of this country. They would also recognise the fact that

labourers, manufacturers, and all industries were benefitted by the National Policy. This policy would stand as a monument of the genius and financial ability of the Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman had reason to feel proud that he was not only backed up by a large majority of the representatives of the people, but that the great voice of the general public had pronounced in favour of his policy. Some special interests might temporarily suffer, but, as a whole, the National Policy was calculated, as it was intended by the hon. the leader of the Government and his colleagues, to promote, foster, and encourage the agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests of the country. Although the country had suffered in the past under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, they had reason to feel assured that it still possessed all the elements of future greatness. We had a soil and a climate equal to that of any other country. We had a people characterised for their industry, their independence, and, above all, their loyalty. It but required a united effort on the part of the people and their representatives to make this country one of the greatest and most prosperous of the countries of the world.

MR. WELDON said, if the hon. member had visited the city of St. John, N.B., he would have altered his opinion respecting the effect of this policy. Far from being a benefit to the Maritime Provinces, it would crush their industries. He would leave the questions of Free-trade and Protection to men of more experienced ability than himself, but, so far as regarded that portion of the Dominion which he had the honour to represent, he would call the attention of the House to the effect of this tariff there. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) said he had been for many years a follower of the Minister of Finance, that, by his seductive arguments he had been led to support the project of Confederation. He (Mr. Weldon) had taken the opposite view; he had opposed the union of New Brunswick with the other Provinces, dreading the majority which would overwhelm the lower Provinces, and cause sectional feeling to over-ride public spirit, and one portion of the Dominion to be sacrificed to the interests

of another. He had referred back to the period before Confederation to ascertain what then was the position of New Brunswick. Their tariff was then a small one, and the Finance Minister then endeavoured to prove that it would not be exceeded under Confederation for even a quarter of a century to come. Scarcely half that period had elapsed when they found it had nearly trebled. He would call attention to the speech of the Finance Minister, in which he first unfolded to the people of his native Province the advantages he would derive from his Confederation scheme. On the 7th November, 1864, in the metropolis of New Brunswick the hon. gentleman addressed an audience, and held out the prospect that they would manufacture for Ontario, and that their stream would be used to turn the mills for the manufacturers of goods for the Dominion; but the picture to-day was the reverse, and it was Ontario that would manufacture for the Lower Provinces, not they for Ontario. In 1864 and 1865, as during the last election when the famous telegram was sent from John Boyd, the wires were used, though for a different purpose, to persuade the people of New Brunswick to join in Confederation. The telegram to Mr. Boyd was either sent with the honest intention to carry it out, or to deceive and delude the people of St. John into supporting the hon. the Minister of Finance. And he (Mr. Weldon) did not hesitate to say that, had it not been for that telegram, the hon. the Minister of Finance would not be on the floor of this House acting the rôle of Coriolanus leading on his legions from Ontario and Quebec to crush his native Province. The hon. the Finance Minister had distinctly declared that the system of taxation would not be raised. He maintained that the promise that the taxation should not be increased was as much a consideration of their entering the Confederation as the construction of the Intercolonial railroad. This tariff, he was assured, would crush out the different interests of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman had distinctly stated in the letter referred to, that they did not propose to increase, but to readjust, the tariff. He could well understand how, in a political campaign,

in the excitement induced by the enthusiastic cheering of political supporters, the hon. gentleman might have made a misstatement, for which he might have been excused, but when he deliberately made the statement in writing he could only have made it for the purpose of securing his election in the city of St. John. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) had also, at a public meeting, deprecated the idea of a rise in the tariff.

MR. DOMVILLE said the hon. gentleman was stating to the House that which was not correct.

MR. WELDON said the statement appeared in the public prints that the hon. member for King's deprecated the idea of a rise in the tariff, and said that such was not the intention of the Government. Then, on the 23rd August, a late member of the House, Mr. Palmer, just before the elections, said that it was never contemplated that any duty should be placed upon flour. This was the position in which the question was put before them, and he asked whether it was in accord with the tariff that had been brought before the House? With regard to the question of flour, the Finance Minister, the other evening, said that he expected to draw a revenue of \$250,000 from it. He desired to show how much the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island would have to pay of the additional duty on breadstuffs. Last year, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia imported 148,000 barrels of flour; of Indian corn, 172,684 barrels. Nova Scotia imported 76,000 bushels of corn, and New Brunswick, 22,315; Prince Edward Island imported 84,500 barrels of flour, showing that the duty on breadstuffs would be \$160,000 for those Provinces alone. With regard to anthracite coal, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would import 32,000 tons, on which \$16,000 would have to be paid by them towards the revenue of the country. So the revenue on breadstuffs, together with the revenue on coal which would be paid by the Maritime Provinces, would amount to six per cent. of the whole deficit. His hon. friend from Queen's, the previous evening, had undertaken to show by facts and figures how the tariff would affect the lumbermen and farmers of the Maritime Pro-

MR. WELDON.

vinces; but there was another very important interest—an interest upon which rested the prosperity of the Province of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. He alluded to the shipping interest. Years ago they were merely hewers of wood. They built their vessels for the Liverpool merchant, and did not make any progress commercially; but, when they became shipowners, the country rapidly increased in prosperity, until, at this time, the total tonnage of vessels belonging to the ports of the Maritime Provinces, was 1,114,000 tons. Now the shipping interest was to be protected by a draw-back, but they would not be able to obtain that until the vessel was ready for use. In regard to the articles required for the construction of ships, he pointed out that the French Veritas and the English Lloyd's required vessels to be built of a certain class of goods—pitch pine, which was brought from Georgia. That wood had been largely used in the construction of that vessel, because it was necessary for the higher class. Scarcely had the tariff been printed before he had received a letter on the subject from a gentleman who was a staunch supporter of the Finance Minister. He found that iron paid a duty of 1½ per cent.; spikes, ¾ of a cent per pound and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*; brasswork, 30 per cent.; plumbers' fittings for the cabins, 30 per cent.; wire rigging, 20 per cent.; cordage, 10 per cent.; cottons for sails, 5 per cent.; hardware, 30 per cent. Mahogany and cedar wood, only required in the cabins, were admitted free, but this was the revision of the tariff in the interest of the furniture manufacturer. They were also allowed to import rock salt from Turk's Island for the purpose of sealing their vessels. The shipbuilder had to pay 20 per cent. duty on pitch pine imported, and, as these large ships took a long time to build, the result was that, even assuming the drawback, the interest on his capital would be very much indeed.

MR. TILLEY said pitch pine was free. It had been omitted from the free list, but it had been rectified in this respect the other night.

MR. WELDON said his impression was that pitch pine was taxed, and it

was quite clear the collector at St. John had construed the tariff as he (Mr. Weldon) had, but he spoke subject to correction. His impression had been that there was a duty of 20 per cent. on it when brought from Savannah in a hewn or partly manufactured state. Then, besides all these duties the materials had to be purchased, and the result would be that shipbuilders would have to carry more capital to enable them to meet these additional expenses. The shipbuilding interest also stood in another position. He would take only the 1,000 ton ships built at St. John, N.B., principally of pitch pine and oak, the cost of building and making ready for sea was about \$40 a ton, which would make the cost of the ships, in labour and materials, \$40,000; and as labour and materials bore about the same proportion, the cost of each would be \$20,000. It had been stated that the poor man's wages would be increased, but he (Mr. Weldon) did not think that was a necessary result of this policy; and, at any rate, supposing they were increased, it would take the whole of the increase of remuneration to meet the increased cost of living. If the value of labour were not increased, this additional expense of the necessaries of life must be borne by the poor labourers, but assuming the additional cost of living would be ten per cent., as stated by his hon. friend the member for Queen's, the other night, it would, on a ship such as he had been speaking of, cause an extra cost of \$2,000, which would, by no means, be returned to the shipbuilder. Besides the drawback, there would be this additional \$2,000, at a time when their shipping was in a most depressed state, when the ships in the harbour of St. John were not getting remunerative prices for the carriage of deals etc., across the Atlantic. Those ships were owned by their people, and he would ask whether the increased price of labour was going to enhance one shilling per ton the value of these ships? This tariff would prevent American ships from going into St. John for repairs, and in that way their merchants, manufacturers and labourers would lose the benefit derived from repairing those ships. There was another and very important feature in regard to the ship-

ping interest that would be disadvantageously affected. Shipowners considered the cheapness of a port a very important feature in the employment of vessels. He had known many ports where the prices were so high that many ships would not go there. There were necessary expenses connected with the loading and unloading of vessels. Then there were very often expenses which resulted from storms; a vessel might lose her sails, or her yards might be carried away, and other damage done, and even if she escaped without injury, ordinary wear and tear would necessitate her replacing articles at some port. He ventured to state that 25 per cent. of the disbursements expended by the vessels loading at St. John was incurred in repairing or remedying of sails, rigging, etc. Under this new tariff, St. John, instead of being a favoured port for repairs, would be shunned. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) had shown that the lumber and farming interests suffered under this tariff, and the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) had spoken in regard to the fisheries, and he (Mr. Weldon) thought he had shown that, under this tariff, the shipbuilder would receive no benefit. He would ask what boon had they received for this increased taxation? None, whatever. They were induced to enter this Confederation, on the compact that their taxation would not be increased. The only thing put forward by the hon. the Minister of Finance the other night, anything like a concession in their favour, was a tax of 50c. per ton on coal. He (Mr. Weldon) had stopped to hear if there would be a cheer from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull), when that announcement would be made, but he was silent. There was another important interest with regard to the Maritime Provinces, which he would also deal with, that was the coasting trade. From their geographical position, their natural market was the United States. They sent shingles, clapboards, etc., to the American markets, and in return received various commodities in exchange. He found that last year there had been 24,000 arrivals and departures of vessels between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the United States. But, under this tariff, owing to the increased

duties, these vessels would be unable to bring return cargoes. He would ask the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Wade), whose constituency was largely engaged in this business, and the people of Annapolis, how this tariff was going to affect them. They would have to purchase their breadstuffs in Ontario at a higher rate. Somebody would reap the benefit of the additional tax on corn-meal and flour. He thought they would find that the importers of the city of St. John were going to be seriously injured by this tariff. They found that many of the very men who had supported the Minister of Finance now felt that their business was to be entirely destroyed by the duties now imposed. They were a producing country, and the extra expense required to obtain their supplies would fall heavily on the people. This country could not consume the articles produced in it, and they required foreign markets. So far as he could judge from letters he had received from the Lower Provinces, he found that the feeling there with regard to this tariff was that it was a tariff which would press heavily on the poor man.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 40) To incorporate the Napanee, Tamworth, and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Hooper.)

SENATE AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

The amendments made by the Senate to the two following Bills, were severally taken into consideration, and agreed to:—

Bill (No. 10) To extend the powers of the Dominion Telegraph Company, and to amend the Act incorporating the said Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 14) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.—(Mr. Langevin.)

MR. WELDON.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the debate on Resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise.

MR. WELDON said he held in his hand a letter from a large carrier, referring to the difficulties which this tariff would impose upon Canada. Another illustration he would give was in regard to blankets. He held in his hands a Halifax paper which gave a statement of the case as it existed, the figures being supplied by a drygoods man of that city. A firm had just imported two bales of blankets, costing, in England, \$252. Under the old tariff the duty would have been \$54.55; under the new tariff the total duty was \$110.25, or two and a-half times as much as before. The tax was a little higher on more expensive blankets. Now, with regard to literature, he assumed that it was the duty of the Government to foster the introduction of literature, and more particularly of a high class of literature. But by this tariff it was completely shut out. He was informed by a leading firm that the first package they had received under the new tariff had to pay a duty of 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. The new tariff taxed such a book as Webster's Dictionary by weight 67c.; under the old tariff it was 30c. An excellent work like Macaulay's History paid 66c., while formerly it only paid 30c., and so of all the better class of books. One of the leading booksellers of Halifax said: "We do not approve of the duty on printed books, as it shuts out a very large quantity of cheap literature published in Great Britain, as well as the ordinary school books. The result of this will be, that instead of having a literature of a better class, we shall have that of a cheap and ordinary class." There was also another class of books which would be seriously affected by this tariff, and which he needed only to mention to secure the sympathy of the House — he referred to law-books. English Law Reports had to pay 60c. each, which would raise the price from \$29.60 to nearly \$40.00 a year. This was a heavy tax on the indispensable legal knowledge of this country. This class of literature and still better class were en-

tirely shut out by this tariff. He understood the hon. the Minister of Finance to say the other evening that he had been informed by a merchant of St. John that since the tariff duty was imposed he had been able to purchase corn meal in New York at 35c. a barrel less than before the duty was imposed. He (Mr. Weldon) was a little surprised at the remark, and took the trouble to telegraph to a leading firm in that business in St. John for the purpose of ascertaining the facts, and received a reply which showed that the immediate effect of this tariff with regard to an article of ordinary consumption, was to advance it at once by 27c., and no doubt, in a short time, the advance would be still greater. They had heard a great deal about British connection, and to the effect that this tariff would not interfere with our relations with Great Britain. There was one thing to be said, however—they had only to look at the press in England to find that both parties in that country spoke of the tariff with universal condemnation. They spoke of it more in sorrow than in anger, that principles so unwise should be adopted in Canada. He recollected, when this great scheme of Union was devised, the loyalty of the people was appealed to in its favour because it was said that Great Britain was in favour of it. The feelings of the people in New Brunswick, the descendants of the old Loyalists, were appealed to and asked to come into the Union in deference to the wishes of the Crown. Yet, in this tariff they had a standing defiance to the principles recognised and adopted by the Mother Country. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), speaking of an article in the *Mail* newspaper, said we were not discriminating against the Mother Country, but we were simply fighting for existence against foreigners. And yet here was a tariff which made a difference of 25 per cent. against the Americans, and nearly 40 against English manufacturers. He had observed that in the city of Quebec about a week ago, at a meeting there, Mr. Dobell, a well-known merchant, moved, seconded by Mr. Vallée, "that this meeting regrets that the Government had not been able to discriminate more in favour of the manufacturers of Great Britain as against those of the United States." For all

these reasons he was strongly opposed to this tariff, and had felt it his duty most earnestly to protest against it on behalf of the city and county of St. John, whose interests would be disastrously affected by it. Not only his Province, but all the Maritime Provinces would be injured by it. He considered this tariff was a violation of the compact under which the Maritime Provinces entered into the Confederation. It was only after being assured by the promoters of Confederation that the tariff would not be increased that the Maritime Provinces consented to come in to the Union. He felt that these propositions struck one of the most serious blows that were ever levelled against the industries of those Provinces. He recollected the time when the present hon. Finance Minister consented that the Intercolonial Railway should go by the North Shore and be taken away from St. John, when, to use the language of the hon. member for Halifax, \$8,000,000 was thrown into the sea. St. John city staggered under the blow then dealt her, though she had since recovered. Two years ago, when on the 21st of June, 1877, he returned to St. John, and found his home and the homes of thousands in ruin after the great fire, he thought it was one of the heaviest misfortunes that had ever befallen that city. They had just risen from that conflagration, when this new tariff was proposed, which he did not hesitate to declare was a still more crushing blow than any other the city of St. John and the Province of New Brunswick had ever yet received, and that from the man whom it had been her delight to honour.

MR. DOMVILLE said they had heard a good deal to-day about the imaginary evils which this tariff was going to bring to the country. They had not heard any broad, statesmanlike views about the best interests of New Brunswick; they had heard nothing but the cry of Confederation being a deception to New Brunswickers, and they were asked to condemn the sacred compact made in the interests of New Brunswick at the time of Confederation, and asked to do this by gentlemen who had nothing to do with the making of that compact, and who were literally, to use a harsh term, kicked into

accepting it. Whenever an election took place in New Brunswick, the same old cry of anti-Confederation was raised. He hoped to be able to show that since Confederation the taxes of New Brunswick had been lightened instead of increased, and if the figures were correct, he thought he could prove it by the records of the Customs and other Blue books of the Government. The speeches made in this House on the National Policy by gentlemen opposite seemed to him to have been inspired more by hostility to this Government than with a view of benefitting the country. The question of the National Policy was not to be settled in this House to-day; it was not to be settled by any vote they were going to give—this great question had been settled by the people on the 17th of last September. All they had to do now was to discuss, in a statesmanlike manner, the merits of the Bill to be brought down by the Government. He thought the hon. the Minister of Finance had taken a great deal of care in preparing his Budget, and in endeavouring to suit the tariff to the various interests of the country. Did the hon. gentlemen opposite mean to say that the hon. the Minister of Finance could make a perfect Budget? It was more than man could do to make a tariff that would please every one. Look at our geographical position. At one end we were contiguous to the United States, and at the other end we were nearer to Great Britain. It stood to reason that goods could be brought to Toronto, for instance, cheaper from the Maritime Provinces than from England. Had the hon. the Finance Minister not been required to go to England to float a loan, he would have had more time to look into this subject, though he (Mr. Domville) doubted very much if he would have done better even had he given the tariff still more consideration. His hon. friend (Mr. Weldon) had raised the cry that religious literature would have to pay 7c. per pound. How many of those works, he would like to know, did his hon. friend read? Then he told them the lawyers and their law books were going to catch it. He (Mr. Domville) was very glad if there was one thing in which the lawyers were going to catch it. There might be some people who were not satis-

fied with the Budget, but when they saw manufacturers differing among themselves as to what the tariff should be, how could the Finance Minister be blamed if he had not been able to please every one? When he (Mr. Domville) heard the late Finance Minister talking of a defective tariff, it made him remember the time when the late Finance Minister bought down his own celebrated Budget in which he had put puddled bars under the head of ship's materials, and left out anchors altogether. That hon. gentleman, on the same occasion, brought in a duty on sugars, based on the Dutch standards, while he had not a single standard in his possession. He (Mr. Domville) applied to this House for those standards, and was referred to the Minister of Customs' office. Upon going thither, he was told that they had not got any, but that they would write down to Redpath's, to Montreal, to make them up a set. And yet they accused the present hon. Finance Minister of bringing in a tariff to suit the refiners. He should say, from the circumstances just narrated, it would look as if the late Minister of Finance was in league with the refiners instead. It was not well to criticise a work when you could not do it any better. The country had given those gentlemen a five years' lease of power, after they had chased out the Conservatives on a cry of corruption. But the people soon learned that there was nothing in the cry, and before five years had passed, they looked upon the *soi-disant* party of purity as nothing but a sham, who had made promises they had not carried out, and made pledges of economy which they had broken in every instance. Then, as regarded Free-trade principles, hon. gentlemen opposite knew well enough that we had never had Free-trade. To allow goods to be imported into the country free of duty was not one of the principles of Free-trade, but Free-trade was an exchange of the commodities of countries on an equal basis. Then, they were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that they were taxing the country, and one hon. gentleman said that he (Mr. Domville) had pledged himself at Havelock that people should not be obliged to pay a duty on flour; that Sir John A. Macdonald had

telegraphed down to say that flour was not to be taxed. Well, supposing he did, he did not telegraph to him (Mr. Domville), he did not see the telegram, and was not bound to believe what the hon. gentleman opposite had said. This was what he (Mr. Domville) had said—speaking of the party then in power—and he stood by it: “I maintain they (the Reform Government) have been tried, and found wanting. Conspicuous among their claims for further office are hypocrisy, incompetency, extravagance and utter disregard for the circumstances of their country, and a talent of abuse for those in Opposition rarely excelled in Billingsgate. For my part, my programme is this: to keep as far as practicable the people in this country, by finding employment for them, and to put down taxation. I contend that the tariff can be adjusted towards this, and without adding one cent further of taxation.” The working man understood the question of the day just as well as the hon. members opposite; perhaps better. The Government promised to readjust the tariff in such a way as would help the shipbuilding interest, the manufacturing, the mining and the agricultural interests. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) said the Government had ruined the shipbuilding industry. The Government had not put one cent of taxation on the shipbuilder. The hon. gentleman spoke of Southern pitch pine, and no doubt the letter he had received on that subject was similar to the one which he (Mr. Domville) had received from New Brunswick; but, perhaps, he did not read the letter carefully. He (Mr. Domville) had informed himself on the point, and had ascertained that pitch pine, used in ships, would not pay a duty.

MR. WELDON: The collector charged a duty.

MR. DOMVILLE: The collector did a great many things, as he had shown the other night, which he ought not to have done, and he might not be there long to charge those duties. The hon. member for Queen's said the lumbermen were going to pay more to the farmer than at present; consequently, lumber must cost more to produce. He told them, at the same time, that too much lumber

was produced in this country, and also that the duty imposed on agricultural produce only amounted, in the aggregate, to \$9,300 per annum, which was all the protection the farmers got under the proposed tariff. Supposing a fire had decimated the forest, and the lumber business was to cease, from any other cause, in New Brunswick, they would have to turn their attention to something else. What should they do? They would have no lumber to cut, and a population of 200,000 or 300,000 people to provide for. They would have to seek employment in the mines and on the soil; but, under this tariff, they expected to be able to manufacture, thus opening new avenues of employment. They would create for the farmers a home market. His hon. friend had said that a home market would enhance the price of flour, oats and potatoes. Supposing that to be the case, the farmer would not suffer by it. He represented a farming constituency, and would like to see the farmers get along; but common sense told them that the price of flour would not increase under this duty. The hon. member for Lambton bore testimony to this, for he said it would not enhance the price of flour, because the flour in the Canadian market is governed by the price of flour in the markets of the world. The country was willing to give this policy a trial, and if it should prove to be a benefit to the country, the Government would be entitled to its gratitude. If not, then the hon. members on the other side would be in a position to find fault with it, and not now. Would it not be considered strange that, if a new factory were started in this city to-morrow, everybody should prophecy that it would not be a success. Would not that rather discourage the manufacturer? A fair trial should be given to this tariff before finding fault with it. Supposing New Brunswick should suffer slightly under the tariff, as claimed by some. A tariff could not be made which would give the same advantages to the whole country at the same time. Some parts of it would benefit more than others, and some would feel the benefits earlier than others. But he had no fear for New Brunswick. She would get her quota in some way. Hon. gentlemen would not see her downtrod-

den, but would do what was fair. The hon. members for Queen's and St. John said that, since Confederation, the amount of taxation had increased. He was prepared to show that, since they entered into Confederation, the cost of living in New Brunswick had decreased, and if they placed the benefits gained indirectly, as against direct taxation, the latter would be found considerably reduced. In 1866, when New Brunswick entered Confederation, flour was \$10.50 to \$12 per barrel for high grades, and \$8.50 to \$9 for lower grades; to-day it was \$5.50 to \$6. Before Confederation molasses was from 42c. to 45c. per gallon; to-day it was 32c. Sugar, known as crushed sugar, then cost 11½c. to 12½c.; to-day it was worth from 8½c. to 9½c. Tea in the same proportion. By working out these few articles alone, it would be found that the people of New Brunswick saved \$1,500,000 per annum since Confederation, which, divided, would give over \$5 per head. The hon. member for Queen's said that Mr. Tilley, in 1866, had guaranteed the duty per capita would not exceed \$2.75 for a quarter of a century. If he would take that \$5 per head annually, saved, since they had entered into Confederation, from the duty actually paid per capita, he would find that Mr. Tilley's word was literally carried out. If they would look over the various other items in the tariff, they would find it had been still further reduced. They all knew that the market had fallen; that there had been a change in the value of goods; but these gentlemen prophesied that, under Confederation, they would have to pay all this money; yet he could show from the Blue-books that they were indirectly benefitted by it, and that extra taxation had not been levied. They had argued that the sugar question was going to be detrimental to the Maritime Provinces. That sugar tariff was the best tariff that ever was made in the interest of Canada, because it was so constituted that it would keep out the refined sugar from Europe and the United States, and, at the same time, allow our refineries to produce sugar without extra cost to the poor man. Sugar refineries in this country would depend for their existence mainly on keeping out the American sugar. Fifty-five thousand tons were used in

this country per annum, the major part of which came from the United States and England, and about one-fifth from the West Indies direct. In 1875, 13,000 tons came from Great Britain, 19,000 tons from the United States, and 22,200 tons from the West Indies. In 1876, 23,800 tons came from Great Britain, 19,300 tons from the United States, and 7,600 tons from the West Indies. Thus, while the United States remained about stationary, the trade with the West Indies was transferred to Great Britain; so that we were using adulterated sugar containing about 60 per cent. of saccharine matter, instead of using the sugar from Porto Rico, Demerara, and other ports, containing 90 per cent. to 95 per cent. of saccharine matter. This tariff would compel all the sugar used as refined to be imported direct from the colonies where it was grown. The poor man would pay no more for his sugar, because he was paying only, under this tariff, a duty of 2c. per pound; while the higher grades would be entirely kept out of the country, the raw sugar would be brought in at a low rate, and on a margin sufficient to keep out the refined article. Refiners had about \$80 to \$90 a ton protection, which was sufficient, because all they had to do was to clean up the sugar. To boil the sugar at the place where it was produced only cost £10 10s. sterling per ton, while the refiners here would have from \$80 to \$90 to work upon. Porto Rico sugar, which contained 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. of saccharine matter, would come in at the same rate as before, so the poor man would not have to pay more for his sugar, while the refined sugar would be made in this country. This policy involved the importation of the raw material by ourselves direct from the places of production. Formerly it was brought in by foreign vessels, such as those of the United States, was taken into New York and sent into the Dominion where it suited the Americans. The middlemen and the American vessel-owners got their money; we got nothing. We sent our vessels to the West Indies with lumber but could not get return cargoes, because we had not a home market. He had seen two cargoes landed at the same moment, one from the West Indies, and one from the United States,

the first paid a duty of 60c. a gallon and the other 5c. The one was charged 25 per cent. on its cost at the place of production, the other 25 per cent. on its value in the United States market, when it might have been sold for many reasons at a reduced rate. Therefore, we could not import any cargoes from the West Indies, because we never knew what duty we would have to pay when we landed it in Canada. But now we were able, in a great measure to pay for our imports by our exports. Many thousand tons of sugar would be refined in the Dominion per annum, thus using our own labour and keeping the money in the country. This country required foreign relations, a policy that would give us foreign commerce. We ought to be able to make our iron in this country, and produce everything we required. The United States sent \$30,000,000 worth of goods annually to the Brazils and the West Indies, and why should we not take a portion of that trade? We could send our lumber there and bring back their sugar, coffee, etc., as return cargoes. It was impossible for us to build up a foreign trade unless we had merchandise to ship in exchange, and we must devote ourselves to building up the interests of the country. He was assured that the injurious competition which had been predicted would not supervene. Iron would cost no more under this tariff than before. There would soon be three blast furnaces where there was now only one. They all knew that it was impossible for a young country to compete with an old one. England was wealthy and could obtain money at a cheaper rate than a young country could; consequently, she could sustain a few years' depression, where a younger country could not. In a Commission of the English House of Commons, one gentleman gave evidence to the effect, that British manufacturers had spent a large sum of money for two or three years, in order to keep the working population around them, and so prevent the ruining of their business. Consequently the manufacturers of Great Britain could keep running until our manufacturers were ruined, then she could control our markets and command her own price, before the colonial manufacturers would have time to recuperate or amass suffi-

cient wealth to resume. In reference to the argument of disloyalty, he asked, were we not bound to do the best we could for the country, and keep our people employed. What was the use of bringing emigrants here, unless there was employment for them? The result of a tariff like the present would induce capitalists to settle here, and invest their money. Instead of Protection enhancing the price of goods to the consumer, he thought it more likely to reduce it. Of course, in going over the tariff in detail, there would be many little suggestions to be offered in regard to it. At present they were merely discussing the question on its merits—that was to say, the general policy of the country. He was prepared to swallow the National Policy as a whole, and justify it before his constituents. He would not change his coat; he believed the present Government were doing the best they could for Canada, and he would support them so long as he believed them to be in the right. There might be many things he did not like, but he could not have everything his own way. As regarded the pleasing of the people of New Brunswick, he was confident it would be acceptable to a majority of them in the long run, and he was prepared to stand or fall by the issue. They would have elections in New Brunswick in three or four months, and the hon. member who had last spoken would himself have to face the people of that Province and give an account of his stewardship. He hoped to meet these gentlemen then, and he hoped to convince their constituents that they were in the wrong. Of course, there was a certain number of people whom they could not convince, amongst these were the anti-Confederationists, who called themselves Liberals, but who used to be known by the soubriquet of "smashers;" consequently, when they heard a man called a Liberal, they did not know whether he was a "smasher" or not. He trusted this policy would be endorsed by the friends of the Government, and that when they met next year they would be able to say, "We are all satisfied." He was satisfied that, whether they did right or wrong in voting for this policy, the country could be no worse off under this Administration than it was under the last.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said he noticed in the discussion that had taken place on the tariff debate, a good deal of allusion had been made to the altered positions of parties in the House. He had heard gentlemen, especially on the other side, allude to it very frequently, and those allusions were loudly cheered by those who sat around the speaker. As an old member of the House, or at least as a member during the last Parliament, he must confess that changes had taken place in the relative positions of parties in the House—changes that he had thought were not for the better, but for the worse, and he could have desired that a power had been possessed by the Committee of Internal Economy of the House to put matters in a better shape than they were at present. What did they see on the Opposition benches; gentlemen eminently fitted by nature, and who had evinced that fitness during the five years they had been in office, to accomplish good. Then, on the other side of the House, they saw gentlemen that were of some little use in Opposition, but who would be a power for evil instead of for good where they were, to judge of their legislation by this tariff. He proposed, and he thought it was intimately associated with this question, to review for a few moments the history of this country, and examine into and ascertain what were the causes which had produced this great change in the position of members, and of parties in the House. He had heard gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, supporting the present Administration, charge that the cause of the downfall of the Mackenzie Administration was the corruption that reigned within it, and the departure from all principles that it had advocated. These gentlemen declared that they were so firmly and fondly and devotedly attached to the principle of good government, that they could never for one moment think of linking their political fortunes with the party who had violated the principles that they professed. He admired that sentiment very much. He was pleased to find that these gentlemen held political principles themselves, but he asked these gentlemen to consider with what party they were allying themselves. If they had lived in Ontario and heard the stump orations delivered by

the Ministers and their followers that he had heard, they would have been forced to come to the same conclusion he had, and that was that there was only one thing the Conservative party boasted of, and that was, they had never professed to have any principles at all. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that the Opposition professed to hold certain principles, which they had violated, and it was ingeniously charged that in consequence of that violation, forsooth, power must be given to those who never professed any principle at all. Then he had heard the members from Quebec, supporting the present Administration, say that the defeat of the late Government was owing to the unjustifiable conduct of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier. If that was the case, why should they seek to hound that man to the death, when he wrought such good for their party? But when they made these diverse statements they found that when this tariff discussion came up all previous utterances were forgotten, and they united in declaring that the country was swept from end to end, as they termed it, by the great National Policy which they had introduced in the tariff resolutions now before the House. He proposed, for a few moments, to consider whether that statement was correct or not. He denied that that was the case. He alleged the success of the party at the polls was due to the fact that certain gentlemen so far forgot what was due to themselves, so far forgot what was due to the position they occupied in this country, that they stooped to the position of demagogues, and went about the country telling every class, every interest, and every man, that, if they were restored to power, they would put money in his pocket and raise his wages. That was the mode in which the elections were won; and, whilst they told one story in Ontario, they told another in New Brunswick. Whilst one tale was told in New Brunswick, another was told in Nova Scotia, and still another was told in Manitoba. They told one thing to men in the city, and another to men in the country, and it would be wholly impossible for those gentlemen to fulfil all these promises. Some members of the Reform party, believing the promises of these gentlemen,

had for once forsaken their party, and this small minority of Reformers, scattered through the various constituencies, cast in their votes with Conservatives who stood united, and, in that way, the elections were won. There was one thing that was very much to be regretted in the statement made by these hon. gentlemen. He (Mr. Paterson) belonged to the defeated party; he stood in a House where there were scarcely half a hundred about him of like views; in the presence of a majority that was able to out-vote them, and which had the power to deny him, if they so wished, even the right of free speech.

MR. PLUMB: We shall not stop you.

MR. PATERSON asked if there was anything wrong with his hon. friend. He (Mr. Paterson) was prepared for his uneasiness, for he had excited the hon. gentleman on former occasions. He hoped the hon. gentleman would keep cool. He (Mr. Paterson) belonged to a party that was so small, and so weak, that they were conscious that nothing they could propose could be carried into effect, and that, though they might raise their voice against injurious legislation, they were powerless to stop it. The hon. gentlemen opposite were elected on the strength of promises which they made, but which they could not fulfil, no matter what they might do. When the time came again for the people to try this matter, the Opposition could go before them, and hold up their heads, conscious that they were not elected under promises which they could not have fulfilled, if they had attained power. An old proverb said that it was an ill bird that fouled its own nest. It was scarcely too severe to characterise as traducers of their country men who, in order to elevate themselves to power, would not hesitate to resort to the continual every-day defamation of the country in which they dwelt, and that was the line of conduct pursued by the hon. gentlemen opposite. He would not speak so strongly on this matter, had not the Minister of Public Works, with his usual boldness, seen fit, on the floor of this Parliament, in this debate, to denounce and villify his native land, of

which he was one of the rulers. Some friend was cruel enough to print his speech *verbatim*. He (Mr. Paterson) had it in hand, and here were the words he (Mr. Tupper) used:

"Let him look at Canada to-day, and compare it with what it was when he assumed the financial management of this country, and what will he find? Where wealth, prosperity, happiness and progress were in Canada, he will find gaunt poverty and distress pervading the country from end to end. That is what he will find. I do not envy the hon. gentleman's feelings when he casts his eyes over the horizon of his country, and finds here and there spectres gaunt with famine and distress; poverty where wealth existed before; hunger where plenty was known."

That was the utterance of the Minister of Public Works two or three nights ago. Now he would ask this House to bear in mind that the present Government had been in power five months. It was very cruel for the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who must have known that his leader and master had publicly declared that, as soon as the Conservative party would be elected to power, that even before Parliament would meet, prosperity would return, bank stocks would rise, and the country would prosper—knowing that his leader had made these predictions, that hon. gentleman, even if he desired to supplant that leader, by thus casting a doubt on the truth of that gentleman's utterances, might at any rate have been kind enough to have done it in language a little less scathing. He (Mr. Paterson) would commend him to the pity of the First Minister, and would suggest to him to ask forgiveness from his leader for thus proclaiming that he had uttered what was false. The hon. gentleman could plead in mitigation: "It is true my utterances proved the falsity of your statement, but you must deal leniently with me, for I have openly proved myself guilty, as well as you, for I, too, a few days after the election, declared the gloom had passed away." He (Mr. Paterson) denied the position taken by the hon. gentleman. He denied that under the Government of to-day gaunt poverty and distress pervaded this country. He denied that, under the Mackenzie Administration, Canada was in the deplorable state it had been pictured by the Minister of Public Works. He pointed to the manufacturers that they

talked so much about, and he found them thriving. He noticed that those manufacturers had sent their products to Philadelphia, to Australia, and to Paris, and that they had stood in competition side by side with the manufactured goods of the whole world, had held their own, and even carried off the prizes. When he knew that Canada was able successfully to compete with the United States 3,000 miles from home, he felt that it was not necessary to impose an excessive tariff to enable them to maintain their supremacy at home. But supposing the depression they pictured did exist, would those gentlemen attribute it to the Government? That was what they did. Then, by parity of reasoning, as England was also depressed, a change of Government was required there. Would hon. gentlemen opposite admit this? They knew that the Government of England was unable to prevent the depression there, and they must admit that the Mackenzie Administration could not prevent the depression that existed in this country. They had heard it represented, and represented *ad nauseam* that their young men and other citizens were driven into the neighbouring States in order to find work. But what were the facts? He would cite an authority that hon. gentlemen could not deny. He would cite a gentleman who had aided the success of the Conservative party, and many of them were in possession of the pamphlet issued by that gentleman. He referred to Mr. Phipps. He asked these hon. gentlemen to read the contradiction of their own statement on page 16 of Mr. Phipps's pamphlet, where Mr. Phipps said that, according to the last census of the United States, taken in 1870, when the hon. gentlemen had been in power ten years or more, the number of native born Canadians in the United States was 487,000. He could cite the authority of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), if he saw fit, in refutation of the same statement. He would now enquire, after the five months' experience they had had of the present Administration, whether the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and the hon. the leader of the Government and the other gentleman who proclaimed throughout the country that as

MR. PATERSON.

soon as they attained power bank stocks would increase in value, etc., etc., were in accordance with the facts. He happened to have a circular showing the price of bank stocks, and he proposed to read the value of stocks during the last week of the Mackenzie Administration, and the bank stocks quotations which appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of yesterday's issue. It was as follows:—

| | Last days late Gov't. | Present quo- tations. | Decrease. |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Bank of Montreal.... | 171½ | 140 | 31½ |
| Bank of Ontario.... | 82½ | 65 | 17½ |
| Consolidated Bank.. | 75½ | 47½ | 28 |
| People's Bank..... | 74½ | 51 | 23½ |
| Molson's Bank..... | 94½ | 77 | 17½ |
| Toronto Bank..... | 139½ | 115½ | 24 |
| Jacques Cartier Bank. | 41 | 33 | 8 |
| Merchants' Bank.... | 94½ | 80½ | 14 |
| Eastern Townships' do | 107 | 98 | 9 |
| Bank of Commerce.. | 113½ | 103 | 10½ |
| Exchange Bank.... | 78 | 57½ | 20½ |
| Montreal Telegraph Co | 113½ | 104 | 9½ |
| Dominion Telegraph Company | 82 | 64 | 18 |
| Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.... | 61½ | 40 | 21½ |

But, perhaps, hon. gentlemen would endeavour to reply to him, that he had selected only exceptional cases. He defied hon. gentlemen to show him a single bank stock that had not been depreciated. The baneful influence of these hon. gentlemen was felt over land and sea. It was felt alike in bank stocks, telegraph stocks, navigation stocks; more than that, it was felt even in the City Passenger Railway Stock. He could not find a single stock in the country that had not gone down from 15 to 20 per cent.

| | Last days late Gov't. | Present quo- tations. | Decrease. |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Montreal City Pas- senger Railway.. | 90½ | 75½ | 15 |
| Montreal Gas Co.... | 144 | 110 | 34 |
| Montreal Loan and Mortgage Co..... | 110 | 100 | 10 |
| Royal Canadian In- surance Co..... | 82½ | 50 | 32½ |

He would not say that the decline of these stocks was due to the fact that these gentlemen had attained power. He would make a laughing stock of himself if he did so, but that was precisely what these hon. gentlemen had made of themselves. They declared that on their advent to power stocks would go up. Now, what were the facts in reference to

business generally; had it improved under this Administration as predicted? He was sorry to say that depression, during the past few years, had existed in all countries, though to a less extent in Canada than in other places. It existed here at the present moment, and, since this tariff had been announced, the depression had been greater than at any time under the Mackenzie Administration. The hon. gentlemen opposite knew this to be the case, else why had they been forced to appoint 131 additional official assignees to wind up the estates of unfortunate merchants? How stood the record with reference to the promises made to the farmers? Prices were to go up; grain was to advance; they were to get more for their wheat, more for their barley, more for their oats, more for everything they had to sell. He would not weary the House by going into figures, but the House knew perfectly well that the prices of grain tumbled after the present Government came into power. If the hon. gentlemen opposite did not know this, they ought to know it; at any rate, the farmers knew it. Hon. gentlemen opposite admitted that they had made certain promises to the country, and they now presented this tariff as the fulfilment of all those promises. The hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) said that, because the people asked for this tariff, this House had nothing to do with the question as to whether it was right or wrong. He (Mr. Paterson) denied that statement. He denied that the people had asked for this tariff. The farmer asked for higher prices for grain; the workman asked for higher wages; the manufacturer asked for a larger market; the consumer asked for cheaper goods; the fishermen asked for an increased protection; and all were promised exactly what they asked for, and that was just what they expected. And did hon. gentlemen dare to say that this tariff was going to be the fulfilment of all these promises? Men would sometimes descend to extraordinary subterfuges, but he did not think even the hon. gentlemen opposite would dare to say that this tariff would fulfil the expectations they had raised. They promised the manufacturers an increased tariff, and they promised the people of

New Brunswick that there should be no increased tariff; they promised the farmer a higher price for the breadstuffs that he had to sell, and they promised the man who eat the breadstuffs that he would get them at a lower rate; they promised the mechanic that he would get higher wages, and yet, from one end to the other of the land came the tidings that wages, instead of advancing, had been lowered. He desired to speak a few words now in reference to the tariff, but, before doing that, he would allude for a moment to the statement made by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) the other night. In the course of that very able and admirable speech, the hon. gentleman stated that many of the views he entertained with reference to this trade question he had learned from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and from the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in the speeches they pronounced on this question in 1876. And to-day the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert)—whom he did not intend to notice at any great length, but as he had thrown himself so persistently before him (Mr. Paterson), he would for once gratify the overweening desire the hon. gentleman had to attain some prominence in the House by a few remarks upon his peculiar style of quotation—his whole speech consisted of reading extracts from what he evidently considered the ablest authors, and, if anything was wanting in his speech to make it a finished production, it was a few couplets of poetry at the end. Part of his time was taken up with allusions to his (Mr. Paterson's) speech in 1876. Extracts were read from that speech, by which he endeavoured to prove him (Mr. Paterson) inconsistent with himself. The hon. gentleman first devoted his attention to himself, then to the hon. member for South Huron, then to the hon. member for North Oxford, and then he came down heavily on the hon. member for North Norfolk, and so he kept going round the bush; and, finally, so convincing was he that he was making a powerful impression, and that his opponents were all writhing under the castigations of this valiant defender of the Ministry, that, when the hon. gentleman for North Oxford left the House for a

moment, he (Mr. Rykert) attributed it to the merciless manner in which he was cutting him up. He (Mr. Paterson) would say to that hon. gentleman that, though he might have read an account, and believed it, that a live lion was once put to flight by the braying of a jackass, he must not therefore think that, because his hon. friend from North Oxford left the House for a moment, it was his speech that drove him out. He did not think, however, that Parliament and the floors of Parliament were the proper place to introduce petty subjects, and therefore he did not intend to say much about the member for Lincoln; but he thought he might venture to do that much, because that hon. member was craving for notoriety, and had sought that he should mention him, and therefore he would do so. Could it be possible that that hon. gentleman, in trying to find inconsistencies in the utterances of public men in this House, was anxious that some one should recall to the members of the House some of the inconsistencies in the hon. gentleman's own career. The hon. gentleman had charged, truly or falsely—he (Mr. Paterson) denied the truth of the charge in his own case—that they had been found occupying two different sides on the Protection question, and that the position he occupied now was not the one he occupied in 1876. He denied the truth of this statement. He held the same position now he did then. But even if it were true that his hon. friend from North Norfolk, and others to whom he (Mr. Rykert) alluded, were on two sides of a question, in a course of two years, they never accomplished what the hon. member for Lincoln did, in being on two sides of a question at the same time. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Rykert) must remember that, in 1863, in the Parliament then sitting at Quebec, he was charged with attending a Conservative caucus in the morning, and a Reform caucus in the afternoon. He could not have forgotten how the words, "traitor," "Judas Iscariot," were applied to him in the Quebec daily paper of that day. He could not have forgotten how, when he entered the House and attempted to make his defence, the Tory members—the members of the gentleman's party, who never

wounded the feelings of any one—how they hissed him, how the words "Judas Iscariot" were passed from mouth to mouth among those hon. gentlemen. He (Mr. Paterson) might be wrong in the information he had received respecting that circumstance, but he had received it from a gentleman now a member of this House, and who was then a member of that House, who saw and heard what took place; and, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rykert) seemed inclined to doubt the statement now made, he (Mr. Paterson) would have great pleasure in calling his witness to give his testimony here.

MR. RYKERT: Call him now.

MR. PATERSON: The hon. member for South Wentworth will please tell whether I have stated what he has told me, or whether I have not.

MR. RYMAL: A great many witnesses were present during the occurrence of the scene which has been alluded to, in the old Parliament of Canada, but I believe I am the only one who appears in the flesh. But, let me say in a word, that everything that the hon. member for South Brant has said in reference to that memorable occurrence is on record.

MR. RYKERT: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he stated that I ever attended a Reform caucus.

MR. RYMAL: I said you were charged with it, and, more than that, I believe you did not deny it when you were charged with it.

MR. PATERSON said he had only to say that he thought it but right to give his authority when he made this statement. He knew nothing of the merits of the case, and he was sure that if his hon. friend had testified to what was not correct, he would take it back. He was not in that Parliament, but he remembered, as a matter of history, that in the subsequent election the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Rykert's) constituency rejected him by 600 votes, on the first day of polling, and he supposed there must have been some cause for it. He believed he (Mr. Rykert) had been elected as a Conservative, that he afterwards pretended to be with the Reform Administration, trusting to get Reform support, but, while he

MR. PATERSON.

was professing to support the one, no one knew whether he was supporting the one or the other. He had only made this much allusion to the hon. gentleman because that hon. gentleman seemed to desire it very much. He would go on to say that he did make a speech in 1876, and that speech was in the *Hansard*, and the hon. gentleman quoted from that speech. His hon. friend from North Norfolk made his speech, which was in the *Hansard*, and the hon. gentleman quoted from that too. But the hon. gentleman did what Satan would do if he attempted to quote Scripture—he took passages out of their proper connection, and, when anyone did this, he could make a passage mean almost anything. If the hon. gentleman had read the whole of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, the House would have seen that the charge of inconsistency which it had been sought to fasten upon him was entirely false. This was a sample of the way in which public men's utterances were dealt with by certain hon. gentlemen on the other side. The hon. gentleman had read an extract from the speech of his hon. friend from North Norfolk, in which it appeared that he was in favour of a retaliatory policy with the United States. Now, he would read in the *Hansard*, to show how manifestly unfair was the way in which he had been quoted. The hon. gentleman could have had but one object—that of leading this House to believe that his hon. friend had advocated, as a bold proposition, that it was the duty of this Government to have retaliatory legislation against the United States. The members of this House knew well that that was his design, and, doubtless, many members of this House had been deceived by the quotation. Here was the sentence he quoted from: "With regard to the resolution, I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted." The hon. gentleman stopped there; he did not read the whole sentence, which was as follows: "With regard to the resolution, I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted which would bring the United States to terms, and would, at least, protect us against slaughter invoices." That was what the hon. gentleman really said.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PATERSON asked them not to halloo until they were out of the wood. He would proceed to read further from the speech: "I doubt, however, whether that is an evil which requires the interposition of Government. I doubt whether it is good policy, in view of the fact that this is a temporary evil, for the Administration to pursue a course which would lead to retaliation—a retaliatory policy may please us but will not hurt them. I hold that what Canada desires is reciprocity with the United States; a short cut to the markets which Protectionists propose to secure for us. It is a matter of very great importance that we should obtain access to those markets. A retaliatory policy might have a bad effect in preventing this." Would hon. gentlemen now, after hearing the whole context, say that the construction that had been placed upon his hon. friend's speech was a fair one, was an honest one, was such a one as ought to have been made by an hon. gentleman sitting in this House? It might be permissible to the Conservative party, who boasted of being gentlemen, to treat men's utterances in this way; it was disavowed on the side of the House to which he belonged. His own speech was equally garbled; sentences were taken out of it and read out of their connection, giving his remarks a construction entirely different from their real meaning. If the hon. gentleman had read the whole of that speech, he would have seen that he (Mr. Paterson) declared emphatically that he was not a Protectionist, that he did not believe in erecting a wall so high that other nations could not come in; but that he did believe in a tariff for revenue purposes upon those classes of goods produced in this country, and upon which the United States levied high duties, that this tariff should be high enough to afford protection to those industries. That was his position, and he stood here to-night uttering the same sentiments, and that was why he supported the late Government. He would not support any Government that did not act on that policy under the present circumstances of the country. He had nothing to take back. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), who had made certain utterances in 1868, had confessed last night that he had held very strong

views in regard to this matter, but that he had grown older and wiser, and had come to see things in a different light. As to himself (Mr. Paterson), however, he had nothing to take back. The sentiments he had previously uttered he was ready to utter now, and the sentiments to which he then gave expression were carried into effect by the Administration which for five years presided over the destinies of the country. Hon. gentlemen would lead the House to suppose that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and himself were bound to support this tariff, because of their utterances in 1876, but he asked if the sentiments he had uttered at that time were such as to compel him to vote for this thing which he now held in his hand. Did he and his hon. friend from North Norfolk ever agitate for anything which would compel them to approve of this tariff? Why, there were manufactures which would be injured, instead of helped, by this, which, under the revenue tariff of the previous Government, enjoyed more protection than they did under this. If they could, from the speech made by the hon. member for North Norfolk at that time, convince anyone that he was in favour of that, then he (Mr. Paterson) would admit that he was mistaken. How did the hon. gentleman sum up his utterances? The standpoint he took was that the Finance Minister, in raising his revenue, would provide protection to certain industries. That was the point on which he and his hon. friend stood, and their view was carried into effect. Protection was a very indefinite term. Two per cent. given to a manufacturer, by way of duty, was protection; 5 per cent. was protection; $7\frac{1}{2}$, 10, 15, 25, 100, or 10,000 per cent. was protection. They wanted, however, to hold his hon. friend from North Norfolk and himself to this, that they were in favour of a prohibitory tariff, though the fact was that they both openly protested against it. What hon. gentlemen opposite had stated was that they would enact a prohibitory tariff—"Canada for the Canadians; no foreign goods" was their cry. He would read the closing paragraph of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk:

"In conclusion, I may state that I am desirous of doing everything calculated to pro-

MR. PATERSON.

note the manufacturing interests of this country. But looking from my standpoint I believe that the present tariff is adequate. That, at all events, to demonstrate its inadequacy will require more time. I heartily endorse the policy of the Finance Minister in declining to advance the rate beyond $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent."

The statements in reference to his hon. friend had been answered on previous occasions, but to-morrow, if it saw fit, the *Mail* newspaper would repeat that his hon. friend had reversed his record and was inconsistent, and orators would arise on the other side of the House, and not even after this would they have shame enough to reserve their attacks. His hon. friend, however, had nothing to dread from them. Stones were not thrown at the poorest apples on the tree. Their attacks were proof that they dreaded his utterances, and that they knew they had one opposed to them whose words had weight in the country, and even with the hon. gentlemen themselves, in so far as making them feel uncomfortable was concerned. What was promised under this tariff? The manufacturer had been promised higher prices, and a more extended market. The hon. gentleman opposite had said that, when the tariff was brought down, cheer after cheer rose as the Finance Minister read the items, and the universal joy was such that his voice was drowned by the deafening applause which greeted this glorious tariff as the fulfilment of the promises made to the country. And yet the night before last the Finance Minister came to this House and proposed that no less than 34 different items, every one of which, according to the hon. gentleman, had been greeted with cheers at first, should be changed, and they cheered him again. The hon. gentleman knew that, to-day, men representing wealthy enterprises in this country had been at him. That deputation after deputation had appeared here. What were they here for? Was it to see this grand and glorious tariff which every member of the Ministerial party had cheered to the echo? What meant these scores of deputations? They were all here to tell the Finance Minister that in these items the tariff was anything but what had been promised. He (Mr. Paterson) hoped the hon. gentleman would go on making changes,

and that their Conservative friends who had cheered to the echo the tariff as first submitted, and had also cheered the amendments, would have still another occasion to cheer, as he had no doubt they would. The workingman and the mechanic were told that they would have an increase in wages. Many of the employers of labour who had supported this policy had, three weeks after the Conservative party came into power, knocked from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. off the wages of their men; and, since the tariff had been brought in, wages had gone down again. It had been stated that a large employer of labour—a member of this House—from New Brunswick, in order to save himself under the ruinous provisions contained in this tariff, had found it necessary to take from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. off the wages of his men. These men could no longer be deceived. Then the farmer was to have been protected, and these hon. gentlemen solemnly presented this thing as a fulfilment of their pledges to the farmer. They had made many statements in this House which had caused him surprise, but that proposition was one of the boldest he had ever heard. They had not contented themselves with telling the farmer they would put a certain duty on grain, but had said they would put a duty on grain, the effect of which would be to raise its price. It ought not to be necessary, in an assembly as intelligent as this, to argue the question whether the farmers of Canada could be protected or not by the imposition of the duty. He asserted that it was a moral impossibility to protect the farmer by raising the duty, except in regard to Indian corn, which Canada did not produce to the extent of her requirements. In regard to other grain, of which we had a surplus, it was as impossible to raise the price by putting on a duty as to arrest the progress of the sun or the moon in its course. And the hon. gentleman knew it. Under the old tariff, butter was protected 4c. per pound, and last year it was lower in price than it had ever been before. Was it for want of protection? The protection on that article was 40 or 50 per cent. Why did the price go down? Because the law of supply and demand,

which was eternal in its operation, fixed the price of everything. There was more butter than the world wanted, and the price of butter went down accordingly. When there was not so much as the world wanted, the price of butter would go up, and not till then. In regard to all that the farmer had to sell, excepting Indian corn, we had a large surplus, and, as long as we had that, the markets of the world, which were controlled by the law of supply and demand, which was unvariable and inexorable in its action, would be the same. The surplus of wheat from Russia, China, India, and the United States and Canada, was absorbed by the great consuming nation—England, and the price of grain in Liverpool was precisely the same price as that in India, in Russia, in the United States, and in Canada, less the cost of transport from those countries. Hon. gentlemen opposite knew this, and would be unfit to occupy their positions, if they did not know it, and yet they thought they could trade upon the credulity of the farmer. It was probable that, in the spring, a rise would take place in wheat, but the farmer would look at the Chicago and the Liverpool markets to see whether wheat had gone up 15c. per bushel more in Canada than elsewhere, and that was what it must do if this tax was to benefit him. It was absolutely impossible to protect the farmer. The manufacturer could be protected, because, when the demand was greater than the supply, prices would advance, and, by putting on a duty, they limited the supply, while the demand remained as it was. But we had a surplus of all these grains, and the imposition of a duty was the merest farce. There was the argument that, by putting on these duties, we might secure reciprocity with our neighbours. But while the United States levied a duty of 20c. per bushel, our farmers were only to have 15c. The leader of the Government, in a speech delivered in this House, said that a duty of 15c. per bushel put by the Americans upon barley, came out of the pockets of the Canadian farmer. If that were true, then 50c. a bushel on wheat would come out of the pockets of the American farmer; and why should they not take it out of his pocket? That is

what he (Mr. Paterson) would like to know. The hon. gentleman proved it conclusively from the fact that a man owning two farms, one of 100 acres on the Canadian side of the line, and the other of 100 acres on the American side of the line, growing 1,000 bushels of barley on each, for his 1,000 American bushels in the American market got \$1 a bushel; for his 1,000 bushels of Canadian barley \$1 a bushel, less 15c. a bushel duty for taking it into the American market, or 85c. bushel net. Then why not put an additional duty of 25c. to 30c. on Indian corn, and get the American's Indian corn for nothing? If the duty on barley took the money out of the Canadian farmer's pocket, then our putting this duty on corn would have the effect of taking it out of the American farmer's pocket. Why had not this reciprocity of tariff promised them been carried out? If flour was charged 20 per cent. over there, and coal 75c., why should we not impose similar duties here? He had just this proposition to make. They told the manufacturer that he would get a higher price for what he had to sell; they told the mechanic that he would get higher wages for working in the manufactories; they told the consumer that he would get that article cheaper from the manufacturers than at present. If the articles were sold cheaper than at present, they practised a base perfidy against the manufacturer. If the manufacturer, to save himself from reduced profits, lowered the wages of his workmen, a perfidy had been practised against the mechanic, and if the prices were raised they dealt perfidiously with the consumer—let them take which horn of the dilemma suited them best. The hon. the Minister of Finance, in introducing this tariff, said it was a revolutionary measure. He (Mr. Paterson) had shown conclusively that the tariff now before them was not what was promised to the people, and, that being the case, there was but one course for the Government to adopt, in view of the introduction of this revolutionary measure, which was not what the country pronounced for. That course was to advise His Excellency to dissolve Parliament, to send the members back to their constituents, and after this test vote they would then see how many of the smiling faces

yonder would be found in their places. He had to allude to another point. He belonged to a party that was not loud in its expressions of loyalty. Gentlemen whose noses were very keen on the scent of loyalty had professed to believe that his party would not bear a microscopic examination on that point. He had always pronounced that charge false and unfounded. He had examined the records of the country and had failed to see when that party had been concerned in any act of disloyalty. They had never burned the Parliament House. They were loyal to Great Britain, but they did not proclaim their loyalty from house-top to house-top. With all their professions of loyalty, this Government had enacted a tariff which discriminated against Great Britain, which struck at the tie that bound us to the Mother Country. He was not disposed to parade his loyalty. It was, however, deep, firm and abiding in his breast. He loved to see the Royal Ensign waving from the dome of this magnificent building of our nation, as it floated over that great city in which dwelt our Queen, whose name was dear to us all, and that feeling was strengthened by the fact that one of the members of the Royal Household, adorned, by her presence and the graces of her manner, our own Government House. He was glad to see that it fell to the part of those gentlemen who laid claim to such intense loyalty to introduce a tariff that struck a blow at our connection with the Mother Country. He, as a Canadian, held his country above all others; but it seemed to him to be an ungracious act to discriminate against England, where we went to borrow money to construct our canals and railways, and on whom we depended to defend our coasts. It was no use for hon. gentlemen to say this was trivial nonsense. So important was this matter that the Colonial Secretary telegraphed to this Government his regrets that they had seen fit to enact such a tariff. That official document would not have been sent from Downing-street to this country had not the British Government felt that a great injustice had been done to Britain. The hon. the Finance Minister endeavoured, by a very plausible statement which he had compiled, to lead this House to believe that Great Britain

was not discriminated against. He made up a comparative statement of the imports from Great Britain and the United States into this country, endeavouring to show that we imported from the United States \$28,606,691, and from Great Britain \$17,983,321, and that, therefore, by putting a duty equal in amount, as he claimed, on the products of the United States by reason of our importing more from that country, it would discriminate against the United States and not against England. What were the items in our imports now? One of them the hon. gentleman could not lay claim to. He put in \$13,028,903 of breadstuffs that never came from England at all; breadstuffs being articles which we never imported from England, and which were not needed for consumption here. In order to ascertain how we stood with the Mother Country compared with the United States, with reference to our imports, we must strike out the breadstuffs, deducting which, our imports from the United States were \$15,277,798, and from Great Britain \$17,983,321, or a discrimination against England of \$2,705,743. He would refer, while on this subject, to the utterances of a gentleman, one of the most prominent members of the Dominion Board of Trade, who was a member of this House, and an ornament to it, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). In one of the able speeches delivered by that gentleman before the Board of Trade, on this subject, he said: "I tell you, Sir, to-day we have in force and operation a tariff that is discriminating against Great Britain, inasmuch as the cost of freight from that country to this is greater than from the United States, and in so far it discriminates against Great Britain. I ask you if this state of things should not be changed?" It was not changed under this tariff, but aggravated by the fact that we imported from Great Britain nearly \$3,000,000 worth of goods, which this tariff sought to exclude, more than we imported from the United States, thus discriminating to that amount against the Mother Country. He thought that, if an appeal were made to the country on the part of the Government, the people would reject this tariff on this ground alone. He came now to his last point, and it was one that settled the pro-

position that he had made, that there should be a dissolution of the House and an appeal to the people, in order to get at the merits of this question. He would again quote the same high authority that he had quoted a few moments before, the hon. member for Cardwell, who said, in a speech delivered before the Board of Trade: "What Canada desires, what any country needs above all other things, in order to establish prosperity, and to maintain it, is permanence in its tariff." This tariff could not be permanent in its nature; it had only been two weeks before the House when it was changed, and it would be changed again. Deputation after deputation had arrived to say it was not what they wanted. The hon. member for King's said we must have the tariff for a year anyway, and we would see how it worked. Did he expect that men were going to invest their capital under the provisions of a tariff, on behalf of which all that its strongest defenders in the House could urge was that they were going it blind, and they would see how it worked? If there was an appeal to the country, and that tariff was the issue, and the country sanctioned it, we would have something like permanence in it, but not otherwise. The hon. member for King's said there were many things in it which he did not like, but he would swallow it whole, because there were things in it that he did like. It could only get through on the principle that there was honour among thieves. Just as soon as thieves began to quarrel over the spoils, there would be a reaction in the camp. As soon as the operation of this tariff became apparent, one gentleman might see that the interests of his constituents were sacrificed for those of another; and a second might see that his were sacrificed for a third, and so on, and at once an agitation for repeal was commenced. He repeated that permanence in the tariff was essential, and, with a view to still further illustrate the instability of this tariff, it would be necessary for him to examine the record of some of the hon. gentlemen in the House, on this subject. He desired to make an explanation on this point, for this reason. He did not think it worth his while, he did not think it right to the House and the country, that the time of the House

should be taken up by anyone, in the attempt merely to show the inconsistencies of hon. members. His object in tracing the course of hon. gentlemen, was to show that the permanence of this tariff could not be ensured, and that it was not safe, because the record of the man promoting it and carrying it through was against the provisions contained in it. While he did so, he would have a little quiet amusement in looking up the record of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. He did not do this in order to show that the hon gentleman was inconsistent; that would be time utterly wasted, for the country knew that that was a characteristic of the hon. gentleman. If, by some superhuman power, he could make the hon. gentleman consistent with himself, he would awaken the surprise of the whole Dominion. But when that hon. gentleman could rise in his place and inflict the House with such manifest "Tupperisms" as he did, he could not expect to be allowed to go free. When the hon. gentleman rose in his place and alluded to the fact that the Finance Minister had proposed, as he alleged, to increase the tariff $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and then failed to carry out his intention, as a shameless abandonment of principle, everyone who knew the hon. gentleman must regard the statement as one of the most audacious of "Tupperisms." What was the record of the hon gentleman himself? The country had this same National Policy, in an attenuated form, under hon. gentlemen opposite, on two different occasions. The first was in 1867, and, one year after, they had the same Government who put it on knock it off. They had the right hon. the leader of the Government saying that a duty on flour had been imposed with a view of showing our American friends our independence. But, seeing the new tariff did not work satisfactorily, or do our people any good, it was repealed, as a step in the right direction. Two years afterwards, the same gentleman, the Minister of Public Works being in the Government, introduced another tariff, and the Government of the day told the House that the safety and wellbeing of Canada depended on that tariff. It remained in force ten months, and the very men that put that law upon the Statute-book voted

MR. PATERSON.

it down and trampled it out of existence, after they had declared that it was in the interests of the country that it should be maintained. Yet, the hon. gentleman talked about abandonment of principle. A motion was made on the third reading of the Bill which repealed those duties, by his colleague who sat behind him, the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell), to retain the duty on flour and grain; and subsequently another motion by the member for South Norfolk, and on both of these occasions he voted against them. After voting against these two motions, he voted for the third reading of the Bill that put them out of existence, until he resurrected them last week. With that record, the hon gentleman had the temerity to talk about abandonment of principle. Would the hon. gentleman say that, if the Administration of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie were voted down on a question of vital importance, that Administration would have held on to office and abandoned that principle? Nothing would justify such an assertion. He would read the list of those who voted with the Government on that occasion to repeal these duties, for the purpose of showing that they did not approve of the principles advocated in this tariff, and the probability that they would repeal it when its iniquity became manifest to them in this tariff. Who else voted against the motion to impose duties on coal, coke, wheat and flour? The hon. member for Ottawa City (Mr. Currier) voted against it; the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Daoust), the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Benoit). There was another hon. member in the House at that time who voted against it—Mr. Blanchet. There was the hon. member for London (Mr. Carling) who voted against it. There was that champion of consistency who lectured his hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) for inconsistencies in newspaper utterances, and was going to support this tariff—Mr. Costigan, he voted against it. The member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) voted against it. The smiling and genial member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) voted against it. There was another hon. gentleman who voted against it—Mr. Langevin. The member for South

Simcoe (Mr. Little) voted against it. The member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson)—a gentleman whom they all respected—voted against it. The member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) voted against it. Mr. McDonald (Cape Breton) voted against it. Mr. M. P. Ryan voted against it; and Mr. Tilley, who voted against it, now put a duty on those articles. He then voted down, as against the interests of the country, these duties that he now imposed. There was the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who declared it was prejudicial to the people; and circumstances had not changed, because the Americans did not send any more corn in now than they did then. The hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) voted against it, and the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Baker). He proposed next to look up the record of some of the votes they had last year, when this was a living, burning question. He found that, on the 8th of April last, Mr. Brown moved, seconded by Mr. Ross,

“That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the chair, but that it be resolved, that whereas a large quantity of wheat and flour has been imported into Canada within the last few years, this House is of opinion that the interests of Canadian farmers would be promoted by the imposition of a duty on these articles.”

Upon the principle laid down in that resolution, the House voted. Who voted against the proposition? The hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Benoit), the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc), the hon. member for Drummond (Mr. Bourbeau), the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster), the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Cimon), the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), the hon. member for Ottawa city (Mr. Currier), the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Cuthbert), the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Daoust), the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardin), the hon. member for King's N.B. (Mr. Domville), the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas), the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Hurteau), the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Lantier). He wished to call the attention of the House to the fact that he had only one object in reading this record, and that was to prove that this tariff could

not be permanent in itself. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDonald) voted against it, the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McKay), the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Methot), the hon. members for Champlain (Mr. Montplaisir), Laval (Mr. Ouimet), Laprairie (Mr. Pinsonnault), Bonaventure (Mr. Robitaille), Dorchester (Mr. Rouleau), Digby (Mr. Wade), Ottawa County (Mr. Wright). These gentlemen said by their votes that the imposition of a duty on wheat and flour would not promote the interests of the farmer, and yet this tariff came down and made additional burdens on him. The whole thing was a delusion and a snare, and there were enough members in this House to outvote the Government on this tariff, if they only voted as they did last year, for, in addition to the names already quoted, Messrs. Blanchet, Baby, Langevin, Masson, Pope (Compton), Pope (Queen's), all voted against it, while Mr. Tupper was conveniently absent. There was another vote on April 9th. His hon. friend who sat in front of him thought he saw an injustice in the tariff, and he moved to rectify it in the following direction. Mr. Béchard moved:

“That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, That, a large quantity of corn and oats having been imported into Canada within the last few years, this House is of opinion that the interests of Canadian farmers would be promoted by the imposition of a duty upon the importation of these products.”

He (Mr. Paterson) found that the vote on that motion was a very mixed one. The reason he would repeat this vote was to prove that, whilst the Hon. Mr. Masson, Minister of Militia, was perfectly consistent in the course he took, for he voted against the whole motion; the hon. the Postmaster-General, in explaining the way he was going to vote in reference to the imposition of a duty on wheat and flour, stated that it was a sectional tax, and he could not sanction it for that reason. He thought it was rather a sectional resolution that his hon. friend (Mr. Béchard) moved in reference to corn and oats, yet he found that the hon. the Postmaster-General had voted for it. He would go over the list again, and show how the votes stood on the three motions: Mr. Benoit, Cham-

bly, voted against the duty on wheat and flour, for the duty on corn and oats; against the duty on coal. Mr. Bolduc, Beauce, against all three motions. Mr. Bourbeau, Drummond, voted against the duties on wheat and flour, also against the duty on corn and oats, and for the duty on coal. Mr. Brooks, Sherbrooke, voted against the duty on wheat and flour, was absent on corn and oats, against the duty on coal. Mr. Bunster, Vancouver, against the duty on wheat and flour, for the duty on corn and oats, and for the duty on coal. Mr. Cimon, Chicoutimi, against the duty on wheat and flour, for the duty on corn and oats, absent on the duty on coal. Mr. Colby, Stanstead, against the duty on wheat and flour, absent on the votes on corn and oats and coal. Mr. Currier, Ottawa city, against the duty on wheat and flour, absent on the duty on corn and oats, against the duty on coal. Mr. Cuthbert, Berthier, against the duty on wheat and flour, for the duty on corn and oats, against the duty on coal. Mr. Daoust, Two Mountains, against the duty on wheat and flour, absent on corn and oats, against the duty on coal. Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga, against the duty on wheat and flour, also against the duty on corn and oats, absent on the duty on coal. Mr. Domville, King's, N.B., against the duty on wheat and flour, against the duty on corn and oats, absent on the coal motion. Mr. Dugas, Montcalm, against the duty on wheat and flour, for the duty on corn and oats, against the duty on coal. Mr. Hurteau, L'Assomption, against the duty on wheat and flour, for the duty on corn and oats, against the duty on coal. Mr. Lantier, Soulanges, against the duty on wheat and flour, for the duty on corn and oats, against the duty on coal. Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton, against the duty on wheat and flour, for the duty on corn and oats, for the duty on coal. Mr. McKay, Colchester, against the duty on wheat and flour, against the duty on corn and oats, for the duty on coal. And so it ran on through twenty other names. The point he wanted to make was this, that the deliberate opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite was hostile in reference to matters contained in this tariff, and that being so, and their record proved it was, if they supported this tariff

they could only do it by a complete backing down from their former principles. He thought the effect of this would be that the tariff would be altered, and not be permanent in its character. That industries that might spring up under it, if any, would—under such a jeopardising tariff as this—be destroyed. The hon. the Minister of Finance had said that the United States under a protective system had prospered in a greater degree than Canada. Even if that were true, which it was not, it was not, after all, an argument why this Parliament should adopt a similar tariff. He denied that there was as much prosperity in the United States as there was in Canada. He had listened, the other night, to the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), and had noticed, while the hon. gentleman was speaking, that the reporters were not reporting him as they in times gone by had done, and he had told the hon. gentleman that, as he saw that his (Mr. Plumb's) remarks would not be reported, he would like to get his figures respecting bankrupt railways in the United States, and he (Mr. Paterson) had told him fairly that he intended to use them against him. The hon. gentleman said he would let him have them, but he did not.

MR. PLUMB: The hon. gentleman asked for them after they were in the reporters' hands.

MR. PATERSON said he would not make a point against the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Paterson) had found that the *Ottawa Citizen* had given a record of some of the things the hon. gentleman said. He supposed it was a true report, as it would appear in the *Hansard*, but there was not one word in the *Ottawa Citizen* in reference to the bankrupt railways in the United States. However, he (Mr. Paterson) would give the figures from memory: Seventy or eighty railways in the United States, involving a capital of \$700,000,000, had become bankrupt in three years. Yet the hon. the Minister of Finance, if he remembered aright, had expressed the desire that Heaven would send such prosperity in Canada as the United States enjoyed. The same sentiment had been uttered on every platform in the West, by men expressing the desire that this

MR. PATERSON.

country might be ruined in the way the United States was. Could those gentlemen, traducers in high places, which gave their words more weight than they otherwise would have, point out seven or eight—taking the basis of forty to four—bankrupt railroads in Canada in three years? They could not point to one mile of bankrupt railways in this country, so far as he knew, and yet the hon. gentlemen said, would that Heaven would send them the prosperity that the United States enjoyed. If it were true that the prosperity of that country was greater than this, though he (Mr. Paterson) believed it was the reverse, the circumstances of the country were so different that what would be a safe line for that country to adopt, might not be wise here. They had a population of 44,000,000, scattered over half a continent, with a diversity of soil and climate, having any quantity of minerals of all kinds developed, which was not the case with us yet, and the same rule could not be applied to 4,000,000 of people situated as we were, and separated by different interests. Protection would be a dangerous experiment for us to try, even if it had been proved and pronounced successful in that country. Protection might work in the States for a time, but even there it would be abandoned. Under different circumstances, the evil results might not show themselves so soon, but he feared that a prohibitory tariff here might involve very great distress upon the country. He believed in a National Policy, so long as it was for the purpose of encouraging the raising of the revenue, at the same time protecting our industries and giving employment to our people; but to go beyond that, and enact a prohibitory tariff, tended to take money out of the pockets of the people, for the benefit of a few. Further, the large proportion of the manufacturers of the country would be in a worse position under this tariff, and three or four manufacturers would be benefitted at the expense of the rest. It might be, as was pretended, a scientific tariff, but it seemed to him that the instructions given to the gentleman they imported from Washington, in order to frame this tariff, which was proved conclusively to discriminate against Eng-

land, must have been to prepare an attenuated, shrivelled, and diluted edition of the American tariff. It had the semblance of standing on our rights, and having a retaliatory policy, but they had only succeeded in showing the Americans that they would like to strike but were afraid to do it. Why not have the American tariff out and out? The hon. the Finance Minister showed he was willing to do what was spiteful but dared not; that he had the willingness to offend, but not the bravery to defend. The hon. gentlemen had proved by their tariff that they were too cowardly to retaliate. He believed in a National Policy. He believed they were all true and loyal to the country in which they dwelt, and they would be unfit to represent the people in this Parliament unless such was a distinct characteristic of them. The people of this country were loyal to the country, loyal to the Confederation, loyal to their Mother Country. They desired the maintenance and binding together in a more compact form the Provinces that constituted this country, and a National Policy that would be calculated to bring about that end; and such a policy he (Mr. Paterson) was in favour of; but it was a misnomer for the hon. gentlemen to call their policy a National Policy. It was declared in the most solemn manner by hon. gentlemen from some of the Provinces that this policy was a direct violation of the solemn compact which was entered into when they joined Confederation. When he found Province balanced against Province, interest being arrayed against interest, when he found dissatisfaction created, and rings of monopolists formed, he saw great danger to the maintenance of this Confederation. He would like to see a National Policy that would bind them more together, but it could only be accomplished by the policy laid down by the late Government, that the people of this country should only be taxed for the purpose of raising the revenue required to carry on the Government of the country, levied on such articles as would best promote the interests of all. This tariff, he thought, struck at this principle. He joined in the aspiration that the time would come, within the existence of many now present, when, instead of there being only 4,000,000 population, there

would be 10,000,000; when our great North-West would be the home of happy millions, and when everywhere throughout this Dominion peace and good feeling might reign and be perpetuated by the enactment of laws which gave justice to all and bore oppressively on none. He could only say to the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that, though the Opposition, as a party, were powerless just now to prevent the legislation that had been initiated, and were forced to sit and hear the defenders of the Ministry jeer and taunt them for upholding what they considered to be right, they were willing to endure all that, and calmly and patiently, yet hopefully, bide their time. When that time came, and an appeal was had to the people again, they would go back to the country firm in the conviction that the verdict which had been snatched from it under false pretences would be reversed by an overwhelming majority, and that the Reformers, who had stood by their principles and gone down, would come to the front again, crowned anew with glory, and have a more permanent reign than they ever had before.

MR. RYKERT said he rose to make a personal explanation in regard to the charge made against him by the hon. member for South Brant. It was not the first time this charge had been made against him in different parts of the country, but never before in his presence. He was surprised that the hon. member for South Brant had dared to repeat what he must know to be a slander and untrue. He (Mr. Rykert) used these words deliberately, because he knew the hon. member believed the charge to be untrue. He was surprised that his hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Rymal), who was present at that time in Parliament should not have had sufficient manliness to correct an hon. gentleman when he heard him making a misstatement. No person knew better than the hon. member for South Wentworth, that the charge was absolutely untrue; and he knew that he (Mr. Rykert) had never attended a Liberal caucus, as stated by the member for South Brant. If the hon. member for South Brant had had a particle of honesty he would have called upon the hon. the

MR. PATERSON.

leader of the Opposition—the real leader of the Opposition—to stand up and contradict the hon. member for South Wentworth. He (Mr. Rykert) denied the charge, and would call upon the leader of the Opposition to stand up and state what he knew of the facts. A certain newspaper in the city of Quebec had charged him with attending a Conservative caucus in the morning, and a Reform caucus in the afternoon. He took occasion to move that the proprietor of the paper be brought to the bar of the House. He would read to the House the report of the facts, as published in the paper he charged with slandering him. Upon that occasion the Hon. George Brown was reported to have spoken as follows:—“He said that he hoped he (Mr. Rykert) would not press his motion. He had vindicated himself completely, and nothing could be gained by persisting in the motion.” The Hon. Mr. Drummond, then a member of that same Government, and the colleague of Mr. Brown, concurred in the course of the member for South Oxford, and used the following language: “He said he concurred in the course suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford. Certainly no hon. gentleman would, for a moment, believe that his hon. friend from Lincoln was guilty of any such conduct as that described in the paragraph in question.” The Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald, leader of the Government, said “that his hon. friend had completely exonerated himself, and that was quite sufficient, and hoped he would withdraw the motion.” And he did withdraw the motion accordingly. The hon. member for Lambton was present on that occasion. Why did he not rise in his place to-night, and deny that he (Mr. Rykert) attended the Liberal caucus, and thus vindicate the honour of a member of Parliament? It was true that he was defeated in a subsequent election, but not for the reason alleged. It was because he chose to support his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, in voting for the Separate School Bill. But in the subsequent municipal election, held in the city of St. Catharines, he defeated the gentleman who had opposed him for Parliament, as Reeve of St. Catharines, by a large majority. He had defeated the best men of that party—men who had spent \$40,000 to defeat

him in the last two elections,—and no persons knew better than the Opposition in this House, that he could defeat any man of their party in the county. He would now call upon a living witness to state whether he had given a correct version of what took place in Parliament at Quebec. As no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House had the courage to defend him, he would ask the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Ross) to state whether he had reported the facts correctly.

MR. ROSS (Dundas) said he recollected, in 1863, attending a caucus of the then Opposition in the House, at which his hon. friend (Mr. Rykert) was present. It was called for the purpose of fixing upon a plan of attacking the Government. At that caucus, a difference of opinion existed as to whether the Government should be attacked upon their measures by a general want of confidence motion, and no agreement was come to; that many were in favour of defeating them upon a measure which, to some, was objectionable, and it was left to the leaders, the late Sir George E. Cartier and the present Premier, to decide upon what plan to adopt. The caucus adjourned, with the understanding that it was to be called again. However, when the House met, at three o'clock, and when the order was called for going into Committee of Supply, his hon. friend the present Premier proposed then, without further notice, thinking, of course, it was best to do so, a motion of general want of confidence in the Government. His hon. friend from Lincoln, when the motion was read, was occupying a seat on the Ministerial side of the House. He passed over across to where he (Mr. Ross) was sitting, and asked him "Was that the understanding that was arrived at?" He answered that it was not. The hon. member for Lincoln then said he should not support a motion that was not in accordance with the understanding arrived at, and should oppose it. He (Mr. Ross) said to him that he had better not take that course, it was too late. His hon. friend for Lincoln answered that, as the party had not been called again according to understanding, to decide on a plan of action, he felt that he was released of the obli-

gation of supporting the motion. That was his (Mr. Ross's) recollection of the occurrence.

MR. RYMAL said he had been charged with cowardice, a thing which he had never been guilty of. In a conversation he had had with the hon. member for South Brant, he was asked whether there was any vulnerable point in the hon. member for Lincoln. He (Mr. Rymal) referred to this affair which had taken place in the old Parliament at Quebec. He did not know he (Mr. Paterson) was going to bring it up here, although, if he had known it, he should have given him the information just the same. He had no doubt what had been reported of the sayings of the Hon. George Brown, and the Hon. Sandfield Macdonald, was true. But what he (Mr. Rymal) saw, and heard, and knew, he believed; and when the hon. gentleman came into the Chamber and took up the *Daily News*—and that paper was not to be found to-day—one of the Tory organs in Quebec at that time, he raised a question of privilege and read this article, and the Tory party rank and file—there might have been some few exceptions—hissed him as he stood on the floor. He thought that it was rather hard treatment, as he did not know whether he had been guilty of the treachery he was charged with or not.

MR. RYKERT: Did you attend the caucus yourself?

MR. RYMAL said that he never saw the hon. member for Lincoln in their caucus, but he had stated it was reported the hon. gentleman had betrayed his friends; and that was the sum and substance of what his hon. friend from South Brant had said. He might have said that it was by attending a double caucus, but it mattered very little whether he came to their caucus or not, or whether he was confederating with the chief of the Ministerial party, and telling him what had occurred. That was what he was charged with, and that was what he (Mr. Rymal) believed he was guilty of. He (Mr. Rymal) did not think that some sixty members of the Tory party would have stood up there in the House at Quebec and saluted the hon. member for Lincoln with hisses and epithets of "traitor," if

they had not believed the article in the newspaper to be true. If he (Mr. Rykert) did not attend the caucus of the Liberal party, he knew very well—or he (Mr. Rymal) knew it—that he was in Sandfield Macdonald's confidence, and that he went back to his constituency more as a candidate of the Liberal party than of the Tory party. But the Tory party would not touch him with a ten-foot pole, and the Liberal party would not have anything to do with him, and he was beaten by 600 majority. It was true that he had outlived this, and that he had done works meet for repentance, and the Tories were not very particular as to the purity of their candidates. He (Mr. Rymal) did not wish to expose anything further, but he might add that the hon. gentleman from Lincoln was charged, not only with confederating against his own party, but with having received \$40 for doing it; and, if this money had been paid in a certain species of British coin, he would have received the same number of pieces of silver that Judas Iscariot did.

MR. PATERSON said the House would understand that, in alluding to the hon. gentleman from Lincoln as he did, since that hon. gentleman had been charging gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House with inconsistencies, he proposed, though he did not think it profitable, to speak with reference to his (Mr. Rykert's) own record in that respect; and, in any remarks that he had made, he distinctly gave it to be understood that he had received his information from others, and the hon. gentleman from Lincoln should not say that he (Mr. Paterson) had uttered a slander knowing it to be such. None of his political opponents would ever charge him with doing that. He believed every word he uttered, and, if he said anything that was not true, he was sorry for it. His object in referring to the matter was simply to administer a lesson to the hon. gentleman from Lincoln, who was always so ready to hunt up other people's records, and whose whole life was passed in doing that kind of thing, that those who lived in glass houses should not throw stones.

MR. RYKERT: Cowardly attack.

MR. RYMAL.

MR. PATERSON: Cowardly attack? I never said it behind the hon. gentleman's back; and I say more to him—a coward never makes an apology. If what I said was untrue, I am sorry I said it; and, if he says it was untrue, I will take it back.

MR. BUNSTER said he wished to explain the vote he gave last Session on the Protection question. He had told the hon. leader of the Opposition at the time that his policy did not go far enough. He wanted a grand National Policy, the same as they had now before them. He wanted to put a duty on wheat and flour, and if, last Session, he had voted against the resolution proposed by the then leader of the Opposition, it would have been said that he was looking only after his own interests because he owned a flour mill in the city of Victoria. He was sorry to see that this discussion had assumed a warlike appearance against the tariff, but it behoved every hon. member to consider why this attack on the National Policy was made. He, for one, claimed that he understood it well. The attack was made, not against the National Policy, not against the policy of the people, which the present Government, fresh from the polls, brought down, but in order to get on the Treasury benches and receive the large salaries paid to the Ministers. It was not that they cared so much about the tariff. If they were on the Treasury benches, he questioned very much whether they would have had ability enough, even if they made the same pledges to the people, to have brought down a policy which had been endorsed from one end of the country to another. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), had said it was denounced from one end of the country to the other; but he (Mr. Bunster) could deny that, as far as British Columbia was concerned, and that was the most important end of the country. Hon. members who had attacked the National Policy had kept to the amount to be placed on flour, or coal, or tea, and had not taken into consideration, in dealing with the question, the general welfare of the Dominion. They had said nothing about the national highway which was to weld the Dominion into one, from the

Pacific to the Atlantic, and was to make Canada one glorious Dominion. Not one of them had brains enough, or if they had, they had not sufficient honesty of purpose to admit that they had sufficient tariff to raise money to build that national highway. Had anyone said that an injustice had been done to British Columbia by this tariff? Nevertheless, British Columbia was willing to stand by it, if the Government would carry out the railway as they had promised, as he believed they would have done had they remained in power in 1873, and in that case 316 lives lost in the old *Pacific* would have been saved from a watery grave. The Terms of Union provided for the construction of the railway within ten years of that date, namely, in March, 1871. Through the conspiracy against the present Government in 1873, not only the people of British Columbia, but the whole people of the Dominion had lost five years of prosperity, and had been put back more than ten years, and even the present Government, with all their ability, would not be able within the next five years to regain the position lost by the blunders of the Mackenzie Government. If the Conservative Government had not been hounded from office, in consequence of their efforts to build the great national highway, it would probably not now have been necessary to call for an increase of tariff. The late member for South Bruce had used harsh language toward British Columbia, but he believed Mr. Shaw, who took his place in the House to-day, would scorn to denounce any Province in the Dominion. He would ask any hon. gentleman, whether Grit or Conservative, if he could endorse such language as that used by the late member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake). What authority had he to say that his (Mr. Bunster's) adopted country was inhospitable? He claimed that his people were as hospitable as those in any part of the globe; and, yet, while they were sending emigration agents to every part of the world, they were met by such a villifying statement as that. He believed the injustice done British Columbia during the last five years had brought on the extra taxation they were now about to endure. As long as the present Government kept faith

with the people, and carried out their promises with honesty of purpose, and a fair determination to carry out their pledges, the people of British Columbia would be satisfied, but otherwise they would not. They had gone to the Pacific and opened up that Province, and had been induced, on a promise made by the only "nation-maker" Canada had (Sir John A. Macdonald), that he would build the national highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. If the people of the Pacific Province had not been loyal to the old flag, they would have had ten railways built, if they desired them; but they said they would stick to the old flag. They would not go to the Yankees, but would rather go back to the old flag that had braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze. They might have to do that if the present Government did not carry out their promises, but he had faith in them and trusted them, and believed they would do what was right. It was quite obvious why the present Government were compelled to increase the tariff. The people had declared, by a majority of over eighty in this House, that they wanted the National Party in power again. They wanted a railway that would give them a national road and employment for their industries. The hon. member for South Brant had stated that bank stocks had fallen from 170 to 130, but under the National Policy they would go up again to their legitimate value. It was boasted that Confederation had brought all the Provinces into one Confederacy, and where was there any one except Sir John A. Macdonald and his colleagues who had the ability to do that? Certainly, Mr. Mackenzie and the Reform party never originated any great public movement; they were incapable of doing so; but instead they committed mistakes and blunders which had cost the country almost endless expenditure and trouble. Sir John A. Macdonald was back again in power now, and would carry out his promise he felt confident. He could not consistently agree with the Government in this National Policy, from his standpoint. It did not go far enough. The Americans charged anthracite coal \$1 per ton, and bituminous 75c. per ton; on barley and wheat they also had an advantage of 5c.

per bushel. What we wanted was a home market for the farmers. The farmers needed protection and sent their representatives here to frame a protective tariff for them. If the present Government were now to appeal to the people, they would come back to this House with even a larger majority than at present, because they had been honest in carrying out their pledges. The hon. member for South Brant had said that Canadian goods could hold their own with 17½c. protection. That had been tried, and had not succeeded. During the depression in the United States, bankrupt stocks were sent into Canada and sold under cost price, greatly to the injury of our honest traders. As the result, many of our traders could not help falling into the hands of the official assignees, with whom this country was flooded by the late Government; their number being 101 according to the hon. member for South Brant. Before the late Government got into power, they never had an official assignee in British Columbia, and now there were three there who were of very little use. Now, the hon. member for South Brant spoke about the price of grain having gone down in this country. He had watched the prices in California and Liverpool, which governed the price of grain throughout the world, and he failed to see the price of grain had gone down. From the encouraging report from California and Australia, of the recent rains there, grain had kept stationary in the expectation of an abundant harvest. Was the present Government responsible for that? They could not regulate the price of grain in Australia and California. Now, if the farmers had to pay a little more for their tweeds, they had a protection on their grain in more senses than one. The present Government had raised the tariff on whiskey 10c. per gallon. That alone was a tariff on grain, which probably they did not understand, and that was one reason why the Finance Minister took into consideration that he only put 7½c. a bushel on corn. Corn should stand a better tariff than 7½c., because, when the distillers could not get corn to use, they could resort to using our coarser grains, which would, no doubt, be exported in a very

MR. BUNSTER.

few months, from the great prairies of the West, as soon as the great national highway was built. The hon. member for South Brant said it was impossible to raise corn in the Dominion. There he (Mr. Bunster) joined issue with him. Corn could be raised in British Columbia and plenty of it on the mainland. It was astonishing that hon. gentlemen would not inform themselves about their country, particularly when they came here to Parliament to represent its interests. He knew that our coarse grains would give a better article of whiskey, which had now almost got to be the Canadian national beverage. The hon. gentlemen had made a hue and cry about the butter question; perhaps his constituents had not been able to pay the price for it, in consequence of the depression. But, if the national highway had been going on, if 500,000 Canadians who had left the country, had been kept in it to build the railway across the continent, there would have been no depression. The hon. member alluded to Indian corn. He asked the Government why they did not put on such a tariff that the Americans would grow their corn and give it to us for nothing. They were not such fools as to do that. Our Government said to the people, grow your own corn, and he believed Canada to-day was a good corn-growing country. He would quote from a letter written in 1874, by the late Premier, to a gentleman in his Province, endeavouring to induce their people to abandon the contract. What was that urgent necessity? It was simply want of ability, as a proof of which the Americans built a railway across the continent in three years and nine months, which had ever since been a paying concern, to the commonwealth, at least. The people of British Columbia wanted the Government to carry out their bargain with British Columbia. Canada had not carried out that bargain when she could have done it easily. The excuse made was that the times were too hard. But what were the hard times here compared with the bloody civil war in the United States. Had the Government gone on with the Pacific Railway, we would not have known depression. One of the hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces stated that British Columbia only contributed

54 tons to our shipping last year. He was very much mistaken. British Columbia had purchased over 2,000 tons of shipping last year, and under Protection she would compete with any other Province in building ships, for she had all the materials to do so. The hon. the Premier, at that time, had said: "You will remember that the Dominion is bound to reach the 'seaboard of the Pacific' only, not Victoria or Esquimalt, and you will convey an intimation to them that any further extension beyond the waters of Bute Inlet, or whatever other portion of the sea waters may be reached, may depend entirely on the spirit shown by themselves in assenting to a reasonable extension of time, or a modification of the terms originally agreed to. You will also put them in remembrance of the terms they themselves proposed, which terms were assented to by their Local Legislature, and point out that it was only the insane act of the Administration here which gave such conditions of Union to Columbia; that it could only have been because that Administration sought additional means of procuring an extension of patronage immediately before the general election, and saw, in coming contracts, the means of carrying the elections, that the Province obtained, on paper, terms which, at the time, were known to be impossible of fulfilment." Was that the way to treat British Columbia? No candid person could say it was. It was trying to drive her away from the bargain made with the Dominion of Canada, by making the Province take \$1,500,000 in exchange for her railway bond. They would have been very foolish had they done so. The right hon. the Premier would have laughed and said, Why did you make such a foolish bargain with Mr. Mackenzie and destroy your chance of ever having a railroad, for the Home Government will not sanction breaking the Terms of Union? To-day he dared say he felt proud of British Columbia for not breaking the contract, but keeping it intact for him to carry out the bargain as fast as he conveniently could. That was all the people of British Columbia reasonably expected from him, and, if he failed to do that, the people of British Columbia would say to him "We do not want you to repre-

sent us; we do not want to have anything more to do with Canada, we will go back to our old flag." Some hon. gentlemen might think they had not pluck or ability enough to do it. He assured them that they were mistaken. If they were to secede, the Mother Country would say they were perfectly justified. The Carnarvon award gave them until the 1st of May. The people meant business, and, if something was not done, he would not answer for the result. They were told that the country was against the tariff. He knew that people, as a general thing did not want to be taxed—that was beyond doubt; but, when the necessity existed, they should be patriotic enough to assist the Government that had got the ability to carry out their wishes. On the question of loyalty, he would ask if it was loyal of the late Government to use such language in reference to British Columbia as they did. They possessed the same rights as any other part of Canada. They sent an agent to British Columbia to try and tamper with their Local Legislature, which had been objectionable to the people. Fortunately, British Columbia had some statesmen in that Province who were not willing to make the concessions required. He desired to review the condition of British Columbia for a moment, and see how much better off she would have been if she had never joined Canada. Under the circumstances, Confederation had been of no benefit to British Columbia; on the contrary, owing to the manner in which they had been treated, the connection had been a curse to them. Had they not entered the Confederation, they could have made a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, the Sandwich Islands, Australia, and other countries. They would have been able, in their own legislative halls, to have framed treaties and tariffs suitable to their wants, instead of coming to this Parliament and begging the Government to allow things they did not produce to come in under a moderate tariff. He was obliged to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to that, because he had distinctly refused to allow mining machinery to go into that country, inasmuch as it could be manufactured in Canada. That, he claimed, was not fair, as the dis-

tance from the eastern part of the Dominion prohibited them from purchasing Canadian mining machinery. He regarded it as the duty of the Government to foster their industries, and not attempt to crush them out by such a heavy taxation on mining machinery. He thought the financial policy of the country should be framed with a view of developing the resources of that country, and, therefore, he again called the attention of the Government to the desirability of allowing mining machinery to enter free. He would conclude by urging upon the Government to carry out the terms of their original agreement. He hoped that they would not do as the late Government had done, place in the Estimates, year after year, a vote of \$500,000 for railway construction, and never spend a dollar of it. He was quite satisfied British Columbia would have better consideration than she had been receiving for years past, as far as the tariff was concerned. British Columbia, as a matter of course, felt aggrieved, to a certain extent, but they were willing to assist the present Government in this matter, in order that they might be better able to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. He was happy to be able to state that, since the present Government had come into power, the value of real estate in British Columbia had increased 25 per cent., and he hoped that they, by a judicious administration of affairs, would so convince the people of British Columbia of their fitness to control the affairs of the Dominion, that the price of real estate would be sent up 25 per cent. more by acting honestly with the Province that has acted so nobly to the hon. the Premier and the people believed he would, with the assistance of the able statesmen he had in the Cabinet.

House adjourned at
 Forty minutes after
 Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 31st March, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MR. BUNSTER.

THE TARIFF RESOLUTIONS.

MR. CASGRAIN complained that the number of French copies of the tariff distributed was insufficient.

MR. LANGEVIN said the number printed already was much larger than the rules of the House allowed.

MR. HOLTON held that the document in question did not come under the rules of the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD promised that the matter should be attended to, and suggested that, if the House desired to have a larger edition of the tariff, his hon. friend the Minister of Finance having announced his intention to lay some amendments before the Committee of Ways and Means, it would be well if the new edition included the amendments.

MR. HOLTON: Hear, hear.

PACIFIC RAILWAY TENDERS.

QUESTION AND REMARKS.

MR. MACKENZIE asked the Minister of Public Works if all the tenders which had been received for the Pacific Railway were on the paper which had been submitted.

MR. TUPPER said he had directed that a list of all the tenders received should be laid on the table of the House, and he presumed they were all there. There were some informal tenders which were considered which were not included in this statement; but all those which came within the regulations of the Department—all that came within the notice—were laid upon the table.

MR. MACKENZIE: Were there none for the whole of the British Columbia section from Yale to Kamloops?

MR. TUPPER said that was another question altogether. He had never been asked to lay any tenders for that section on the table. The tenders brought down applied to the two contracts, copies of which he had laid on the table, and had no reference to any other portion of the line. He might state, however,—in fact he regretted to be obliged to state—that, after

all the time spent in publishing the advertisements over the whole world, not a single tender, in the terms of the advertisement, were received for the whole line. One was submitted that was quite unintelligible, and he had requested Mr. Fleming to put himself in communication with the party who sent it in, and that party was now here to explain it.

MR. MACKENZIE said his reasons for asking the question were pertinent. If there were tenders for the entire line it would be difficult to understand giving out the two tenders, unless by comparison with the tenders for the whole line they appeared to be the most favourable. The tenders for the whole line were asked upon the basis of 1874, which provided for the grant of a certain quantity of land for each mile, and a certain amount of money; and the tenderers were to name another sum, if any more were required than that, upon which interest at the rate of 4 per cent. would be given for a certain number of years. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had anticipated that some tenders would have been sent in on that basis, and it would be necessary to an intelligent discussion to know if such tenders were sent in.

MR. TUPPER said he should have pleasure in placing in the hands of the hon. gentleman the only tender received for the whole line, and he would admit that its character was such as to render it impracticable on its account to delay dealing with the other portions of the line.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Was that for the whole line, or only for the British Columbia section?

MR. TUPPER: It was for the whole line from Thunder Bay to the Pacific.

MR. ANGLIN: Will the hon. the Minister of Public Works state when he proposes to ask the House to approve of these contracts?

MR. TUPPER said the law required that these contracts should lie upon the table of the House for thirty days, if not previously formally approved of by resolution, and they were in a position to be moved against by any hon. member. But, if

they were not so moved against, at the end of thirty days they were considered to have received the approval of the House. It was not his intention to offer any formal resolution in relation to them.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 26) To authorise the Trustees of the Toronto Savings Bank to sell and convey to the Home Savings and Loan Company, Limited.—(Mr. Cameron, North Victoria.)

Bill (No. 63) To grant certain powers to La Société Permanente de Construction d'Iberville.—(Mr. Mousseau.)

Bill (No. 69) Further to amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, Limited.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

QUEBEC GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY INCORPORATION BILL.—[BILL 65.]

(Mr. Fortin.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. ANGLIN said this Bill should be passed by the Provincial Legislature of Quebec.

MR. FORTIN said the society did not confine its labours to the Province of Quebec, nor to the Dominion. It was already affiliated with seven of the most important societies in the world—the Geographical Society of New York, the Royal Geographical Society and the Geographical Societies of Paris, Bordeaux, Lyons, Bremen and St. Petersburg, and he was surprised that any member should say the work was only local.

MR. MACKENZIE said everyone would be willing to advance the interests of a geographical society, but it was not for the House to pass such a Bill as this, which enabled the corporation to recover all penalties due under any by-laws, and to impose penalties for certain violations of membership. This provision could not be proceeded with. If the society were organised in Quebec that would not

prevent its operating in any of the Provinces. If the Bill was proceeded with in its present shape, it would have to be introduced by resolution of the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not think the clause about penalties required the mover to proceed by resolution, though the clause itself might be introduced by resolution and afterwards incorporated in the Bill. The fact that it was called the Geographical Society of Quebec did not render it a Quebec institution, any more than the Bank of Ottawa was an Ontario institution. The question was as to the object. If it had a general action all over the Dominion it ought to have a Dominion character. He saw no objection to the Bill passing.

MR. MILLS said several similar Bills had been ruled out in former years. He thought there were powers sought in this Bill which should be sought in the Provincial Legislature.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the clauses which were said to be *ultra vires* might be left to the Private Bills Committee. He merely contended that, as the Society had a Dominion existence, and a Dominion object, and not a Provincial object, the incorporation itself was quite within the power of this House.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he would take this opportunity of calling the attention of the First Minister to the desirability of adopting the English system with respect to Private Bills, namely, that of having some efficient and responsible examiner, who was a lawyer. They could not expect the Minister of Justice to give attention to these Private Bills, which dealt with questions of an intricate character, and were sometimes of a constitutional nature. He was convinced that unless they adopted the plan of having examiners, they would have a constant succession of injurious Private Bills put on the Statute-book—more particularly if they allowed Private Bills to be introduced, as was being done, at an advanced stage of the Session. During the last nine or ten years a good many Private Bills had got on our Statute-book creating mischievous pre-

MR. MACKENZIE.

cedents, and which never would have occurred if they had had an examiner.

Bill read the second time.

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP WHARF LIGHT.

QUESTION.

MR. GRANDBOIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a light on the wharf at Rivière du Loup.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): The Government has not decided to place a light on the wharf at Rivière du Loup this season.

MONTREAL AND OTTAWA MAILS.

QUESTION.

MR. CHRISTIE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to forward two mails daily, each way, between Montreal and Ottawa, by the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, and if so, when.

MR. LANGEVIN: A mail leaves Ottawa at 9.10 a. m., carrying mails for all post-offices between Ottawa and Montreal every day except Sunday. Another train leaves Ottawa at 11.30 a. m. By this train a special bag is sent to Montreal and the points for all offices between Montreal and Quebec. We cannot, do more than that.

SALMON IN THE BARNABY RIVER, MIRAMICHI.

QUESTION.

MR. SNOWBALL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place salmon fry this year from the Miramichi Hatchery into the Barnaby River, Miramichi, to re-stock this stream that was at one time a salmon river.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): No schedule has as yet been made out as to where the salmon fry should be distributed this season. When that is done, Barnaby River will be considered with others.

CUSTOM HOUSE AT EMERSON, MANITOBA.

QUESTION.

MR. DUBUC enquired, Whether the Government intend to establish a Custom-house office at Emerson, in Manitoba.

MR. BOWELL: It is the intention of the Government to establish an office in that section of the country.

SETTLERS ON RAILWAY RESERVE LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

QUESTION.

MR. MCINNES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to give an assurance to all whom may settle on the Railway Reserve Lands in British Columbia that they will be allowed to purchase all lands occupied or improved by them at whatever price the Government may set on adjoining unoccupied or unimproved lands.

MR. TUPPER: When the lands reserved for railway purposes become the property of the Government, they will be prepared to consider the equitable claims of squatters, by allowing them to obtain possession at the price of the land before the improvement; or, if the lands are required for railway purposes, the Government would pay them the value of the improvements that have been made.

NEW BRUNSWICK DIVORCE COURT JUDGE.

QUESTION.

MR. GILLMOR enquired, Whether it is intended, in the Supplementary Estimates, to make any provision for the salary of the Judge of the Divorce Court in New Brunswick, and for the expenses of that Court.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): It is not the intention of the Government to make provision for the salary of the Judge of the Divorce Court, in New Brunswick, nor for the expenses of that Court.

ARISAIG PIER, NOVA SCOTIA.

QUESTION.

MR. MCISAAC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to

make provisions, this Session, for the improvement of the pier at Arisaig, Nova Scotia.

MR. TUPPER: It is not the intention of the Government to provide, this Session, for the improvement of the pier at Arisaig.

ALLOWANCES TO POSTMASTERS.

MOTION.

MR. DREW moved that the Report of the Postmaster-General for the year ending 30th June, 1876, which was presented to this House in the year 1877, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts. He said his reason for making this motion was that his attention had been called to these accounts by one of the postmasters, who said he did not receive the amount that was there charged against him. Wishing to know the facts of the case, he wrote to him, asking for the particulars, and received the following reply:—

“POST OFFICE,
February 25th, 1879.

“DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 24th inst, I beg to say I received, for year ending 30th June, 1876:

| | |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Salary | \$576 00 |
| Forwarding allowance..... | 80 00 |
| Rent, fire and light.. .. | 80 00 |

\$736 00

not \$920, as charged. I will be happy to give you all the information I can in each of the offices mentioned. In the list, the salary, forward allowance, &c., are all one-fifth too much.”

It was for the purpose of enquiring into the matter that he asked it should be referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he thought it would have been better if the hon. gentleman had gone to the Department for the information, without taking so much trouble as this motion entailed. He had no doubt the facts, when disclosed, would show that the Department had acted perfectly right.

MR. LANGEVIN said he knew nothing about the facts of the case. He supposed there could be no objection to its reference to the Committee on Public

Accounts. All facilities would be given to enable the particulars to be ascertained.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BUILDINGS
ON THE METAPEDIA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. ROBITAILLE moved for a return of all papers, correspondence and Orders in Council, in reference to the sale of certain buildings and out-buildings on the bank of the Metapedia River, on the Intercolonial Railway line, built for the purposes of the railway, occupied as dwellings by officers of the road, and disposed of by private sale; also, the cost of such dwellings and land attached thereto; the amount sold for, and the estimated cost of new dwellings to replace the same. He said that, at the time of the building of the Intercolonial Railway, it was found necessary to erect houses at different points for the use of the engineers who were superintending that road. One of these houses was built at Assametuagan, on the Metapedia River. This building had 40 feet frontage, by 26 in depth, contained four rooms down stairs, plastered and papered; four rooms up stairs also papered; a kitchen and servants' rooms back of the house. There was a stable with three stalls, and a carriage shed, with hay-loft overhead. The contract price for the building was \$350, but it was found necessary to improve the building, and the Government paid \$1,000 to the contractor. There was a barn that cost \$100 besides; land, \$200; fencing, \$100; making, in all, \$1,400. In addition to this, there was the work of the axemen working for the engineers, and who were employed in finishing the building when they could not work upon the line. Therefore, he would not be wrong in saying that the house cost not less than \$1,600. They found that, about two years ago, Mr. Brydges, the manager of Government Railways, thought proper to sell, by private sale to a Montreal gentleman, the whole of this property for the sum of \$300. There was another building, which was erected at the same time, at the mouth of the Meta-

Mr. LANGEVIN.

pedia River, about 200 yards from the Metapedia Railway Station. It had been used by the engineer superintending the construction of that part of the road. This building had 40 feet frontage, and was 26 feet deep, with double windows and Venetian blinds. It had a wing attached 50 feet long and 15 feet wide. The division on the first flat was as follows:—Drawing-room, 19 feet by 15 feet, with a shelved pantry behind, 6 feet by 15; a lobby 8 feet wide; a well-finished staircase, and cupboard underneath; west of the lobby were two rooms, 15 by 13, all well lighted; two kitchens, 14 feet by 14 feet; water-tap and sink; upstairs they found six bedrooms, 12 feet by 12 feet, well plastered and finely papered; back of the kitchens a roomy carriage-shed, stable with 3 stalls, over which was a commodious hay-loft; the stable had also a water-tap. In the grass plot in front of the carriage entrance was a fountain jet 20 feet in height, out-houses, woodshed, etc.; piggery, with a bay and straw loft overhead, the whole enclosed in a neat picket fence, which also encircled the garden. The whole piece of ground covered nearly one acre. There were also cellars attached to the property, which must have cost more than \$3,000. They found that Mr. Brydges sold this property to the same Montreal gentleman for the sum of \$600. The house was a very comfortable one, and he believed it was the intention to have it placed at the disposal of His Excellency during the fishing season. Any one might be glad to pay \$3,000 for it. It might be argued that the property was not wanted for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway, but he maintained that it was. One of the roadmasters had occupied, and was now occupying the house, and was told that he would be removed to some other place. The house was required for the use of the station-master, and he was satisfied it would be impossible to have such an establishment erected in such a locality for less than \$4,000 or \$5,000; this would be proved shortly, because the Government would have to build a house to replace this one, for the station-master. He would not have said anything about the sale of these properties by an employé of the Government, beyond asking for the cancellation of such sales; but, on look-

ing at the paper, he saw the late Government, on the 7th October last, on the eve of their resignation, thought proper to pass an Order in Council ratifying the sale of these properties. In view of that, he felt it his duty to bring the matter before the House and the country, as he looked upon it as an infamous transaction.

MR. TUPPER said there was no objection to bringing down the papers and to furnishing the information required. As the hon. member had introduced his motion by some very severe strictures, it was but right to say that the buildings were not constructed by the Government, but were constructed by the contractors when they were engaged in the construction of the work. They, subsequently, when the road came to be operated, fell into the hands of the Government, and Mr. Brydges stated that, in his judgment, the buildings were not required, and offers being made by private parties for their purchase, that had been reported to the Government, and with their sanction the sale was made.

MR. MACKENZIE said the explanation was right, with the exception that the sales were made before they were reported to the Government. He did not think it just, when the sales were made apparently with the sanction of the Government, to refuse their sanction.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT LANDS AT PRESQU'ISLE.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

MR. KEELER moved for copies of Orders in Council, reports of Ministers, correspondence, instructions to surveyor, reports of surveys, valuation of improvements, and all other papers and documents relating to the last survey and proposed sale or free grant of the lands upon Presqu'Isle Peninsula and High Bluff, in the East Riding of the county of Northumberland, in the year 1878, previous to the Dominion elections. He said this was another of the numerous instances wherein the honourable "party of purity" had used the Government money and prostituted their positions to promote their political objects.

In this case his (Mr. Keeler's) opponent in the late elections had gone to the occupants of the lands owned by the Crown, and had told them that he would induce the then Government of gentlemen opposite to grant the lands at the low price of five dollars an acre, with a private intimation that of course they would be good and vote the correct way at the election, but the poor men were only promised, they did not get their patents. Now he (Mr. Keeler) had tried his utmost, when he was a member of this House in 1867, and subsequently, to obtain from the Government of that time the grant of these lands to the squatters or occupants, but had been positively assured that the Dominion Government had no power whatever to sell or convey the lands, as they were granted by an Order in Council of the Ontario Government to the Dominion solely for lighthouse and harbour purposes, and that the only way was to lease the lands to the squatters. But Mr. Biggar, in his desire to get the votes from the men, who were mostly Conservatives, took the method stated to effect his purpose, and the late Government had sent a surveyor, at an expense to the country of \$400 or \$500, to carry on the survey, just before the elections came off, in order to deceive the poor men and get their votes, and this waste of money for a survey which had been previously done by the same surveyor only a few years before. He brought up this matter for the purpose of knowing how much of the people's money had been squandered for electioneering in his Riding by the party of purity.

Motion agreed to.

MR. KEELER moved for copies of instructions to solicitors under which proceedings in Chancery were instituted, a short time before the last general elections, by the Hon. Rodolphe Laflamme, as Her Majesty's Attorney-General, against William Mason, and several others, for trespass upon lands of the Crown upon Presqu'Isle Peninsula, in the East Riding of the county of Northumberland; also, for copies of all letters between the late member for that Riding and any of the late Ministers under which said proceedings were initiated

and subsequently suspended. He said this motion, like the last one, he had brought forward to show to the country the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite acted to influence votes during the last elections to this House. Here they found proceedings in Chancery instituted by a lawyer in Pictou, and a friend of that pure party, against six or eight electors, who lived upon the lands of the Government at Presqu'Isle Peninsula, for trespass in cutting a few poor rotten trees, not worth drawing away, the trespassers being in that way frightened to vote for the Grit candidate, or be let in for a great bill of Chancery costs, which was no small terror to poor men who were possessed of limited means. It was perfectly plain that these suits were for the one object only, that of coercing these poor men to vote for the Government candidate, and he (Mr. Keeler) had seen letters from the Department of Marine and Fisheries here, and from Mr. Biggar also, exposing the whole transaction. The writs were issued and served upon the so-called trespassers, and, when it was thought they were sufficiently frightened to come to terms and agree to do as they were required in the voting business, Mr. Biggar happened to come that way in his buggy, and in his kind fatherly care over the oppressed poor men, undertook to write to the Government, and have the awful Chancery suits stopped, and, to make the poor men sure who saved them, left the letters which passed between himself and the officials at Ottawa, with one of them, who very wickedly handed them to him (Mr. Keeler). He hoped the present Government would see that these suits were not proceeded with further, as he was certain they were initiated solely for base party purposes, and at a large waste of public money, and for corruption of the worst sort.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said those interested in the navigation of the lake had complained of those people cutting standing timber, which was useful to ships. It was necessary to resort to extreme measures to deter them from cutting this timber, and these suits were instituted a year or two before the elections. On the people undertaking not to trespass again, the suits were dropped.

Motion agreed to.

MR. KEELER.

TELEGRAPH LINE BETWEEN SELKIRK AND BATTLEFORD.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. SCHULTZ moved for copies of all contracts for the maintenance of the telegraph line between Selkirk and Battleford; the number of days during the past current year that through messages could be transmitted; the amount deducted from the pay of the contractors, together with all correspondence between the said contractors and the Government.

Motion agreed to.

MOLESWORTH POSTMASTERSHIP.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE AND REPORTS.

MR. HESSON moved for copies of all correspondence and reports relating to the dismissal, by the late Government, of one Samuel Lougheed, postmaster at Molesworth, and the appointment of one George Brown. He explained that, from information in his possession, he had learned that Mr. Lougheed had been guilty of no offence meriting a dismissal, and he had learned also that a petition, signed by something like three hundred people who had been served by that post-office, was now in possession of the Department, asking that he be retained. He desired to know the reasons of Mr. Lougheed's dismissal.

Motion agreed to.

DAMAGES TO LOCK 21, WELLAND CANAL.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

MR. McCALLUM moved for copies of all reports, letters or correspondence by the Superintendent, Welland Canal, as to the damages to lock No. 21 on the Welland Canal, in the year 1874, by the schooner *Louise*; also copy of bond given by Mathew and John Battle, to secure the payment of said damages; also, statement giving the date of payment of said bond, if paid, and copies of all letters by Mr. John Battle to the Government, or any of the Departments, about the payment of bond given for said damages.

Motion agreed to.

PACIFIC RAILWAY CONNECTION WITH
PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. PLUMB moved for copies of all papers, correspondence and documents, relative to a proposed railway connection between Prince Arthur's Landing and the line of the Pacific Railway, at or near the town plot of Fort William, and the proposed crossing of Government lands for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

PACIFIC RAILWAY TERMINUS ON
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER.

Mr. PLUMB moved for copies of all reports, instructions, correspondence and documents relative to the dredging of the Kaministiquia River, and the practicability of forming a harbour accessible to the larger classes of lake shipping, at the point selected as the Pacific Railway terminus on that river.

Mr. DAWSON, in seconding the motion, said that it would be very interesting to have the opinions of the engineers in reference to the dredging of the Kaministiquia. No branch of engineering had, of late years, attracted more attention than that of the formation of harbours at the mouths of rivers. Many rivers were obstructed at their entrance by bars of a more or less formidable character, and engineers generally spoke of them as drift-bars or delta-bars. The latter were very difficult to deal with, and the bar at the mouth of the Kaministiquia was a delta bar of the most pronounced description. In front of the three mouths of the Kaministiquia extended an immense bar, which had been formed by the sediment brought down by the river. Before the proper method of dealing with such bars was understood, vast sums had been expended in futile attempts to dredge channels through them. Lake Superior was a tideless sea, and there were tideless seas in Europe, where bars, like that of the Kaministiquia, had been experimented upon. The Rhone which fell into the Gulf of Lyons was a case in point. It was not unlike the Kaministiquia, for it had three mouths, with an immense delta-bar in front of them. The

depth across this bar in the main channel of the river was originally seven feet. The French Government expended a million of dollars in dredging it with the result of diminishing the depth to five feet. They then made a canal at some distance from the bar, which joined the river above the delta, and in this way they obtained a navigable channel. The result would be the same at the Kaministiquia. On the present system, they could not increase the general depth, which was no greater now than it was before the dredging was commenced, except on the immediate bar at the lake, through which a small channel had been cut, but it filled up and had to be dredged anew every year. Five years of dredging had resulted in nothing, and, if it were continued, the result would be the same five years hence. He (Mr. Dawson) had written a report eleven years ago, long before railroads were heard of in that quarter; that report was printed, and on reference to it, it would be seen that he had said that the Kaministiquia might be made accessible to small vessels at a moderate outlay, but not to large vessels. Time had shown that he was correct. The unusual high water of Lake Superior, two years ago, had enabled the engineers to report that the depth had been increased, but the water was now back to its normal level, and it was found that in the general depth there was no increase. On the present system of dredging, no greater depth could be obtained, except at an enormous outlay—such an outlay as the country would not sanction. The money so far expended on the work was thrown away—literally wasted—and he (Mr. Dawson) ventured to say that, when the returns came down, it would be found that no engineer had recommended the scheme. He then referred to drift bars, instancing the Sulina mouth of the Danube, and other cases, in which they had been overcome by means of jetties.

Mr. PLUMB said the information given by the hon. member for Algoma on this subject was most valuable. It was his (Mr. Plumb's) desire to get from the Government whatever might throw light on the selection, as the site of one of the most important harbours in the

country, at the present terminus of the Pacific Railway, of the Kaministiquia River, and everything connected with the navigation of that river, with the usefulness of its harbour, as the best point for that terminus had been a question. He had the honour to ask, last year, for certain papers in reference to that subject, but they were not produced. He was told that part of them had been brought down in the Public Accounts Committee, and that no others would be brought down, if he understood the Minister of the day correctly. He (Mr. Plumb) thought, however, that he would take the earliest opportunity of asking the present Government to bring down whatever information was in their power, because he had seen the most conflicting testimony in respect to the feasibility of constructing a harbour at the Kaministiquia River. He knew something of that stream and harbour, and had seen the course of its winds and currents, and knew that the current of the river was constantly bringing down deposits that were extending a delta from the mouth of the river, and that the prevailing winds were in the direction stated by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). He had observed with some surprise, that the hon. the ex-Premier had said in another place that his first intention was to place the terminus at Point de Mueron, which was further up the Kaministiquia than the one selected. Altogether, having seen the conflict of testimony of the masters of vessels on this subject, he desired to know something further about that river and get it in an authentic form. He noticed that the masters of vessels who asserted it was of great convenience to work two or three miles up the Kaministiquia, in order to find a point that was deep enough for loading or unloading at, that those who were the most precise in giving information in favour of that scheme, and who made the strongest certificates in regard to its advantages, were mostly commanders of vessels in the employ of the gentlemen who held contracts for carrying Government freight up to that point. He considered them somewhat interested witnesses, and this consideration led him to ask for the information sought by this motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he did not think it necessary that he should say

Mr. PLUMB.

much on the motion. He did not know there was any formal report recommending any particular mode of dredging the Kaministiquia River; nor did he know that the purely scientific question dealt with by the hon. member for Algoma had been dealt with specifically by any engineer. All he knew was that Mr. Fleming had recommended the point selected as the best for the railway terminus, and he could not conceive of his recommending it without recommending the improvement of the navigation necessary to reach that terminus. Mr. Kingsford recommended, verbally, very strongly, the Kaministiquia in preference to Prince Arthur's Landing. He (Mr. Mackenzie) knew also that he reported to himself, specifically, that to make a harbour suitable at Prince Arthur's Landing would cost between \$400,000 and \$500,000, to obtain the same accommodation as given at Goderich Harbour for example. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had no doubt that the right point had been selected, and that the dredging at the pier could be accomplished, and he could not conceive the member for Algoma right in stating there was no greater depth of water in the river than before the dredging commenced. He was not able to say positively that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dawson) was wrong, because, personally, he knew nothing of the matter; but he was tolerably certain the hon. member was incorrect. He (Mr. Mackenzie) could not conceive how the dredged locality could be all filled up already. If so, it was extraordinary. The first dredging was done by the Ontario Government which spent \$12,000 there, before that point was selected for the railroad, showing that they entertained the opinion that that was the right place for the harbour. As to the comparative merits of the two places, he declined to discuss them at that moment, further than to say that it was quite absurd to speak of Prince Arthur's Landing as a harbour at all. With its long, shelving beach, one had to go a long way to reach deep water. It was open not only 15 miles directly out to the lake, due south, but beyond to Isle Royale. The wind coming from that direction had, he believed, the full sweep of the lake for 40 miles. The distance was a great deal more than 15 miles. The bay itself

was about 15 miles in one direction, by about 22 in another, and a sheet of water of that size could scarcely be called, with any reason, a harbour. If a harbour at all, it was a harbour all over, and he knew that vessels had been obliged to leave the wharves at Prince Arthur's Landing, when at anchor, or go to sea to avoid the winds. He had been told that occasionally the sea swept entirely over the wharves, which made it utterly impossible, without a large basin there, for vessels to obtain shelter. In deciding upon the terminus of the Pacific Railway, they had two things to consider: In the first place, the best point for the harbour, which was considered the Kaministiquia; that was considered the best point by the Engineer, and he agreed with him, because it would be very easy to construct the wharves there, and there was a sufficient depth of water in the river, after passing the pier, for any vessels that could navigate the lakes. In the next place they saved a few miles of railway, which would have been a small consideration, however, could they have, at the cost of a few miles, reached a better harbour; but it was not the opinion of the Engineer that that could be done, other professional people coinciding with him. The hon. member for Niagara chose to state that the persons approving of the terminus did so because they were captains of the vessels engaged by the contractor with the Government. He (Mr. Mackenzie) did not think it was fair to speak of gentlemen not face to face with one in that manner. He thought people might fairly assume that the captain of any vessel summoned to give his evidence would give it quite as truly as the hon. member for Niagara. If he referred to the captains of the Beatty line of steamships, two had given evidence against the terminus, and one in favour of it. He had never spoken with any of them before they gave their evidence, and to only two of them afterwards. He could not conceive it possible that any honest sailor would be influenced by such motives as the member for Niagara had ascribed to those gentlemen.

Mr. PLUMB said he had merely noticed the fact of a conflict of testimony, in respect to the feasibility of making a proper harbour at the Kaministiquia,

observing that captains of vessels had given contradictory evidence, and the late Premier had acknowledged as much in his reply. He (Mr. Plumb) did not say upon whose lines of vessels those captains were employed; but that captains of vessels carrying the Government freight had approved of the terminus selected, and he repeated it. He was also somewhat surprised to hear the late Premier state what he heard him state before, with great astonishment, namely, that the Chief Engineer had selected the Fort William town plot as the terminus. The evidence of the Chief Engineer, before the Senate Committee, was directly contradictory of the late Premier; it was this: being asked—Who selected the terminus on the Kaministiquia River? He replied—I selected it in consultation with the Government. But who selected the town plot at Fort William, as the terminus? was the next query, to which he answered—The Government selected it. I did not. He added: The Government having selected it, he laid down the line of road to be occupied; but, if he remembered right, took the greater part of the frontage of the town plot at Fort William. He (Mr. Plumb) knew nothing of the relative merits of the two places—Fort William and Prince Arthur's Landing, nor had he chosen to take any part in the controversy as to the merits of the rival localities.

Mr. MACDONNELL said he rose to a point of order. The hon. gentleman was speaking too often on the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. gentleman had asked, and been granted, the leave of the House.

Mr. PLUMB said that he would repeat that it was most unfortunate that the present site of the harbour and terminus was selected, when lands could have been bought near the town and river, equally convenient, for a far less sum. There would have been fewer proprietors to deal with, and less cost incurred, if the Government had made another selection. It was most unfortunate that their decision to go to the Kaministiquia was known before they secured the required lands, as otherwise they could have obtained the land want-

ed at the Kaministiquia for one-tenth to one-twentieth of what it cost when the choice became known.

MR. MACKENZIE said he rose to a point of order. The notice of the present motion conveyed no intimation that the hon. gentleman intended to discuss the terminus of the Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Plumb) had prepared himself with a tissue of the old misstatements on this subject, and it was quite out of the question that the motion should be distorted for the purpose of the hon. gentleman now apparent.

MR. PLUMB said he did not prepare himself for a speech of this kind, but the remarks of the hon. gentleman himself had forced him to reply, and he could not pass unchallenged the statements of the hon. member (Mr. Mackenzie), which, on another occasion, he had called in question, when he (Mr. Plumb) was not treated with that courtesy and civility which he had a right to claim from that gentleman, as the head of the late Government. He had merely risen to correct the statement that he had heard before, and to regret the assertion of the hon. gentleman, that he had made or used a tissue of misstatements. He had used no statements of which he could not make proof, and he challenged the hon. gentleman to controvert any of them.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING HARBOUR.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. PLUMB moved for copies of all reports, instructions and documents in reference to the Harbour of Prince Arthur's Landing, the pulling down of the Government buildings, and the leasing of the Government lands at that place.

MR. DAWSON, in seconding the motion of the hon. member for Niagara, said that he did not mean or intend in any way to enter into a discussion of the land purchases on the Kaministiquia. He would confine himself to the question of the harbour, and he would repeat his belief that the present system

MR. PLUMB.

of dredging the Kaministiquia would never produce a harbour at that place. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had been deceived if he had been led to suppose that a few miles had been saved by fixing the terminus on the Kaministiquia. The first station on the railroad, known as Murillo Station, was as near to Prince Arthur's Landing as it was to the terminus on the Kaministiquia, and the ground to be gone over was much the same in both cases. He had been deceived, also, as to the dimensions of Thunder Bay and the character of the harbour at Prince Arthur. The wind had nowhere a sweep of forty miles, and the widest part of the bay was less than fifteen miles. Prince Arthur's Harbour was in a sheltered bay, within the greater bay, but the whole bay was like a sheltered inland lake. No surge could come into it from the outside lake. It was eleven miles wide at its entrance, and in this entrance was Pic Island, five miles across, with numerous other islands to the west, completely locking in the bay. It was, as he (Mr. Dawson) had said, in every respect like an inland lake of the same dimensions, free from all surge, except what could arise within the limited area of the bay itself. The best proof that the harbour was a safe one was the fact that, in the last eight years, there were over seventeen hundred arrivals, and as many departures of large vessels, without a single accident occurring to any of them. Large vessels could not enter the Kaministiquia with loads, and it would be difficult to convert it into a harbour for the larger class of vessels navigating the great lakes. Some of these vessels were 240 feet in length of keel, and such vessels, loaded to a depth of ten feet from stem to stern, could nowhere turn in the Kaministiquia; but a greater depth than ten feet would be required, for the improvements now being made about Sault Ste. Marie, when the great new lock at that place was completed, would be such as to admit of the use of vessels drawing thirteen or fourteen feet, or even more. Then the length of the season of navigation was a very important matter. The first hard frost closed the Kaministiquia, while the bay was open all through November and December—and sometimes

nearly all winter. He (Mr. Dawson) was not sure but that Lake Superior could be navigated by properly constructed steamers, nearly all winter. At all events, a month or six weeks of open water in the fall was a matter of very great consequence, more especially in view of the fact that it was in the fall that the harvests of the North-West would have to be carried out. Last fall a vessel with freight for the Kaminitiquia was obliged to unload at Prince Arthur, because the Kaminitiquia was solid with ice. As to the opinions of the lake captains, they were printed, and it would be found that those having the greatest experience, those who commanded the most valuable vessels, those, in fact, who had the greatest weight of responsibility on their shoulders, were all in favour of Prince Arthur's Landing. They believed it to be a better and more accessible harbour than ever could be formed on the Kaminitiquia. He (Mr. Dawson) was far from saying that a harbour could not be formed at the Kaminitiquia, but he maintained that the object could not be attained by the present system of dredging. As to the cost of forming a harbour at Prince Arthur, it would not be extraordinary. The former Premier had been misled, and he (Mr. Dawson) would read a passage from a printed report of two of his engineers, to show that Thunder Bay had been incorrectly represented as being nineteen miles wide, while, in order the better to condemn the harbour, the prevailing direction of the winds—which was north-west in these latitudes—was changed to south-east. He concluded by reading an extract from Mr. Kingsford's report.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING AND THE KAMINISTQUIA.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. PLUMB moved for copy of returns of numbers, tonnage and weight of general cargo of vessels that have entered and cleared from Prince Arthur's Landing and the Kaminitiquia, respectively, during the season of 1878.

Motion agreed to.

POSTMASTERS IN MONTMAGNY.

MOTIONS FOR COMPLAINTS.

MR. LANDRY moved for copies of a complaint lodged on the 21st August, 1875, by Achille Talbot, Esq., late Deputy Post Office Inspector, against certain postmasters in the county of Montmagny; and also, copies of all correspondence, evidence and Orders in Council, which, following upon, and as a consequence of the above-mentioned complaint or report led to the dismissal of Mr. Gatien Lachaine, *alias* Jolicœur, from the position of postmaster at Crane Island, in the county of Montmagny; with all documents whatsoever relating to the said dismissal, and to the appointment of Mr. Vezina in the place of Mr. Gatien Lachaine. He said that, after the Local elections in 1875, the Liberal Government, in order to recompense a political friend, had appointed Mr. Achille Talbot as Deputy Post Office Inspector, and this individual, one day, took into his head to lay a complaint against the postmaster of St. Thomas, in the county of Montmagny, because a certain document he had deposited in that post-office had not, as he pretended, reached its destination within a reasonable time. The letter was addressed to Isle aux Grues, at which place Mr. Lachaine was postmaster. Mr. Talbot proceeded to Isle aux Grues and asked to see the document, but the girl who was temporarily in charge refused to give it up to him. Mr. Talbot then entered complaints against Mr. Lachaine and Mr. Vezina, postmaster at St. Thomas. Mr. Lachaine was never notified of any complaint against him, and was unjustly discharged.

Motion agreed to.

MR. LANDRY moved for copies, 1. Of a report made on the 21st August, 1875, by Achille Talbot, Esquire, late Deputy Inspector of Post Offices, against Stanislas Vallée, Esquire, then postmaster at Montmagny; 2. Of the minutes of the enquiry held in the case of the said Stanislas Vallée, Esquire, on the facts mentioned in the said report of the 21st August, 1875, which said enquiry was held *ex parte* by the said Achille Talbot; 3. Of the minutes of the counter enquiry ordered by W. Sheppard, Esquire, Post Office Inspector, as to the method

pursued by the said Achille Talbot in conducting the aforesaid enquiry; 4. Of all complaints subsequently, to wit in 1877, laid against the said Stanislas Vallée, Esquire, when postmaster at Montmagny; 5. Of the minutes of the enquiry held in consequence of the said last mentioned complaints; 6. Of all correspondence on the subject of the said enquiries; of all Orders in Council passed in consequence of such enquiries ordering the dismissal of the said Stanislas Vallée, or calling upon him to resign; 7. Of all petitions filed in the Post Office Department, praying that such dismissals should not be carried out, or that Mr. Vallée should be reinstated in his position; and 8. Of all documents whatsoever, correspondence, telegrams reports, etc., relating to the said dismissal, and to the appointment of Mr. Nazaire Bernatchez, of Montmagny.

Motion agreed to.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SAUGÉEN RIVER LIGHTHOUSE.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. GILLIES moved for copies of all correspondence relative to the erection of a lighthouse at the mouth of Saugéen River, for the protection of the fishing fleet and other craft that largely frequent the river in question. He said that a very considerable number of fishing boats, as well as other craft, frequented this river. It was very dangerous at certain seasons of the year, especially at the commencement of navigation and in the fall months. About a year ago, this was brought to his notice by the fishermen and others interested in the safety of that place, and, upon the first opportunity, he had brought it before the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That gentleman, after consideration, gave him to understand that the light would be erected; and he went away from this place, last year, under that impression. It appeared that afterwards some correspondence took place between the reeve of the village of Southampton and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. A misunderstanding arose

MR. LANDRY.

out of that correspondence, and he (Mr. Gillies) again communicated with the Minister of Marine, and told him the reeve was mistaken in what he stated. He had no doubt that, had the Government of that day remained in power, the lighthouse would have been erected; and he had no doubt the present Government would also proceed with the work, inasmuch as he did not suppose the Government would have any other desire than to do that which the interests of the country demanded.

MR. BOWELL said he did not know there was any objection to the papers being brought down. He could only say the hon. gentleman must have been well-grounded in his faith if he fancied the late Government would have built this lighthouse last fall, had they remained in power. It would have had to be a very small lighthouse, if it could have been done since the accession of the present Government. He had no doubt the present Minister of Public Works would, if it was in the interests of navigation, do what was necessary.

MR. GILLIES said it was not his impression that the erection would be proceeded with last fall. He was given to understand that it would be proceeded with at the earliest possible date. Seeing there was no mention made of it in the Estimates, he felt it to be his duty to bring the matter up, so that the Government might include it in the Supplementary Estimates.

Motion agreed to.

COAL OIL SUPPLY TO ST. LAWRENCE LIGHTHOUSES.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE AND TENDERS.

MR. METHOT moved for copies of all correspondence, documents and tenders in relation to the furnishing of coal oil or other oils for the lighthouses on the River St. Lawrence, in the Province of Québec, and in the Gulf, since 1873; also, copies of all contracts, bargains or agreements with the parties now furnishing the same, showing their names, the amount of their tenders, the date and

duration of their contracts, and the reasons why such contracts were awarded to them.

Motion agreed to.

OLD IRON RAILS BELONGING TO GOVERNMENT.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier), in the absence of Mr. VALLEE, moved for a statement showing the quantity of old iron rails the Government now has at its disposal; 2nd. The names of the companies to which quantities of old rails have been lent, and the conditions upon which such loans were made; 3rd. Where the rails at the disposal of the Government now are.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE EXPENDITURE.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. COLBY, in the absence of Mr. STEPHENSON, moved for returns of all expenditure during the years 1876, 1877 and 1878 on account of the North-West Mounted Police; together with a detailed statement of moneys paid to J. G. Baker & Co., of Fort Benton, Montana Territory, United States, and for what said moneys were paid.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA AT THE CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. COLBY, in the absence of Mr. STEPHENSON, moved for returns showing the names, date of appointment of all persons appointed by the Dominion Government as Commissioners, Secretaries, or otherwise, in connection with the Canadian Exhibit at the Centennial Exhibition, held in the city of Philadelphia, U.S., in the year 1876, together with a detailed statement of moneys paid for salary of each; also, a statement in detail of all money paid for expense of living, travelling, or otherwise, and time of service of each.

Motion agreed to.

REMOVAL OF STEEL RAILS FROM VANCOUVER ISLAND.

MOTION.

MR. BUNSTER moved that the return to the Order of the House, for copies of all letters of instructions, relative to the removal of steel rails from Nanaimo and Esquimalt to Frazer River, British Columbia, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts. He said that this motion was of a little more importance than hon. gentlemen might think, inasmuch as it involved considerable outlay to the Dominion. The removal of these rails was ordered some time last June, for the purpose of influencing the coming elections. The *ruse*, however, was not attended with the anticipated success, and the people of Victoria rebuked the origination of it by the election of the right hon. leader of the Government at the head of the poll. That election showed the opinion the people of British Columbia entertained of the party who ordered the removal of the rails. It must have cost some \$30,000 to remove these rails; some still remained where they were originally laid. He called attention to the fact that the line of railway was not yet located, and this was due to the vacillating policy of hon. gentlemen, in a desire to propitiate both parties. It was a question of considerable importance where those rails were. They had been shipped for a political purpose, and no beneficial result could follow. He would consider himself derelict in his duty to his Province, derelict in his duty to the Parliament of the Dominion, if he did not make this enquiry, in order to show how uselessly these large sums had been expended. It would take a great deal more to replace these rails than it had to remove them, because where they were they were perfectly useless to British Columbia and to the Dominion.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Province was bought.

MR. BUNSTER said that, to the credit of the Province, it had not been bought, but it had been deceived by the late Administration. It was never even in the market, any further than to maintain its relationship with Canada. This large amount of money had been ex-

pended for political purposes, and reports on the subject had been suppressed. Mr. Marcus Smith's report was not brought down in the shape it ought to have been, to do justice to the Province, to give precise information of its resources, in return for the large sums of money squandered in making useless surveys for political purposes. As a proof of that, they had only to refer to the instructions given to Mr. Edgar in 1874, solely with the object of breaking the contract with British Columbia. In moving for these returns, he would beg to have them referred to the Public Accounts Committee. In the Public Accounts Committee he would go further into detail, and bring out such a statement as would make some of the hon. gentlemen of this House feel ashamed of themselves.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS AND DISMISSALS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

MR. MUTTART moved that Sessional Paper No. 73 (not printed), 1875, respecting dismissals from and appointments to, the Civil Service in Prince Edward Island, be laid on the table of this House.

Motion agreed to.

MR. MUTTART moved for copies of all papers relating to the causes assigned for the dismissal of officials from the Civil Service in Prince Edward Island, in 1873 and 1874.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY — HENRY CLARKE'S CLAIM.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. MCKAY moved for copies of all correspondence, petitions and reports between Henry Clarke, Esq., of Truro, or the Department of Public Works, or the officers of the Intercolonial Railway, in reference to his claim for property destroyed by the officers of the Intercolonial Railway.

Motion agreed to.

MR. BUNSTER.

RIDEAU CANAL DAMAGES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. McRORY moved for a return of all claims for damages, caused by waters dammed back for the purposes of the Rideau Canal since 1st January, 1872; and for all papers and reports connected therewith, and showing the manner in which such claims have been disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

LEGAL SERVICES RENDERED TO GOV- ERNMENT.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. COLBY, in the absence of Mr. STEPHENSON, moved for a return of all fees paid by the Government of Canada to, and the names of, all counsel, solicitors or attorneys that have been employed by the Dominion Government, or by any Department or head of Department of said Government, and a statement of all fees paid to such persons by the Government or received by them for services in connection with the business of the Government of Canada, between the 5th November, 1873, and the 10th October, 1878; and also, a return of the amount of the fees claimed by the said counsel, solicitors or attorneys during the said period.

Motion agreed to.

OAK CONTRACTS FOR WELLAND AND ST. LAWRENCE CANALS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. COLBY, in the absence of Mr. STEPHENSON moved for returns of all correspondence in possession of the Government from Messrs. Booth and Company, and others, with reference to supplying oak for the construction of lock gates on the new line of the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals; any contract entered into with said firm for said oak; all statements of modifications of said contract, if any were made; together with all official information in possession of the Government with reference to the remission of duties on oak imported into Canada since 1874.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERS' SALARIES AND MEMBERS' INDEMNITIES.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. JACKSON moved for a statement showing the salary attached to the office of an Executive or Privy Councillor in the year 1841; the date when any subsequent alteration of such salary was made, the amount thereof and the authority for such alteration; also, a statement of the indemnity paid to members of both Houses of the Legislature, as Sessional allowance or otherwise, and the amount per mile for travelling expenses in the year 1841; the dates of any subsequent alterations in the rate of such indemnity, the amount thereof, and the authority under which the same was made; said statements to cover the period from 1841 to 1878, inclusive. He said that prudence in the conduct of business was one of the conditions of success. A merchant, especially if prudent, would frequently enquire into his books and stock to ascertain what business he was doing; and, if he found he was encroaching on his capital, he would, in order to restore the equilibrium, conduct his business with greater caution, extend it in certain directions, bringing to bear on it his intelligence and experience, and lop off all unnecessary expenditure, keep his expenditure within his income, and in pursuing that common-sense course, would eventually succeed in business. Instead of dissipating his capital, he would increase in wealth, and realise the advantages of his prudence. A prudent statesman would apply the same common-sense rule in the management of public affairs. There was no very great difference between the means by which the success was attained in the one, and that by which it was attained in the other instance. Political economy was only a larger application of the principles of domestic economy, and the common sense rules applicable in the management of domestic and commercial pursuits were the same as those which applied, to obtain successful results, to statesmanship. There was no great difficulty in ascertaining whether a country was in a solvent condition, or whether it was retrograding. It was exported more than we imported,

to the extent of the difference, we were increasing in wealth. At the present time, above all others, it was incumbent upon the Administration to pay particular attention to the condition of public affairs, and he believed that, at this moment, they presented a very serious aspect. The difficulties of Confederation were upon us. The quasi-autonomy that was given to the Provinces involved large expense, and various legislative and corporate bodies had borrowed money largely on credit, as well as the Dominion Government, which made in the aggregate a very large indebtedness against this country. Although the affairs of the Dominion were being well managed, did we not also find that our facilities for borrowing money were too extensively availed of? If they examined the Public Accounts, they would find that the money had been freely borrowed, but that it had not, in all instances, been judiciously expended. An instance of recent occurrence came out in the Committee of Public Accounts two or three days ago. A question was asked a witness, Mr. Smith, one of the chief engineers, in reference to some work that had been done between Fort William and Great Shebandowan—What was the original estimate of Section 14? The answer was that the original estimate was \$42,500. The amount expended was \$647,175; to that was to be added \$75,000, estimated to complete the work on that contract, making a total of \$722,175. Further on, the following question was asked—

MR. OLIVER rose to a question of order. The hon. gentleman was reading from an investigation which was now pending before the Public Accounts Committee, and that investigation had not been finished or reported to this House.

MR. JACKSON said the reports of the investigation were common property. He was not bringing an accusation against anybody, but he was merely showing that the public money was not always fairly and honestly and economically expended. He referred to this evidence to illustrate his argument.

MR. SPEAKER decided that the reference to the evidence given before the Committee was not in order.

Mr. JACKSON said he would refer to the revenue derived from the post-offices of Montreal and Toronto in the years 1874 and 1878, respectively, in order to show that the expenditure of the public money by Government had not always been in the interests of the country. In 1874, the gross revenue derived from the post-office in Montreal was \$170,171, and the expense of management that year was \$39,255. The gross revenue in 1878 was only \$159,659, and the expenditure had advanced to \$51,866. It would be seen that, in 1878, the receipts from the post-office in Montreal were \$10,512 less than in 1874; and that, while the expenditure in 1874 was over \$39,000, in 1878 the expense of management was \$51,866. This instance he had given to show that public moneys had not been always judiciously expended. Let anyone look over the various items in the Public Accounts, and he would see that there was great necessity for retrenchment. The object he had in view in bringing these matters before the House must be obvious to all. He wished also to call the attention of the House to the Departmental arrangements. There were a great many persons employed in the Departments that were quite unnecessary; the expenditure was beyond all reason. Everyone must admit that a large number of persons were employed for other causes than the necessities of the public service. It must be evident to anyone who went through the offices and corridors of the Departmental Buildings, that a great many more persons were employed than were necessary. The same thing could be said of the domestic arrangements of this House. He thought the members themselves were, to some extent, responsible for the existence of so many sinecures. Hon. members were constantly saying that they must keep down expenditure, and yet many of them had been instrumental in getting some friend appointed on a salary. He would now come to the House itself. The indemnities to members of the House and the salaries of Ministers were regulated by Act in 1873. He had called for a statement of the salaries and the indemnity from 1841 up to the present time. Considering the action of the Government in 1873 in advancing the salaries

of civil servants and others, upon due consideration it might be as necessary now to consider the advisability of a reduction to correspond with the present state of the labour market and the general condition of the country. He could see no impropriety in dealing with this question, and acting with regard to public servants as the circumstances warranted, raising their salaries where the duties had been increased. He thought he remembered that, when the Bill in 1873 was before the House, the member for Lambton contended that the Ministerial salaries should be limited to \$75,000. But, when those gentlemen opposite reached office, they heard nothing more of that principle. They condemned the extravagance, but shared in the spoil. The people expected that the present Government, elected for the purpose of carrying out their wishes, should pay regard to retrenchment and reform, as essential and necessary adjuncts to the proper working out of the National Policy. The principal difficulty they had to contend against arose from want of economical management in the past, and the only way in which the equilibrium between outlay and income could be restored, was by the practising of economy. With regard to the expenses of this House, every day it was in Session its expenses were increased several thousand dollars. People outside expressed an opinion on this subject, whether in accordance with the facts or not; they might be censorious, but, while they agreed that great ability had been displayed in the discussion of the great questions before the House, they believed its proceedings were not always marked by a prudent regard to its dignity and usefulness. Outside cities ventured to insinuate that some of the speeches were old speeches revamped, and addresses to buncombe. He did not say that all this was true, but such was the outside opinion, and it became hon. members to enquire whether it was true, or if there was any foundation for it, and, if so, to act with more prudence and respect for their dignity. Economy and retrenchment should be the inseparable adjuncts of the National Policy; unless it was honestly carried out, for the purpose of accomplishing this object, there would be little result.

MR. SPEAKER.

The reputation of their public men should be regarded as public property, to be protected on all occasions. The people looked to the hon. Premier to not only carry out the National Policy, as he believed it in the interest of the country, but to supplement it by a system of economy and retrenchment, in doing which he might depend upon the assistance of the people. His (Mr. Jackson's) remarks had been supplied with a text in a letter from one of his constituents, a miller, saying he was much pleased with the tariff, and thought it would be generally satisfactory; that he hoped the Government would be able to carry it out successfully, and, with proper economy, would establish a better system of things, and put the country in a good position again. He (Mr. Jackson) had no other motive than that for the returns mentioned, in order that the House and Government should have directly before them the history of Ministerial salaries and indemnity to members from the Union of the Provinces to the present time, and he commended it to the attention of the Government for such action as the circumstances of the case seemed to require.

MR. SPROULE said that it was not necessary to say much in support of the motion, of which they could not fail to recognise the importance at present. Considering the condition of the country, the depression of trade, and its natural tendency to a retrograde course, it was inseparably connected with the principles laid down by Ministers in relation to their policy. It was one of the things that must go to enhance the wealth of the country and stop extravagant expenditure. In times of prosperity they were inclined to let their expenditure become reckless, however it might have been the case here. Between 1863 and 1867-68 they were very prosperous, every workman getting, perhaps, twice as much pay as now, and it seemed necessary in the interest of the country that the value of wages should measure proportionately in every department. Consequently, it was necessary to increase the salaries of the members of the Government, and it was found requisite to increase the salaries of the civil servants in almost every Department. But, in

course of time, everything appeared to bring about a change of that prosperous state. People individually launched out in extravagance, rendering it harder to cut down expenses than it would have been to have avoided them at first. It seemed harder for them to share in the general depression of the country as regarded the Civil Service than other classes; but it was as necessary to economise in that, as in other directions. The Government had tried to restore an equilibrium between expenditure and income. They hoped the tariff would go far to restore such a condition of affairs. But this object might be greatly aided by economy. If they found that the expenditure in connection with the Government was out of proportion to the benefits that accrued from their legislation, it was incumbent upon them to try and reduce it, and it was by looking over the history of the past, and estimating how the work had been done, and its cost, that they could ascertain whether, to-day, the expenditure was extravagant or not. This did not attempt to cast any stigma on any class for that increase. It appeared there had been a gradual increase from 1840 to the present year. When they found, however, a decline of prosperity, it became necessary to consider a reduction of the expenditure no longer justifiable. That the public expenditure was extravagant, as compared with a few years ago, could be shown from a few comparisons. The Customs revenue, in 1873, was \$12,000,000, the collection of which cost \$567,000, or \$4.38 per cent.; but, in 1877, they collected \$12,000,000 also, the cost being \$721,000, or \$200,000 more in round numbers, though matters were prosperous the former year, when one would naturally suppose the work would have cost more. He mentioned this fact to show the necessity of considering the importance of trying whether the present expenditure was not disproportionate and unwise. It would be better to reduce the outlay in a great many lines than in only one. Government, by reducing the expenses of the Departments, could save money, and thus help to restore the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. The reduction of the Civil Service staff would effect a saving clearly commendable. They might go further. As men were

now receiving but from 75c. to \$1 a day, as compared with \$1.50 to \$2 in 1873, as labour was worth less than formerly, the same rule should be applied in regard to the members of the House. It was only by comparisons based on the returns asked that they could judge whether the present outlays were extravagant, and if they could be reduced, without in any way interfering with the efficiency of the Legislature. This work would be important, and would, if performed by the Government, prevent private members taking it up in an embarrassing way. When the returns were produced, the Government could deal with them on their merits.

Motion agreed to.

JUDGE WILKINS' RESIGNATION, AND JUDGE WETHERBE'S APPOINTMENT.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DOULL moved for copies of all correspondence, telegrams and memoranda in connection with the resignation of Judge Wilkins, his being placed upon the pension list, and the appointment of Judge Wetherbe.

Motion agreed to.

EXAMINATION OF MASTERS OF MARINE.

MOTION FOR DOCUMENTS.

MR. FORTIN moved for copies of all documents relating to the question of the examination before the Boards of Examiners of the Mercantile Marine of Canada, of masters desirous of obtaining certificates as extra masters, and the manner of obtaining such certificates; and also, of all correspondence which may have passed on the subject between the Department of Marine of Canada and the Board of Trade in England. He said that this House was aware there were in this country, in the principal seaports, Boards of Examiners for the examination of mariners desirous of obtaining certificates of competency as masters and mates of foreign-going ships, and all knew that it was an obligation on the part of such masters or mates to possess such certificates, or certificates of service, which could be reckoned as high

MR. SPROULE.

as the former, before they could be employed on board of these foreign-going ships. Such Boards had been in existence in this country for about ten years; but in England they had been in existence for twenty or more. He held in his hand a pamphlet published in London, by authority, which showed and explained what requirements, both as to seamanship, nautical instruction, age and character, were necessary, before applicants could obtain certificates as masters, mates and second mates, and that after successful examination only. But there was, in England, another kind of examination; it was for extra masters' certificates, it was for a higher grade, both in seamanship and nautical education, and it was among the captains who had attained such a standing in their profession they were to find the masters of these famous clippers, of which every person had heard, and of steamers of the largest class. The following extract, which he would read from the pamphlet above alluded to, would show the great requirements that were exacted from these seamen in every way:—

"An extra master's examination is voluntary, and intended for such persons as wish to prove their superior qualifications, and are desirous of having certificates for the highest grade granted by the Board of Trade.

"*In Navigation.*—As the vessels which such masters will command frequently make long voyages,—to the East Indies, the Pacific, etc.,—the candidate will be required to work a lunar observation, by both sun and star, to determine the latitude by the moon, by Polar star off the meridian, and also by double altitude of the sun, and to verify the result by Sumner's method.

"He must be able to calculate the altitudes of the sun or star, when they cannot be observed, for the purpose of lunars, and to correct the altitudes observed with an artificial horizon.

"He must understand how to observe and apply the deviation of the compass, and to deduce the set and rate of the current from the D. R., and observation.

"He will be required to explain the nature of great circle-sailing, and know how to apply practically that knowledge, but he will not be required to go into the calculations.

"He must be acquainted with the law of storms, so far as to know how he may probably best escape those tempests common to the East and West Indies, and known as hurricanes.

"*In Seamanship.*—The extra examination will consist of an enquiry into the competency of the applicants to heave a ship down, in

case of accident befalling her abroad ; to get lower masts in and out ; and to perform such other operations of a like nature as the examiner may consider it proper to examine him upon."

Every one in the House would see that, by the nature of this examination for extra masters' certificates, a captain who had passed it was a superior man ; he was not a mere tradesman, he was a professional man, and ranked as such among the professions in England. What he (Mr. Fortin) asked was that this Government should have the same kind of examination in this country, so that masters desirous of qualifying themselves could be on the same level as English masters. He knew there were many in this country, not only ambitious to put themselves on the same level as English masters, but able to pass the examination. He was sure the Government would do their best to have such an examination established, especially when it was known that there were schools in this country in which the necessary qualifications could be obtained. There were schools at Halifax and St. John, and there was one at Quebec. He was well acquainted with the latter, and could say it was equal to any school in England. The instructor in that school, Mr. William Seaton, was a gentleman who had been professor in one of the most celebrated schools in England, the Merchant Venturers' School of Navigation at Bristol, England. He held in his hand the prospectus of the Quebec school. Everyone competent to judge would see that any person attending that school would have every facility for acquiring everything that was necessary to enable him to pass the extra examination. It provided for a first course, for the preparation of candidates for the masters' and mates' certificates of competency ; a second course, principally theoretical, and might be resumed in a mathematical investigation of the different rules and formula used in nautical science. And it was, besides, very judiciously provided that, should extra examination be established before the Dominion Board of Examiners, the preparation for those extra examinations of such candidates as would have made their studies at this school—that was the Quebec school—would be free from

any charge. Consequently, all the masters who had passed in the Quebec school would be able to go back to that school and study under Professor Seaton without any extra charge. He thought that was an inducement to them. He did not know why Canadians should be placed on a lower level than British naval officers. They had men here who were in every way qualified to take as prominent a position in maritime matters as could be found anywhere, if they received the necessary instruction in the nautical science. He might cite the examples of Norway, Sweden and Germany. He might read extracts from letters of the gentleman who has been consul for Norway and Sweden at Quebec, Baron Falkenberg, showing how these matters were conducted in Norway and Sweden. He might also cite the report of the United States Commissioner on the school at Stettin, Prussia, but he did not wish to take up too much of the time of the House. This school at Stettin was the best school in the world, and its graduates possessed a perfect marine education. He thought it was necessary in this country to have masters who could class and rank as professional men. What did they see in this country, especially in the Province of Quebec ? They had Harbour Commissioners in Montreal and Quebec—he did not speak of their duty, as regarded the deepening of harbours and building of wharves—but they might enquire as to how far they were able to sit as a Court, to try a ship-master for an alleged offence consequent upon a wreck. The Commissioners at Quebec were, in their proper trades and professions, good and clever men, but how could it be expected that a drygoods merchant, a manufacturer, and a tanner could sit as a Court to judge knowingly masters, mates, or second mates, whose vessels had met with some accident at sea or near the shore ? It was not to be expected that they had the necessary technical education, and such practical experience for such trials. It seemed to him that some change in this respect should be made. Extra masters could well and fittingly form part of such commissions, and they would be able to sit as a Court, and judge with a thorough knowledge all questions relative to wrecks, accidents to ships, and misconduct on the part of masters and

mates. He hoped the Government would do all they could to have these extra masters' examinations established in all the principal ports of the Dominion, as soon as possible. And he did not see there was anything in the way of accomplishing that object. This would be one of the means of developing, in a material way, the shipping of the country.

Motion agreed to.

BRIDGE OVER RIVER L'ASSOMPTION.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. HURTEAU moved for copies of correspondence and documents, relating to the construction of the bridge over L'Assomption River, at L'Assomption.

Motion agreed to.

WINDSOR BRANCH RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. WADE moved for a return of the gross earnings, year by year, of the Windsor Branch Railway, from the 1st January, 1872, to the 1st August, 1877; and a statement in detail of the cash paid to the Dominion Government by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, since the 1st January, 1872, and on what account; and also, a statement of the claims made by the Windsor and Annapolis Company under their charter for a repayment of duties, and the amount allowed and paid by Government.

Motion agreed to.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT BRANDY POTS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. GRANDBOIS moved for copies of all correspondence and documents relating to the resignation of Mr. Richard, lighthouse-keeper at the Brandy Pots, and to the appointment of Mr. Richard's son in place of his father, after the 15th September last.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FORTIN.

PAYMENTS TO CHARLES LANGELIER, OF ST. JOHNS, P.Q.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

Mr. HOUDE moved for a statement of all money paid to Mr. Charles Langelier, of St. Johns, Province of Quebec, for the use of his bridge on the Chambly Canal.

Motion agreed to.

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF INDIANS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. DAWSON moved for a return of all Indians who have become enfranchised, in accordance with the forms provided by law, within the past ten years, with their names, places of residence, and designation of the band and tribes to which they respectively belonged. He said that, in calling for this return, he was confident that he would not impose a great deal of work on the Department that should furnish it, for the number of Indians who had become enfranchised under the existing law was but small. The present Act, or Acts similar to it, providing for the enfranchisement of Indians, had been for a long time on the Statute-book, but it had failed so far, and could never succeed in its object. It had been conceived in a spirit opposed to the customs most cherished by the Indians. By the Act, as it stood, enfranchisement was made contingent on the breaking up and parceling out of the Reserves. An Indian could not become enfranchised unless he separated his holding from the common property of the band. The object of the Act was to break up the tribal system, but that system was endeared to the Indians by many associations, and it was the last remaining protection which they had against the rapacity of the white man. They were attached to it because it was inherited from their ancestors, because it had become a part of their very nature and entered, in all its ramifications, into their everyday life. They would never cease to adhere to the tribal system until they ceased to be Indians. What he (Mr. Dawson) particularly wished to draw attention to was the fact that the present Act was inoperative, and that by the law of Ontario, Indians,

no matter what their position, if they happened to live on Reserves, were deprived of the franchise, and, as regarded elections in Ontario, the law of Ontario was the law of the Dominion. It was much to be desired that some general law could be passed by which Indians could hold their land in common and still have civil rights, like other subjects of Her Majesty. In his (Mr. Dawson's) constituency, if the new territory awarded to Ontario were to form part of it, there would be ten thousand Indians. Of course, no one would think of extending the franchise to the wandering Indians of the forest, but in Algoma there were civilised Indians who had long abandoned the hunter's life, and were settled on farms and lived by cultivating the soil. In many cases they were quite equal to the intelligent and judicious exercise of the franchise. Many of them were Indians but in name, although they retained the habits of Indians, more especially as regarded the tribal system—they were a class of people of much the same appearance and character as the French half-breeds of Manitoba. He mentioned instances of Indians in his constituency who were well-to-do as regarded their worldly possessions, who, in some instances, carried on trade, and who, in certain cases, were so well off as to be able to send their children to Europe for their education. Yet these people would sooner part with all they possessed than sever the tie which connected them with their bands. The Act, as it stood, had been a dead letter, and why persevere in such legislation? There were ninety thousand Indians within the Dominion, and was it in accordance with the spirit of our institutions that these people, even when they became civilised, should still be held as minors, and as unfit to exercise the franchise like their fellow-men? Was it proper that such numbers of people should be without representation in this House?

SEN JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was afraid that it was quite true, as his hon. friend had stated, that very few Indians had taken advantage of the law. The Bill, however, was not intended to apply to the electoral franchise. If an

Indian purchased land, he became one of Her Majesty's subjects, and could vote the same as a white man, if he had the same qualification as a white man. When a member of a tribe he had no separate or distinct interest. He was under tutelage. With respect to the Reserve, the Crown, in fact, was his guardian, and he was considered to be in a legal minority. If, however, he became a landowner and possessed the proper qualifications, there was no reason why he should not vote. He did not see the hardships the hon. gentleman complained of.

MR. DAWSON said that the Premier had explained the law as it should exist, but, in Ontario, the Election Law debarred Indians from voting, whether they were possessed of property like other people or not. The simple fact of living among Indians, or residing on an Indian Reserve, deprived an Indian of the right of voting. No doubt the law of Ontario had been much strained against these people, but the general Emancipation Act of the Dominion should be amended or repealed. The return, when brought down, would show that it had been inoperative so far, and why retain an Act which was practically a dead letter, and could not be worked on the Statute-book?

Motion agreed to.

REPRESSION OF BETTING AND POOL-SELLING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 33.]

(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

MOTION TO GO INTO COMMITTEE.

Order for House to resolve itself into Committee *resol.*

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved that the Speaker leave the Chair.

MR. ANGLIN said he, for one, must protest against this attempt to legalise betting and pool-selling. He regarded the measure as one of a most extraordinary character. He thought the Bill was treated rather as a joke when allowed to go to a second reading; but, if it were allowed to pass, the Legislature, on this subject, would retrograde

seriously. This was an attempt to revive a particular kind of gambling on what were called duly authorised race-courses, and to legalise the whole practice of gambling at these places.

MR. MILLS said that he did not notice that this Bill had been read a second time. He thought it was a very objectionable measure, for the reason that they had already passed a law by the unanimous consent of the former Parliament declaring pool-selling a misdemeanour. They had made it a crime under the law, and now the hon. gentleman by this Bill proposed to declare that in certain cases it should not be a crime for a party to do, within a particular area, what he would be liable to imprisonment for if he did it elsewhere. The Bill assumed that they were duly constituted race-courses. The House had nothing to do with their recognition whatever. They had no existence which the House could take any cognisance of. When the hon. gentleman undertook to declare that race-courses were duly constituted, by what way he (Mr. Mills) did not know, and that pool-selling might be allowed within those limits, he thought it an objectionable measure. It was his intention to have opposed it on its second reading, but it passed a second reading without his knowledge.

MR. CHARLTON said he hoped the House would not become accessory to this most objectionable kind of legislation. He thought it would be most derogatory to the House, and he trusted that by their rejection they would give an emphatic expression of their disapproval of it.

MR. CASEY said he thought the sentiment of the House was decidedly in favour of the Bill introduced by the late Minister of Justice, and which was unanimously passed. He thought that, in the introduction of a measure like the one before the House, it would be necessary to show the hardships created by the existing measure, and that it should be in justice repealed. He also was of opinion that a measure like the present should come from a more responsible quarter. If it was in the interest of the public, it should be brought in by the present Minister of Justice. For these

reasons he would have opposed the second reading of the Bill had he been present on that occasion.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said the object of the Bill was plainly to limit the operations of the existing Act. It was a well known fact, that the law upon the Statute-book was being broken every day, and he submitted that it was far better to have a law which was in itself reasonable, and which would be respected, than a law which would not be observed, and which would be broken every day. There was no harm, as he understood it, in pool-selling, if it was kept under control, and the amended Bill proposed to limit pool-selling to properly organised race-courses, controlled by gentlemen who had an interest in the improvement of stock, and particularly in the improvement of horses. They all knew very well that, when the race took place between Hanlan and his opponent, at Montreal, last summer, pool-selling was just as prevalent as it was before this Act was passed. They also knew that on the last election of the Bishop of Toronto pool-selling took place. It appeared to him that it would be far better to have the Act made reasonable rather than to have it so stringent that it would be broken with impunity whenever an occasion arose. He was just as anxious as hon. gentlemen opposite to keep down the illegal transactions alluded to, but he did not understand that it was a necessity that there should be anything immoral in pool-selling. Of course, anything could be turned into a vice if it were not properly conducted, but he believed there were honourable men desirous of encouraging horse-racing. It was a sport he thought no man need be ashamed of, and he did not think hon. gentlemen should be so straight-laced about the matter, and he thought the Bill would turn out an advantage rather than a disadvantage. The Act said :

" Provided always, that nothing in this Act contained shall be construed in any way to prohibit the recording or registering of any bet or wager or the selling of any pool, on any race-course or trotting-track under the control or direction of any organized turf or racing club or trotting or racing association, or to make the person who records or registers any bet or wager or sells any pool on such race-course or trotting track, guilty of a misdemeanour."

MR. ANGLIN.

They all agreed that it would be better to have betting done openly than in brothels and places that were not directly under the surveillance of the police. But if it was done publicly and openly, as this Bill intended it should be done, there was a guarantee that it would be properly carried on. The effect of the Act which the Bill proposed to amend, he understood, was to do away with horse-racing altogether. Her Majesty the Queen loved horse-racing, she had given a plate to be run for every year (the Queen's plate), for the best horse, under certain circumstances. If it was a fact that a number of race-courses had been closed, because people could not indulge in betting in this way, he did not see why the restrictions should not be removed. He asked the House to pass the Bill at all events, and give it a trial. It would be far better to have a law which would be respected, than to have a law which was often broken, and always with impunity, as no conviction had ever taken place under it. The only effect the law had was a bad one, it excluded honourable men from participating in the noble pastime of racing, and left it entirely to the vicious and depraved, and, consequently, as before stated, all properly organised racing-tracks were closed.

Mr. OLIVER said the hon. gentleman's arguments were contradictory. He said in one breath that the law was not respected or enforced; yet in the next that, owing to its existence, this sport of horse-racing was very much narrowed, that some of these places that were formerly disgraced by this pool-selling had been closed by the effect of the law. The present Act commended itself to the general sentiment of the community, and should not be repealed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was no petition before the House for the repeal of the present Act, as this Bill, to a considerable extent demanded, nor was there any public expression of opinion in favour of repealing it. The present law should be given a fair chance. It did not prevent horse-racing, or prizes or plates being offered, but prevented the sport being made a professional business to draw in people to put their money in

a pool for the sake of the excitement of gambling, and not for the legitimate love of horse-racing, or desire to improve the breed. He regretted that he would have to vote against the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (South Huron) said it would be exceedingly undesirable that a Bill of this kind should pass just now. He could not understand how it succeeded in getting through the second reading. When the present Act was passed, the only dissentient voice was that of the Premier, who doubted the propriety of introducing such legislation. The argument that the law should be repealed because it was frequently evaded might be applied to any law on the Statute-book. He moved that the Speaker do not leave the Chair, but that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Bill six months hence.

Mr. HESSON said he was entirely opposed to the Bill; there should be no relaxation in the law.

Mr. COCKBURN said that among the sporting community there was a strong feeling against pool-selling, which destroyed legitimate horse-racing. No strong reason had been put forward in support of the Bill.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, South Huron) *agreed to*; Bill to be *committed* this day six months.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 4.]

(Mr. McCarthy.)

SECOND READING.

House *resumed* the adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading.

Mr. RYKERT said the hon. the mover of the resolution had not advanced a single argument to induce the House to pass the Bill. It simply was a consolidation of the laws now in force, with two or three clauses in reference to the manner of trying elections. There were only two substantial amendments in it, one in reference to the trial before a certain number of Judges, the other with regard to particulars which were to be furnished by the person seeking to set aside the elections, requiring them to

be verified. In a matter of this importance, the Government ought to take the question in hand. It was quite clear there was very great difference of opinion as regarded this Election Law among the Judges. There could be no new elections for five years, in all probability, therefore the Bill could safely lie over until a few more Sessions, when the Government could bring down a measure consolidating the law. A great objection to the present mode of trial was that the Judges were not sufficiently fortified in delivering their judgments. That objection was a frivolous one. He had yet to learn that the Judges had not sufficient determination to deliver their judgments without being fortified by newspapers. The mover of the Bill suggested that the chief reason for introducing this measure was because certain Judges were attacked by newspapers in Toronto. The only two Judges who had been attacked were the Hon. Chief Justice Wilson, and Mr. Justice Armour. It was a most singular thing that two Judges appointed by that Reform party should have been attacked by its organ. Mr. Justice Wilson, while in this House, commanded the esteem and respect of every member of this House, and was so well thought of by this House and the Government that he was asked to take a seat in the Government, and very shortly after was called to the Bench, and on the Bench no Judge was more esteemed, and there was none whose judgments had been to a greater extent sustained by the Court of Appeal. The other Judge, who had been attacked lately, Mr. Justice Armour, was a gentleman well known to all members of the House as a gentleman of learning and distinction, and who adorned the Bench by his talents. He was attacked in a most unjustifiable manner because he had chosen to expound the law differently from what certain gentlemen considered correct, and had come under the lash of the *Globe* newspaper. He did not see that these were reasons why the House should be asked to alter the whole mode of trial of elections. He was opposed to this Bill because, in the first place, it entailed enormous expense. The trial by three Judges must not only entail expense, but would upset the whole ma-

chinery of our Courts, particularly when Judges were taken from two Courts in different Provinces, and one Judge from the Supreme Court. If the decision was not a unanimous one, it had no greater value than that of one Judge, being simply two against one. It would be utterly impossible for the Judges of the Supreme Court, if there were a dozen election trials going on, to attend to all of them, and select a time when the two Judges of the Courts of the different Provinces could attend the trial. The other strong point in the Bill was that the petition should be verified. He was surprised that the hon. gentleman should use that as a ground, because it was well known that the experience of our Judges so far, in cases tried under the Ontario Act, which required petitions to be verified, had not been in that direction. In fact, the case he could put was the case carried on in the county of Lincoln, in which an attempt was made to unseat him. There the petition was verified; petitioners swore there were 2,200 bad votes recorded for himself, and after investigating the matter during a trial of three years, what was the result? They succeeded in striking off 109 votes out of the whole 2,200, and, after the case was carried to the Court of Appeal, 69 of these were restored. That showed the value of an affidavit attached to a bill of particulars, swearing the votes were bad. That was one strong argument why the provisions were utterly useless. He would refer to another point, that of petitions. The petitioner, in many cases, only asked to set aside the election, but did not claim the seat. He considered this a great defect, and was of the opinion that if anyone asked to have an election set aside, he ought to be compelled to ask for the seat for the defeated candidate, so that he could be disqualified for corrupt practices. In a great many instances an election would not be contested provided the petitioner was compelled to ask for the seat for the opposing candidate. He happened to be in that position. After fighting for three years, he found himself a member both of the Local Legislature and of this House. If the petitioner in the Commons election had been compelled to claim the seat of the defeated candidate,

he would certainly have disqualified that gentleman. Then again the provision for the disqualification of voters was very ineffective. Year after year Judges reported to this House that certain witnesses had been guilty of corrupt practices, and by law these men were liable to a penalty, and should not be allowed to vote for a number of years. But this provision had never been carried into effect. The Judges might report 500 voters guilty of corrupt practices, and they could still go and vote just the same as if nothing had happened. That was not the intention of the law. It should be so arranged that, when a voter was reported guilty of corrupt practices, the Clerk of the House should report him back to the Judge to be struck off the voters' list. In the Ontario Act, machinery was provided by which a person guilty of corrupt practices could be immediately disqualified and prevented from voting for five years. Another important point was the question of agency, which he hoped the hon. the Minister of Justice and the hon. leader of the Government would attend to. Great confusion existed in regard to this question. The Supreme Court had decided one way and the Courts in Ontario another way. In the Lincoln election case Vice-Chancellor Blake determined that every person who attended the original nomination, and expressed no dissent from the sentiments of the candidate who accepted the nomination, was an agent, and upon that ground he unseated him (Mr. Rykert). On the other hand, they found their Supreme Court had gone to a still greater length in the opposite direction in the Jacques Cartier election. We thus had very conflicting decisions, and the hon. the Minister of Justice should endeavour to see that this anomaly was rectified. There were many other suggestions he could make, but he assumed the Government would not allow this Bill to go through this Session. The hon. the Minister of Justice could communicate with the Judges throughout the country, and obtain some idea of what the law ought to be. It was absurd to see a Judge of one Court deciding one way, and another Judge, in the same Province, deciding differently; and, more than this, there was a conflict of

decision in almost all the Provinces. It seemed to him this matter should be taken up by the Government, and not by a private member of the House. In consolidating the law, he held that it was important to settle the question of the right to vote, as it was utterly impossible, according to the various decisions, to tell what was really a good vote. Decisions on this point were very conflicting. In one case lately, a Judge decided that, because a man's grandfather was a British subject, he was a British subject. Chief Justice Richards went so far as to say that a man coming into this country while very young, whose grandfather was a United Empire Loyalist, was a British subject. In Ontario, it had been held that a grandfather being a British subject, the grandson would be a British subject. He hoped his hon. friend the leader of the Government would see that these conflicting decisions would be avoided in the future. He might go on and suggest a great many amendments to the law, but, as it was not likely that the present Act would become law this Session, it was useless to prolong the discussion.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said he quite agreed with the sentiments of the hon. gentleman, and hoped this Bill would not be pressed this Session. There was no need for it, and no prospect of a general election before them. Besides the objection expressed by the hon. gentleman, there was this further one: A serious question was now before the Courts in nearly all the Provinces. The Courts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario, had all had to consider the question of the power of this Parliament to establish a Court for the trial of controverted elections. That question was now pending in appeal before the Supreme Court. The Judges in the Province of Quebec had given conflicting decisions upon that point. Some held that this Parliament had power to establish those Courts, while others held it had not. Similar cases had come before the Courts in Ontario, and the Court of Common Pleas was not unanimous. One of the Judges held that, in the matter of procedure by which parties could come into that Court, this

Parliament had no jurisdiction to establish that procedure. Now, that struck at the very root of the whole jurisdiction of the Court, because, unless parties could have a process by which they could be brought into Court, the Court could not take cognisance of the case at all. That case, he believed, was also pending in appeal. It was, therefore, very important that these questions should be all determined before this House was asked to enact any more legislation. It would be absurd if they were to pass a Bill now and find, a few months hence, that they had no jurisdiction. He would, therefore, submit that, for that reason alone, the hon. gentleman who had presented this Bill—and it certainly was, so far as the consolidation part of it was concerned, very satisfactory—would do well not to press it any further. He (Mr. Cockburn) decidedly objected to the provision that the trial should take place before three Judges. He could see no reason why the whole system of law in the Provinces should be disturbed by taking such a number of Judges away from the Courts who were all required to perform the ordinary judicial business. He would draw this line, however, that, upon the question of disqualification, one Judge alone should not be called upon to decide. That was too important a question for one Judge, and he would like to see a provision in the law that a Judge who tried such a case should always reserve a question of disqualification for a Court of three Judges.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this Bill had been prepared with a great deal of care, and by an hon. gentleman who was fully competent, from his professional experience, to judge what were the defects of the present system, and that there were many defects was acknowledged by everybody, irrespective of politics. It had been found that the system did not work as well as was desirable, and that it required very considerable amendments. Whether this Bill should eventually become law was a question, but it was a very praiseworthy attempt to solve some of the difficulties, at all events, that now appeared in practice. The consolidation feature of the Bill was very satisfactory. There were contradictions that existed between some

of the provisions on the Statute-book previously. His hon. friend from Lincoln had pointed out some of the defects of the present law, and also the contradictions in the decisions of the Courts under the present law. Now, all that ought to be amended as soon as possible, and he thought this House should address itself, as soon as conveniently might be, to the task of amending this law, and making it as perfect as possible. It was quite true that this was the first Session of a Parliament which might last for five years. He was of the opinion that now was just the time to consider this law, when members of this House were not threatened with being sent back to their constituencies. Now was the proper time for them to apply themselves to the construction of a law for the trial of controverted elections, without being disturbed at all by apprehensions that in the near future it might affect their own elections. He thought it was well to take it up early, instead of putting it off to the last Session.

MR. MILLS: There are pending cases.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said these pending cases could not be affected by this law. That the present law had not been satisfactory was shown by the fact that there were two other measures before Parliament dealing with the same matter. His idea was that, as there were not many measures in the hands of private members this Session, this Bill, and all other like Bills, should be read a second time, and sent to a well-chosen Committee, that could sit for the rest of this Session, and make considerable progress, and, perhaps, be able at the end of the Session to submit a measure for the consideration of Parliament. He hoped this Bill would be read a second time, along with the other Bills, and sent to a Committee, which should address itself with vigour to the consideration of some wise measure, to be submitted to Parliament before the close of the Session, so that they could have a year to consider it, and take it up at the next Session. He hoped the Bill would be allowed to pass, with the understanding that it should be submitted to a Committee, along with the other Bills.

MR. ANGLIN said that this question required very careful consideration before they attempted to deal with it finally. It was well that these measures were brought before the House, and discussed on their merits. He would be very sorry to see legislation on the subject this Session. There was no necessity whatever for it, and, if this House were to live for five years, there would be no reason next year why they could not deal with the whole subject as calmly and as deliberately as now. On the other hand, he could see no objection to referring this Bill to a Committee, which should address itself to the task of trying to mature a measure of some kind for submission to the House at this Session. Then the whole subject should be allowed to remain over until another Session, although he did not believe in leaving it until near the end of the present Parliament. There were questions of great importance relating to the Election Law now before the Courts. They had heard, within a day or two, that one of the Judges in New Brunswick, on some preliminary objection, had decided that it was not within the competency of this Parliament to impose on the Courts of the Provinces the duty of trying controverted elections or the authority to try such cases. They might here hold a different opinion, and obviously they did when they passed the Act; nevertheless, it was a question requiring the very utmost consideration of the first minds in this House. The question would probably be passed upon by the Supreme Court. He was not aware that there was any question of that kind now awaiting the decision of that Court. The question was raised as a preliminary objection, he believed, in all the cases yet tried, and from the decision on the preliminary objections, it was asserted that there was no appeal.

MR. COCKBURN: There is an appeal before the Supreme Court on what is called the preliminary objection; but the contention is that it is not preliminary—that the whole question rests under it.

MR. ANGLIN said it was very desirable to have a decision of the Supreme Court upon it before proceeding to any further action; for, if that Court decided that it was not in their power to impose

this duty on the Provincial Courts, then they must provide another Court, the important feature of this measure being the reconstruction of the Court for the trying of controverted elections.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said he trusted the right hon. gentleman would not allow this Bill to go to a second reading.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It will go to a Committee.

MR. CAMERON said the whole Bill was an exact transcript of the old Controverted Elections Act; there was no consolidation. The only change which the hon. member for North Simcoe had imported into it was simply the one as to the mode of trying those controverted elections. That was the very question under adjudication, in Ontario, in the Niagara and South Huron cases—namely, as to the power or competency of Parliament to invest in local courts the right to try those elections. The point was raised in the Court of Common Pleas, where the Chief Justice gave an able, elaborate and logical judgment, practically holding that this Parliament had no power to vest a new jurisdiction in those Courts, and as equally, none to create a practice and procedure in the Local Courts, and with that decision the First Minister agreed. When the Bill was first introduced for the trial of controverted elections by the Judges, the right hon. gentleman, when he introduced that Bill, substantially the same as that now on the Statute-book, took the ground that the Bill should not take effect till the Local Legislatures passed an Act giving the regular Courts in the Provinces the power to try those election cases. One of the Judges gave no decision on the question of jurisdiction; that was, he did not give any reasons for his judgment, or base it on any authorities. He simply agreed with Mr. Justice Gwynne, who dissented from the Chief Justice; so they had the Court of Common Pleas divided on the point. There was no judgment by the Judges of the other Courts in Ontario. They followed the judgment of the Common Pleas as a Court of coördinate jurisdiction, almost without argument, and certainly without assigning reasons for the conclusions ar-

rived at. On the other hand, they had in Quebec one Judge, deciding that Parliament had no such power, and recently a judgment in the Superior Court of New Brunswick to the effect that no Judge had any jurisdiction to try a similar case. An attempt was made to bring this point before the Supreme Court for judicial decision, but the attempt failed. An attempt was also made to bring this question of jurisdiction before the Court of Appeal in Ontario, but the attempt failed there also, and the appeal was struck out, the Lower Court holding that there was no appeal from the judgment of the Court in a preliminary objection.

MR. PLUMB : What case ?

MR. CAMERON said was his own case. The Court refused to permit an appeal to either Court from the lower Court, on a preliminary objection. If that was good law, this most important point as to the power of Parliament to deal with questions of this kind could not be adjudicated upon until the cases were formally tried, and an appeal could then be had to the higher Court. No doubt it would come up and receive a judicial decision before the next meeting of Parliament, and, in some cases under investigation, the question was raised by way of answer to the right to petition, and, therefore, it would, undoubtedly, come before the Supreme Court. The principle upon which this Bill was founded, and the only one, was that this Parliament had the power to utilise the local Courts for the trial of these cases, and had the power to vest a new jurisdiction in the Court of Appeals, and that was the very point now before the Courts, and not yet finally decided ; and, pending these decisions, it would be unwise to pass this Bill. Supposing they passed this Bill, and that the Supreme Court should decide in one of the cases referred to that Parliament had not the power to give jurisdiction to the local Courts, or to the Judges of such Courts, then they would have to go over the work again, repeal that law, and create a new Court altogether. Not only did that Bill provide for utilising the Judges of the lower Courts, but it gave original jurisdiction to the Court of Appeals, where the whole proceedings were taken and carried on ; it went even

MR. CAMERON.

a step further than the Bill which the hon. gentleman introduced, and which was repealed, and practically subsequently introduced by Mr. Blake. It gave the Court of Appeal original jurisdiction. If there was a doubt as to the right of Parliament in the local Courts of original jurisdiction, he did not think there was any doubt that this Parliament had no power to confer original jurisdiction on the Court of Appeal.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Have we no power to give to the Supreme Court here ?

MR. CAMERON said clearly he meant the Court of Appeal of Ontario. He believed there was no power in this Parliament to confer such authority on that Court. By next Session they could know exactly what power Parliament had in the matter. It was merely a waste of time to dispose of this Bill during the present Session, for there was only one point in the Bill, that respecting the creation of a tribunal for the trial of these cases. Any investigation, therefore, now pending judicial decision, would be useless. Supposing a special Committee appointed, that assumed that Parliament had the power to deal with the matter, to vest in the local Courts the jurisdiction, that Committee could not decide as to the power of Parliament when the matter was before the Supreme Court. There were not likely to be any new elections before next Session, or but a very few, and therefore there was no necessity of pressing this Bill at present.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the principle of the Bill was to consolidate the whole law relating to controverted elections. This question of jurisdiction was fully discussed in Parliament when the first Bill was introduced by himself (Sir John A. Macdonald) and subsequently when the amended Act was introduced by Mr. Blake. To a certain extent his Bill avoided the difficulty that had arisen in the last one, because it provided that there should be an Election Court, a Dominion Court, and also that the Judges in it should be taken from the Provincial Judges, and they got the consent of the different Provinces to the services of those Judges. But Mr.

Blake, on introducing his Bill, was so confident of the point, though he (Sir John A. Macdonald) warned him he was bringing up needlessly the question of jurisdiction, and should leave the Court, as before, a Dominion Court, in which Provincial Judges could sit, that he adhered to his opinion that the point would not arise. He, therefore, paid but little regard to the suggestion to leave the Court as it was. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not propose that this Bill should become law this Session, but he did really think that a Committee of legal gentlemen could not be better employed for the month or so that Parliament would be sitting, than in considering the whole of that law. As to the hon. gentleman's statement that there was no chance of a new election, there might be several, from death or other causes, before next Session; and the new candidates would like some law well understood with regard to the right to those seats and the claims of parties who might be improperly holding them. Still, he thought they must suffer until next Session, but he hoped that the House would allow this and the other Bills to go to a Special Committee. It could do no possible harm, and might do good, by eliciting valuable suggestions and enabling prayers to be made before next Session. It was asked what was the use of going into this matter before the decision of the Supreme Court? The very fact of that question being raised would bring before this Committee the question how to avoid that difficulty. If the Supreme Court decided the power they took was *ultra vires*, they could provide for that, because they must have some means of trying those cases. The Committee could decide both cases: First, whether they had a right to give the power mentioned; and secondly, whether, if they had that right, the law could be improved by utilising the Judges of the Provincial Courts. The question was not what kind of Court would be the best for the present. He saw no reason for not allowing all these Bills to go to a Special Committee.

Bill read the second time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK moved that the Bill be referred to a Committee, composed of Messrs. Kirkpatrick, Baker,

Brecken, Laurier, Sir A. J. Smith, McCarthy, Boulton, Cameron (North Victoria), Cameron (South Huron), Caron, Casey, Guthrie, Mousseau, Richey, Ryan (Marquette), Rykert, and Girouard (Jacques Cartier).

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) said he thought it would be better to send the Bill to a Committee not entirely composed of lawyers.

MR. BUNSTER said he agreed with the remarks of the member for East Hastings (Mr. White), that he thought that gentleman did not go far enough, inasmuch as he should have spoken of the advisability of doing away with election petitions altogether, particularly when it was seen that the Committee was composed exclusively of lawyers, who would make the machinery so intricate that no tradesman could know where he stood unless under the guidance of these lawyers. It would be far better if the Government would take into consideration the advisability of doing away with election petitions altogether. He believed that whenever a candidate was declared elected by the returning officer, he should remain elected. In that way, all the legal proceedings and paraphernalia for causing candidates to go to an unnecessary amount of expense would be avoided. It was a serious matter when the public thought they had an honest man, who they believed would act faithfully as their agent in Parliament, that some political trickster of a lawyer would force him into an election contest before the Courts, and he cited the Centre Wellington case, which had lately been tried. He trusted some steps would be taken to do away with election petitions, even though a little more bribery and corruption might be the result.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—

[BILL 19.]

(*Mr. Casey.*)

SECOND READING PROPOSED.

Order for second reading read.

MR. CASEY said that, in moving the second reading of this Bill, he wished to refer more particularly to the reasons

which seemed to make it desirable that such a Bill should pass. They were all aware how impossible it was to tell at the time a law was enacted how that law would operate. It seemed to him that, whatever care might have been taken by legislators in the framing of any law, they could never be certain that there were not defects in it, or that the Judges would interpret the words of it in the sense intended by the House. They might expect, then, not only to see faults and defects in the provisions of a law after it had been in operation some time, but to see the actual meaning of the law, at the time it was passed, changed by the Judges. That had been particularly the case with the laws concerning elections. The whole theory of the Election Law had been changed about the beginning of the last period of five years. There had been a change from trial by Committee to trial by the Courts; there had been the introduction of the ballot, and very much stricter provisions regarding bribery had been made than formerly. It was not to be wondered at, then, that, in the interest of these radical changes, certain defects should have been overlooked, and that the provisions of the law should not have been expressed clearly enough to prevent mistakes on the part of those administering it. These reasonable expectations of finding defects in the substance or interpretation of the law which he had suggested had been justified by facts. They constantly found cases arising which appeared to have been provided for. They found Judges that interpreted the law in a sense which this House had not intended, and, in certain cases, the law had become practically null and void. His attention had been called to this fact by actual examples which had occurred in the trial of cases since the last general elections. He would, without further preface, go on to explain the provisions of this Bill, and he would, as he went along, point out the cases which had given rise to his proposed amendment. His Bill began by describing candidates in such a manner as to make any person, who became a candidate, responsible for his acts as a candidate from the first moment at which he allowed himself to be publicly announced in that charac-

ter. It provided further that any person who actually became a candidate should be responsible from the time the writs were issued for his riding. He did this in order to prevent what he thought had sometimes occurred. He meant the case were a man who intended to be a candidate at an election should defer the formal announcement of his candidature to a very late period, hoping, and perhaps succeeding in his hope, to corrupt the constituency before such formal announcement. This he proposed to prevent, by providing that a man should be considered a candidate from the date of the issuing of the writs. He thought it was not too much to ask that, when a gentleman intended to be a candidate, he should keep within the limits of the law after the writs were issued. He preferred not to define the time at which an election was supposed to begin, because, if a definite time were fixed for an election to begin, they left it open to corrupt agents to do all their bribery before that date. He proposed, in the next two sections, to create what was practically a new offence under Statute Law, though he understood it was now held to be an offence under the Common Law. He referred to the offence of general treating. They were all aware that treating had had a vast influence in elections, and they knew that the legislation that had been passed in the last five years had for one of its chief objects the prevention of treating; that this legislation had had a wholesome effect in checking that influence, and that the first elections held under the amended Act had been comparatively pure in that respect. He did not say in all respects, but there was less treating and bribery than before, for the impression had gone abroad that all sorts of treating were prohibited by the law, and were dangerous, and the people abstained. The Judges, also, had been strict at first. He found that an election had been voided by the expenditure of twenty-five cents in the treating of an elector. As time went on, the Judges appeared to have taken a more lenient view. They all knew that it was not the easiest thing in the world to prove intention, and the Judges had held that a man might do a very large amount of treating without exposing himself to the penalties of

the law, unless corrupt intentions were proved. He did not intend to offer his unsupported opinion and authority on this point, to the House. He wished to support it by the authority of one of the most prominent and learned Judges on the Bench—Vice-Chancellor Blake, of Ontario—who, in his judgment delivered in the East Elgin case, after summing up the evidence, pointed out that, although a very large amount of treating had been proved and admitted, yet, in view of decisions made in former cases in England and here, he was unable to hold treating corrupt; and he went on to show what would be the effect on public morality, especially the morality of elections, such an interpretation of the law must have. He said:

“I feel that, as the law stands at present, a great inducement is held out to would-be candidates to look out in each constituency for men who are habitual drinkers, to win them to their side, and then to send them out to carry on the canvass by systematic treating, and thus to cause the electioneering of the country to depend to a great extent on the popularity aroused by these means rather than on the actual merits of the candidates, or the measures they advocate. The door is thus very widely opened to the introduction of drink as a means of quietly, yet surely, affecting the election. This would be prevented if I could have held that the paying for liquor supplied to a voter by a canvasser when engaged in canvassing his vote was a means of ingratiation or enticement, or of making himself popular, struck at by the Act, and by it made a corrupt practice.”

He then went on to Chief Justice Richards, who said:

“It is found from experience that the provisions contained in the present laws now in force in the Dominion and in Ontario do not effectually put an end to corrupt practices at elections, and that, in order to do so, it will be necessary to bring candidates within the highly penal provisions of declaring them, when they violate the law, incapable of being elected or holding office for several years.”

Vice-Chancellor Blake then cited the North Middlesex election (local) to show that, if a candidate had been in the habit of treating largely, treating to the same extent during an election did not constitute a corrupt practice. From all these cases, he drew the conclusion that even very extensive treating could not be held corrupt, if it were shown to have been habitual. He expressed his own opinion of the meaning of the law in these words:

“If the matter were *res integra*, I should have found this election avoided by the acts of Day; I cannot, however, do so in view of the decisions in this country and in England. I am bound to follow these authorities, and must leave it to those who think themselves aggrieved by my finding to proceed by appeal and have the matter set aside.”

They found that Vice-Chancellor Blake was of opinion that the law originally intended to make treating corrupt, but that, if it were not shown to have been done with a corrupt intent, he could not, in view of prior decisions, void the election. Speaking of a certain agent at that election, Vice-Chancellor Blake said:

“There is no doubt that with the agent treating was an ordinary act of every day life. Whenever and wherever the occasion offered it was indulged in. He is described as a man who did not do much on the platform, but who was a powerful man outside. He appears to have thought that there was not much in himself to commend him to those he met, and at once he invariably turned to his potent friend, the bar, and, by this more than questionable mode of procedure, sought to stimulate or form a friendship between himself and those he met. To this low conception of his own powers he added the view that those he met in his county were guided by a standard no higher than his own, and he appears for over twenty years past to have successfully carried on this vile and degrading system of universal treating which has been found to be so debauching in its effect throughout our Province. This man who has been a candidate for various offices for the past twenty years, and has employed freely treating as an element in his canvass, becomes an agent of a candidate who, no doubt, uses him as a man whose influence, created by the use of liquor, will be sustained by the same means, the benefit of which will accrue to him in the election contest. This treating, if found in one not theretofore given to this vice, would have been sufficient to have avoided the election, but no doubt the respondent and his agent were informed of the decisions which sanctioned, under certain circumstances, a large amount of treating, and they acted on these cases, and I think are now entitled to shelter behind them.”

He thought the opinion of the House would coincide with the opinion of Vice-Chancellor Blake, that the latitude which the present law permitted was a source of great demoralisation to the country at large. He thought the House would be willing to indicate some means to carry out the intention of the original law, which, he was satisfied, was not objected to as too strict by any gentleman in the House. He proposed to

curtail this latitude and bring the law back to its original meaning in this respect. He provided that :

“The frequent or habitual treating of individuals or assemblies of individuals, by any candidate or his agent, at any time before an election, shall be held to be general treating, whether it be done ostensibly with a view to influence the votes or opinions of electors or not, and whether it be accompanied by any attempt to influence the votes or opinions of electors or not, and notwithstanding any declaration made by any party to the treating, either at the time of the treating or any other time, on oath or otherwise, that such treating is not or was not intended to influence the votes or opinions of electors, and notwithstanding any plea that it has been the usual custom of any such candidate or agent to practise such frequent and habitual treating.”

In other words, the law would assume that the frequent treating by a candidate or agent, was done with corrupt intent, while the law at present assumed that he was innocent, and he did not think he was asking too much that the candidates should abstain from habitual treating. He also provided :

“If a Judge has reason to believe that general treating has been practised during any election by the successful candidate or any of his agents, he shall declare the election void, and shall report the name of every party guilty of such general treating. If the Judge has reason to believe that general treating has been practised by the unsuccessful candidate or any of his agents, he shall report such fact, together with the name of the guilty party.”

He next provided that :

“Any person who shall practise such general treating, shall incur a penalty of \$200, recoverable in the same manner as is provided for the recovery of like penalties by the Act 37 Victoria, chap. 9, as amended by this Act ; or in default of payment thereof, shall be imprisoned for a term not exceeding three months.”

He then went further, in order to make the provision which Vice-Chancellor Blake said should be made. The fifth clause provided that :

“The treating of any elector by any candidate or his agent at any time before an election, if preceded, accompanied, or followed by any attempt to influence the vote of such elector, or the frequent treating of any elector by any candidate or his agent at any time before an election, whether accompanied by any attempt to influence the vote of such elector or not, shall be held to be corrupt treating within the meaning of the Act 37 Victoria, chap. 9.”

MR. CASEY.

He then went to a different branch of the subject to provide a penalty for any person voting who was disqualified by law from voting. This would supply a defect that had slipped into the original law. He had been unable to find any penalty for a person voting who had no right to vote. There was a provision that such and such persons should not vote, but there was no penalty attached to the infringement of the law in the event of their happening to pass the scrutineers ; consequently, he had provided that the penalty for that should be the same as for corrupt practices, namely \$200 or imprisonment. His last section touched the basis of the whole electoral system of the country. As he had said, in a change from the system of open voting to that of ballot, it was natural there should be defects in the law. Under the existing law a large number of electors had been practically disfranchised by the informality of the deputy returning officers. He thought it was in the East Hastings case in which it appeared that a large number of ballots had been improperly marked by the deputy returning officers, and the Court held that these ballots must be thrown out. Of course, the electors who cast their votes were disfranchised. It was not intended that a deputy returning officer should disfranchise an elector, and he thought the time had come when this fault should be remedied, consequently he had provided in the last clause :

“No informality, neglect, error or omission, whether intentional or otherwise on the part of any returning officer, deputy returning officer, poll clerk, or other official, in connection with the taking of the poll at any election, either in providing or dealing with the ballots, ballot-boxes, envelopes, poll-books, or any other documents or apparatus used in taking a poll, before, during or after the taking of the poll, or in making reports, or in any of the acts prescribed by law for such official, shall be held to invalidate any ballot appearing to have been cast by any elector at such election, unless it shall appear to the Judge, or a County Judge who is re-counting the ballots appearing to have been cast at such election, that in consequence of such informality, neglect, error or omission, fraud on the part of some elector or other person has actually occurred, and has affected some of the said ballots. If it so appear to such Judge as aforesaid, he shall decide, after hearing all obtainable evidence, which ballot or ballots have been affected by such fraud, and shall hold the same to be invalid. If it do not so

appear he shall hold good all ballots appearing to have been cast as aforesaid, notwithstanding any such informality, neglect, error or omission, on the part of any official as aforesaid, and whether such ballots be found in any packet or ballot-box as provided by law or not."

The object he wished to arrive at, in the seventh section of the Bill, was this: When a person was proved guilty of illegal practices, they found the parties did not follow the provisions of the existing law for the collection of the fine. No one liked to sue his neighbour for these penalties. He had not heard of any such collection having taken place. He provided, therefore, in this section, that:

"Whenever, during or after the trial of any election petition, any person is reported by the Judge, or by any commissioner appointed by the Governor-General, under the provisions of the Act 39 Victoria, chapter 10, as guilty of any illegal practices, to which penalties are attached by any of the Acts in respect of elections, it shall be the duty of the Attorney-General to proceed by law for the enforcement of such penalties, except against any person who has received a certificate that would protect him from proceeding under the provisions of the said Act 37 Victoria, chapter 9. Any moneys recovered by such proceedings shall, after defraying the costs of such proceedings, be primarily applied to meet the costs incurred in connection with the trial of such election petition by the party to such trial at whose instance such person shall have been convicted of such illegal practices. Any balance of such moneys that may remain shall belong to the Crown. No person against whom such proceedings shall have been taken by the Attorney-General shall be subject to be sued for the recovery of any penalty under the provisions of the Act 37 Victoria, chapter 9, section 109."

In submitting this Bill for the consideration of the House, he would say, to a great extent, he agreed with the hon. the leader of the Government, in so far as he said this was the proper time to consider our Election Law. It was a time when they could consider this law without any personal feelings, and both this Session and next, he thought, might very properly be devoted to the consideration of this question. He offered this as an instalment in the meantime, and he hoped the leader of the Government would see no objection to its being read a second time. It had been suggested that this Bill should be referred to the same Committee as the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It seemed to

him, however, that the Committee was too large, and would be tully occupied with its own business. He would prefer that the Bill should be referred to a smaller Committee. He thought there were some provisions in the Bill which his hon. friend would not object to see passed into law this Session. He would, therefore, prefer to have it referred to a separate Committee, so that the acceptable clauses might be crystallised into legislation without delay.

MR. ARKELL said he thought that any hon. gentleman in the House who had gone through the last election, must feel that the law was too stringent, and that it should be relaxed in certain particulars. In his recent election he abstained himself, and his friends abstained, as far as he knew, from any infringement of the Election Law. A few days after the election he heard that an attempt was to be made to invalidate it. He was examined before the Master in Chancery, at St. Thomas, for five hours, and all the questions that suggested themselves to a third-rate lawyer were put to him. When the examination was over, a number of fellows were hired to hunt up election charges. They managed to scrape together sixty-five charges of corruption, treating, bribery, etc. When the Court met at St. Thomas every charge fell to the ground at once. A friend of his, named Mr. Samuel Day, a prominent gentleman of his county, one who had been warden and reeve for several years, who was a genial whole-souled man, and constantly coming in contact with the people, was in the habit of treating his friends when he met them. He had a large acquaintance, and, at the time of his (Mr. Arkell's) election, he pursued the same course he had pursued in regard to treating, for twenty-five years previously. They could not prove that this man had corrupted a single elector; still the Judge, in his wisdom, came very nearly unseating him (Mr. Arkell) on the strength of Mr. Day's admission that he had been in the habit of treating. The lawyers opposed to him almost succeeded in making Vice-Chancellor Blake believe that Mr. Day had corrupted the whole electorate. He (Mr. Arkell) was of opinion that the law should be changed. He did not think

that the people of this country wished to be bound down like serfs. He was of opinion that the Bill was too stringent, and he would therefore move an amendment, that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at

Thirty-five minutes past

Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 1st April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER.

MR. CHARLTON said he begged to call the attention of the House to the bad ventilation of this Chamber. The air was brought in through subterranean passages from the brow of the hill, which ran side by side with the ducts from the water closets. No fresh air was supplied to the galleries, where the temperature ranged from 100° to 110°, when on the floor it was 70°. They could never get good air through these subterranean ducts. The only way it could be done was by placing a tower in this court, reaching half way up to the height of the chimney that carried off the smoke from the engine room; it could be heated in a chamber suited to that purpose. Unless such a course were taken, members would gradually undermine their constitution. The cost of effecting the change would be very moderate, probably not over \$10,000.

MR. PLUMB said there were four subterranean passages, about 250 feet long, through which the air was drawn from the river bank. They were all at different angles, and during certain stages of the wind, the air remained stagnant; at other times it came up and fed the supply, which was heated in

MR. ARKELL.

the chamber. A little attention might suggest a possible remedy. Every member knew how injurious was the sitting several hours in this ill-ventilated chamber. He would move that a small Committee be appointed to consider the matter, and that said Committee consist of Mr. Currier, Mr. Charlton, Dr. Strange, Mr. Ogden, Mr. Cockburn and the mover.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said not a man could go through a three or four hours' Session without being decidedly the worse for it, and the ventilation should be improved.

MR. TUPPER said that the question was looked into formerly, when considerable expense was incurred in the examination into the ventilation. It would be found exceedingly difficult to deal with this matter. The only way would be for the Minister of Public Works to consult with authorities on ventilation. He did not see how the system of subterranean passages could be changed, the chamber being surrounded by corridors, with closed windows.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, after the last Session, the Chief Architect of the Department of Public Works was instructed to consider the matter, and to do everything that could be done. Some improvements were made, and others were in contemplation when he (Mr. Mackenzie) left the Department. In the British House of Parliament, where the same faults were found to exist, a Committee sat for a year investigating the subject, and, at last, were told by Dr. Reed, who had the matter in charge, that the best plan of ventilating the House was to open the windows. What they wanted here was to obtain a supply of pure air as near the building as possible, and his own impression was that, if two large air shafts, built of iron, were in the meantime placed in the centre quadrangle, so as to supply air immediately from above, instead of from below, the object would be attained. Unless that was done, it must come underground from outside the building. He believed such air-shafts, in the centre quadrangle, would probably be the best method, and the least costly, of remedying the defects they all felt. He would suggest that

the hon. the Minister of Public Works should consult his Chief Architect, who was a gentleman of great experience in such matters, and see whether this plan could not be carried into effect.

MR. PLUMB said he had personally inspected the arrangements for ventilation, and found that the air they breathed in this House came up through small apertures in the basement. That basement was heavy with the odours of the kitchen and with the other odours of this House. The air passed thence through tubes that conveyed it into this Chamber. Foul air having a tendency to descend, the basement was charged with it, and consequently the air supplied to the House was in the beginning impure. He thought improved ventilation was imperatively demanded, and was inclined to leave the whole matter in the hands of the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. SPROULE said it must be evident to everyone that they were suffering from a most defective ventilation. It was utterly impossible to have pure ventilation while that air was brought up from the basement. He thought there should be openings in the upper part of the Chamber to allow the vitiated atmosphere free egress. He favoured the suggestion of the hon. member for Lambton that air should be supplied from above ground.

MR. PLUMB said he would withdraw the motion, leaving the whole matter in the hands of the Minister of Public Works.

MR. HESSON said he desired to add, on the same subject, that he came to this House a few weeks ago as strong and healthy a man as could be found in Canada, but he was not in attendance in this Chamber more than nine or ten days before he had to give way, and for the last two weeks he had been decidedly under the weather. He attributed this to the bad atmosphere breathed by the members in the Chamber.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion to agree to resolutions relative to duties of Cus-

toms and Excise reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th).

MR. HOUDE said it was remarkable that most of the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition who had spoken on the new tariff submitted to the consideration of the House had thought proper to taunt the members on the Ministerial side as being bound by mere partisanship to sustain a policy calculated to bring all descriptions of evils upon the country. The last of them, not the least, the hon. member for South Brant, following the footsteps of his friends who had preceded him, concluded his speech by saying that the Ministerialists were sacrificing their principles. It might, perhaps, seem strange to somebody that others had something of that kind to sacrifice. The hon. gentleman added that they were basely robbing this class of the population, and basely robbing that other class, and so forth; in fact, he indulged himself so liberally on baseness, that one might ask what depths he must have come from. But he (Mr. Houde) would not adopt retaliatory tactics towards the hon. gentlemen of the left. He did not see what prestige Parliament could win in the eyes of intelligent people through the course pursued by those hon. gentlemen. In order to defend one's opinions, or to contest those of others, it was not necessary to revile them. Many of his hon. opponents believed the contrary; at least they spoke as though they thought that the best way of raising themselves up was to try to discredit those who disagreed with them. It was a poor reason, indeed, which only proved that they lacked good ones. What had the hon. gentlemen to reproach the members of the right with? There had been before the country on a Protectionist platform, an overwhelming majority declared in favour of it, and now they were going to give the legislation that the mass of the people manifestly expected, and were still wishing for. Would the hon. gentlemen have considered the Ministerialists more deserving their eulogies had the latter been found able to do once in power precisely the contrary of what they pledged themselves to while in the Opposition ranks? Well, of whatever value might be their approbation, he ventured to say that his Ministerial friends were not very

wrong in not copying that page of the political record of the present Opposition. There was, at least, this comforting thought, that the hon. members of the left could make more noise about the new tariff than they could do harm to its supporters. For all the reproaches, the accusations, the arraignments which they were re-hashing now, had been refuted before and during the last general elections, and everyone knew how successfully. They had started more than one hundred and thirty to go and plead before the great tribunal of the nation, and they had come back about sixty in all, so dreadful was the storm which burst out of the thick and gloomy clouds that five years of misuse had heaped up over their heads. Stereotyped in their majestic indifference, they had thought that nothing could reach the height of their pride, and disturb them in the happy enjoyment of power. But even the celebrated Fort Frances Locks became unable to stop the torrent, which, swollen by the blowing of the popular indignation, washed their exalted position away. Nor was that phenomenal tower of the new departmental buildings high enough to save them from the deluge of their political sins. The hon. the late Minister of Public Works had built it in order to immortalise his name; but he was no architect of national prosperity and greatness, and so, instead of being the pedestal of his glory, it remained as a tower of Babel, which witnessed the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of his party, whose extravagance it would only commemorate. And they did not yet seem to have completely recovered from that confusion of tongues which befel them before their dispersion, for, while pretending to advocate the same politics, they contradicted one another in the most amazing manner. For instance, the hon. the late Prime Minister, in his great and elaborate speech at Sarnia, said :

"There is the pretense that a protection on grain would do you a great deal of good, while it would do you a positive and actual injury, because it would not raise the price of your grain one cent, while it would destroy the trade of the country to a great extent in injuring the canals and milling, and many other ways."

Here was now what the hon. the late Finance Minister, the first-lieutenant of

MR. HOUDE.

the hon. leader of the present Opposition, said on the same point in discussing the new tariff :

"The workingman, above all, will feel these heavy duties. The price of farm produce will rise, and he must pay for the increase."

Let them find, if they could, two contentions more contradictory than these. The leader of the Liberal party said "white," and his first lieutenant said "black," on the very same point. Was it surprising, then, that the Liberal ship, having such pilots to guide her on the political sea, should have been so utterly wrecked, and Mr. Speaker himself had had the cruelty of seizing upon the graving dock of Levis, and thus preventing them from repairing their so badly damaged ship. They did not lack steam, but they had no compass, and a very defective helm. Besides, their commander allowed himself to be attracted by the enchanting but deceitful songs of sirens, and turned a deaf ear to the voice of the people on the shore. And now, here were the survivors of the crew, escaped on flotsam ; here were the *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*. He did not deny their courage, but they used it in the bad direction, in doing wrong, as when they laughed at the repeated warnings of the people, their judges, as well as those of the national Conservative party. The few survivors of that wrecked party, especially the hon. member for South Brant, declared that they wished to go and fight the battle over again. Evidently they were great admirers of the legendary cats of Kilkenny. But it was not likely at all that the people would so soon reverse their judgment of the 17th of September last. Then, what would be the advantage of interrupting legislation, leaving grave public interests still longer in distress, and causing great and useless expense to the country? His hon. opponents had already caused enough public expense, and, before asking still for more, they ought at least to give the present Government time to fill up the large deficit which they had left in the Federal Treasury. He could imagine how uncomfortable they felt on the left benches of the House. They were so fond of power, and expected to retain it so long undisturbed. They had fancied that the whole area of the Pacific Ocean separated them from the cold shades of the

Opposition. But they had been deceived by a false mirage, and, when the breeze of September the 17th came, to dissipate the gloom, they saw they had only the width of the Lachine Canal between themselves and the enemy. There was drowned the second lieutenant of their army. And now, they would have probably to make many annual pilgrimages to his grave at St Ann of the "Trap" before they obtained, through his mediation, the favour of returning to power. And that large and resonant clock that the hon. the late Premier had placed last summer in the central tower of the Parliament Buildings to mark the hours of the long and happy life he had expected to spend in the enjoyment of power, served, first, to toll the knell of his Government, and now it remained there to remind him (Mr. Mackenzie), the many departed followers whom his short-sightedness as a pilot on the political sea led to a premature end. Some of the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition had reproached the Ministers with having framed a tariff much higher than what the National Conservative Party had made the country understand it would be; while others had blamed them for not having given it so high as it had had been promised. But no hon. member of the left could prove that the National Conservative party had promised specified rates of duty to be imposed on the importation of foreign goods and products. It would have been improper to do so. What it had promised, through its leaders and its organs, was that every legitimate interest, every branch of national industry would be sufficiently protected. And if his hon. friends of the left were so angry and so unfair to-day with the present Government and its supporters, it was because they had asserted so boldly that no effective protection, no material change of the tariff was to be expected, and because they could not say so any more. That was where the shoe was pinching them and making them feel so uneasy. The hon. gentlemen were using tactics which they might think clever, but which had already proved useless, when they attempted to charge the Ministerialists with their own faults and errors, by pretending that their party was defeated at the last general elections through pre-

judices appealed to by the advocates of the National Policy. The fact was, on the contrary, that, while the latter were explaining the necessity, under the circumstances, of increasing the duties on importations so as to equalise the balance of trade which bore so heavily against Canada, and to invigorate the languishing industries — agricultural, manufacturing, mining and ship-building — of the country, the Liberals were telling the people that the Conservatives wanted to overtax everybody uselessly. And this was what they were still doing here. Where was then the appeal to prejudices and ignorance, on the side of those who spoke so loudly against taxation, often a purely imaginary taxation, and the rest of the time against a necessary taxation, a taxation brought upon them through their own policy and Administration, a taxation that would amply reward the temporary sacrifices asked of the people; or on the part of those who had the courage and the consistency of saying and doing what they knew to be for the good of the country? When the Liberals were seeking the votes of the people, they were full of respect for the "patriotic and intelligent electors;" but no sooner did these same electors disapprove of their policy than they were no longer "patriotic and intelligent;" they became a "selfish and ignorant" majority, in the estimation of the hon. members of the present Opposition; which implied that, in order to be regarded as patriotic and intelligent, it was necessary to view everything through the eyeglasses of these hon. gentlemen. The hon. members of the left pretended that all enlightened people were in favour of Free-trade. Political economy was a science of rather modern origin, and was not yet definitely well fixed. But if they were to weigh the opinions on each side, they would come to the conclusion that the great Protectionist statesmen, such as Colbert, Turgot, Napoleon the First, M. Thiers, in France, and Franklin, Jefferson, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, in the United States, not to speak of others, could compare advantageously for intelligence and genius with the most celebrated authorities in favour of Free-trade. However, he (Mr. Houde), would quote only the most pronounced and renowned writers in favour of Free-

trade in order to convince his hon. friends of the Opposition, if it were possible to convince them of anything on this question, that their doctrine was exaggerated beyond all reasonable limits. They were too much doctrinaires in political economy; they laid down abstract principles and would never deviate from them. In doing so, they went much farther than Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill, whom, nevertheless, they admired as the two greatest writers in favour of Free-trade; and they were right in that opinion. Adam Smith recognised that Protection was advantageous, under certain circumstances. He said:

“To impose duties upon foreign, for the encouragement of native industry, when burthens are laid upon it by foreign nations, is one of the cases in which it is advantageous to protect in this way the home productions. For to lay suitable duties upon the productions of the foreigner who lays burdens upon yours, does not give the monopoly of the home market to the home producer, nor turn towards any particular employment, more capital and labour than would naturally go there. It only hinders that amount of those actually engaged, from being turned away into a less natural direction, and leaves the competition between foreign and domestic industry upon the same footing as before the protecting duty so laid and retaliated.”

He (Mr. Houde) would ask any logical mind whether that proposition laid down by Adam Smith did not apply exactly to Canada's situation, in regard to the United States, which, by imposing heavy duties on our products, deranged the natural course of trade between the two countries. In order to re-establish that equilibrium, it was necessary to treat, at least to a certain extent, the products of the American Republic as it treated those of the Canadian Confederation. Adam Smith admitted that to be defensible on true and sound principles of political economy. John Stuart Mill also admitted another important point which completed the justification of the National Policy proposed by the present Government. He acknowledged the plausibility of Protection, under certain circumstances, in these words:—

“The only case in which, on mere principles of political economy, protecting duties can be defensible, is when they are imposed temporarily, especially in a young and rising nation (as Canada was) in hopes of naturalising a foreign industry, in itself perfectly suitable to the circumstances of the country. The su-

periority of one country over another in a branch of industry often arises only from having begun it sooner. There may be no inherent advantage on one part, or disadvantage on the other, but only a present superiority of skill and experience. A country which has this skill and experience yet to acquire, may, in other respects, be better adapted to the production than those which were earlier in the field; and, besides, it is a just remark of Mr. Rae, that nothing has a greater tendency to promote improvements in any branch of production than its trial under a new set of conditions.”

He (Mr. Houde) would again ask his hon. friends on the left benches, whether that proposition laid down by John Stuart Mill did not apply to the situation of Canada in regard to other countries, particularly to England, and whether, with the one laid down by Adam Smith, it did not cover the whole ground on which the principle of the policy of the present Government was founded. But what was the use of quoting foreign writers as authorities? The country and the House could furnish many a Liberal authority in justification of the political economical principles involved in the new tariff. In 1871 there was formed in the Province of Quebec a new party called the “National Party.” That National Party enlisted under its banner almost the whole of the Liberal party. Such old and prominent Liberals as the Hon. T. Fournier, the Hon. L. Letellier de St. Just, the Hon. P. Pelletier, three gentlemen who had been colleagues in the late Administration with the hon. leader of the present Opposition, put themselves at the head of that organisation. They held a great meeting at Montmagny, and there advocated the National Policy, which this Government was giving to-day to the country. In order to give an idea how far they did go, he would read an extract from a speech of the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, delivered at another large mass meeting in Quebec, on the 28th of March, 1872. It was as follows:—

“The manufactures, the different branches of industry that we could develop with no such advantage, do not meet with sufficient protection. * * * Our country offers immense advantages, and yet it is behind the whole of America, thanks to a want of encouragement to our manufactures, and of outlets for the sale of our products.”

That was, certainly, Protectionist enough; but that was not all. Another hon.

gentleman who was also a colleague of the late Prime Minister, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), was returned in 1871, by the united counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, for the Local Legislature. At the meeting of that Legislature, he rose, and, during the debate on the Address, he complained of the depression which he pretended to prevail throughout the country, laying it at the door of the Conservative party then in power in Quebec and in Ottawa. The course of that depression he described in this way :—

"The principal cause of the evil from which we are suffering is that, until now, the production of the country has not equalled the consumption."

He (Mr. Houde) would ask his hon. friend what better means could be devised to increase the production of the country than by protecting its industries, and thereby increasing its power of production? And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) went on to remark, in the same speech, that Canada was like a man on a bag of gold without being able to use it; or again, as Tantalus, who had a tree laden with ripe fruits, over his head, and water up to his chin, but could not reach either, in order to allay his hunger and thirst. This was how the hon. member for Quebec East depicted Canada in 1871. Yet they all knew that the country was far less suffering then than to-day; that circumstances had altered to an extent which required much more stringently the adoption of the National Policy that the hon. gentleman and his allies had already advocated eloquently. If the House had not fully realised the former views of the National Party, of which he (Mr. Houde) saw here several distinguished members in front of him, he would take the liberty to quote the words of the leader of that party, the Hon. Mr. Joly, who was at present Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec. On the 24th of March, 1876, writing from Quebec to Mr. Orton, chairman of the Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture, he said :

"MY DEAR DOCTOR,—I received, only to-day, a series of printed enquiries, coming from your Committee, in the labours of which I take a deep interest, and I hasten to send you my answers. I fear lest they be a little long; but I must say that I experience a certain

satisfaction to be able to give my views on the subject, of whatever little value they may be.

"It is a kind of protest against the accusation of inconsistency which has been brought against me during that Session, in the House of Commons, and in the Press, to have abandoned the principal plank of the platform of our National party. We claimed, above all, a National Commercial Policy. My friends have been reproached with having abandoned it, and, as the leader of the National party, my name has been coupled with those reproaches; but I have not abandoned that policy."

The House remembered, doubtless, on what memorable occasion that National Policy had been abandoned by the Liberal party. It was when the Hon. Alfred Jones, afterwards Minister of Militia, went to the Ministers of the late Administration, and threatened them with the withdrawal of his support and the support of all the Liberal members from Nova Scotia, if the protecting tariff, which was already framed and ready to be submitted to the Parliament, was proposed by the Government of the day. The National Policy was then dropped, and, with it, down went the Liberal party. The Hon. Mr. Joly was still more explicit in answering the following enquiry :—

"Is it in the interest of Canada that we should continue to admit American products free, while Canadian products exported to the other side of the frontier are submitted to heavy duties?"

"Answer.—No; it is against the interest of Canada. I humbly believe that we should admit free only the raw materials used by our manufactures."

And, again :

"It is not by causing the price of everything to go down that we shall reach national wealth. The dearer we pay, the better for us, providing that our means of paying be at par with the increase of prices. Ask the working-man what he prefers—flour at \$4.50 a barrel and no work, or flour at \$6 and plenty of work? Agriculture and manufacture can, together, arrive at great results; but let those two industries separate their interests, and their divided strengths will be far from being able to accomplish as much."

There was the best answer that could be made to the so-called friends of the poor, who cried for the policy of cheap bread with no work, and it came from one of their own party. That was how the leader of the National party expressed himself on Protection three years ago. The country had been told by prominent Liberals, even in this House, how high-

mindful and patriotic the Hon. Mr. Joly was; how he was "enshrined in the hearts of the people," and deserved to be. How was it, then, that the Conservatives were taunted to-day by the Liberals as being deceivers of the people, selfish politicians, enemies of progress, and heartless oppressors, because they reduced into practice the very principles laid down and advocated by their friend and ally, whose intelligence and patriotism had been so highly praised? Well, it must be because Mr. Joly had the unenviable courage to speak and canvass, from one end of the Province of Quebec to the other, during the last Federal elections, in favour of a Government policy which he previously avowed to be opposed to his principles, and contrary to the welfare of the country. Why did he do so? There was but one plausible explanation for so strange a conduct, not to say more; he was evidently paying a debt of gratitude to the secret influence which had brought him into power in the extraordinary way known to all. He (Mr. Houde) desired next to quote a still greater authority, the hon. leader of the Opposition himself. In his speech at Hamilton, on the 16th of January, 1874, on the eve of the general elections, when he was seeking the votes of the manufacturers and workmen, as well as those of the farmers, the hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

"As I have just said, all parties in the country have accepted the doctrine I lay down, that our revenue must be obtained by means of duties upon imported goods, and the distribution of these duties should always be in such a way as to confer the greatest amount of benefit upon our own people. (Loud cheers.) Then, Sir, with regard to the amount of duty, some say, at least, it will be reduced. I do not contemplate the possibility of its reduction, and in view of the vast public undertakings to which the country is pledged, in the enlargement and completion of our canal system, and the construction of the Pacific Railway, we will be obliged, I fear, to increase it very materially at no distant day, unless the country becomes a great deal richer and more prosperous, during years to come, than we have reason to expect, judging by the past. So that the question of Protection or Free-trade does not arise in this contest at all. Sir Francis Hincks stated, last year, on his election tour, and in the House of Commons, that he was in favour of incidental Protection. I said I was also in favour of it. (Hear! hear!) It is a stupid phrase at best, but it means

MR. HOUDE.

simply this, that as long as duties are levied upon articles imported, they should be levied upon articles produced by our own people. (Cheers.) I do not know a single man in the ranks of my own party who is opposed to that political theory."

So then, the hon. leader of the present Opposition thought and avowed that, in framing or readjusting a tariff, a Government ought to arrange it in such a way as to confer the greatest amount of benefit upon its own people. Therefore, he acknowledged that it was possible, and not only possible but desirable, to help the people to become more prosperous by legislation. Now he contended, with his followers, that it was impossible to do so, that it was foolish to undertake it. Then, he contemplated also "a very material increase" of the tariff, "at no distant day." Why did he oppose it to-day? Was it because the country had "become a great deal richer and more prosperous during" the five years of his Administration? Who would dare to pretend that? According to his own declaration, he did not anticipate such an increase of public wealth and prosperity, and he knew now that it had not taken place. However, he was opposed to that "material increase" of the tariff at a time when it was much more required, by circumstances, than when he made the country believe that his Government would propose it "at no distant day." Surely, it would be difficult to imagine anybody in more open contradiction than the hon. leader of the Opposition had placed himself, as had done also his followers. Of course, that was not partisanship, since it applied to the faultless party, a party so good and with so large and elevated views that the present generation could not understand them. Very likely the next one would not either, unless it underwent some considerable change. The hon. gentlemen could have changed their opinions on such questions, and still be sincere, and deserved to be considered so, provided they had something else than abuse for their opponents to rely upon, and respected more than they seemed disposed to do the convictions of those who happened to disagree with them. Let them prove, if they could, that the new tariff would injure the interests of the country; they had that right. But they had no right to impugn the motives of the present supporters of that policy.

If they found that too much Protection was going to be given, let them say so, and especially prove it; but it was no argument at all to come forward and say that the majority of the House was bound to sustain anything the Government might propose. He did not know whether these hon. gentlemen, when they spoke so, judged their opponents by what they felt sure they would be were they in the place of the latter, or by what they had been when before in their place; but there was a thing he knew, and the hon. members of the left knew it also; it was an easy and agreeable task for the members of the right to help the present Government to make the application of the National Policy, since they had advocated it before, without having the certainty that they would be in a position themselves to bestow it on the country, and since, especially, they had tried before to force it upon the late Ministers, and would have gladly given them the merit of it, should the latter have been wise enough to adopt such a policy. And if he was allowed to speak of himself, in order to give another proof of the injustice of the judgment passed by the hon. gentlemen on the supporters of the present Government, he would say that, far from being actuated by partisanship to sustain that policy, he had advocated it before even the Liberal party undertook to make it a plank of its platform. When that transformed party hoisted up in the Province of Quebec the banner of Protection in 1871, without endorsing all its principles, he looked upon it as a National standard which was destined to lead this Canada of ours into the path of union, greatness, prosperity and happiness. He still thought so; and it was the reason why he cordially supported the present Government, who were to-day the bearers of that standard. The Liberals had let it fall into the dust of the political battlefield. The Conservatives had taken it up at the very moment, when the country, in distress, needed it the most to be resumed, and now they displayed its glorious colours to the eyes of the world, to let the world know that in this vast Dominion there was a free people, a patriotic people, equal to the task of taking due care of its own affairs. He thought it his duty to rally around such

standard-bearers. It might be objected here as it had been elsewhere: Why did not the leaders of the Conservative party adopt that policy before? His answer was, that they had adopted it before. Did they not give the highly protecting tariff of 1858 and 1859? In many respects it was the same as the one now proposed. It was kept in force until 1866, when, in order to effectuate the grand scheme of Confederation, and considering that the Maritime Provinces had not been educated up to the same political economical principles, and that their opinions could not be changed in a day, it was lowered from 20 and 25 to 15 per cent. on the average. It was true that he had been one of those who thought that it would have been better not to wait too long before raising it again, in view of the fact that, the prices of raw materials, and the salaries of workmen being on a continuous decline in Great Britain and the United States, our various industries were meeting with a competition becoming every day more and more difficult to face. But it was only just to state, also, that this necessity was much less felt during the administration of the Conservative party, from the establishment of Confederation till the resignation of the Macdonald Government, in 1873, than under the following Government. They all knew that the great depression in every branch of industry and business was posterior to the resignation of the Conservative Government and the accession of the Liberals to power. He was touching here the very point of political economy where his hon. friends of the left were most in error. They spoke as though there were, in fiscal politics, invariable principles or rules applicable indiscriminately to all countries and all circumstances. Nothing was more erroneous than such an assumption. What was good for one country might not be so good for another. What was advantageous to-day might become disadvantageous to-morrow. There was nothing absolute in that; all was relative; all depended upon the circumstances, not only in which a given country was placed, but even upon those in which others, with which it had commercial relations, might be, or become, placed. An example, well known to every attentive observer of events, would

make him better understood. From 1867 till 1873, Canada had a tariff averaging 15 per cent. Well, it was perfectly true that, under its operation, our industries had had to suffer much less from American competition than under the increased tariff of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. average afterwards given by the Mackenzie Government, because in the former case Canadian industries were indirectly protected by the high prices of raw materials, and the high salaries of the workmen paid by the American manufacturers, while in the latter case the great reduction of the prices of raw materials and the salaries of workmen in the United States had the effect of doing more than neutralise the last increase of our tariff to the extent of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. This was an illustration of the proposition which he adhered to, that in such matters all was relative, nothing absolute. The hon. gentlemen of the Opposition were always ready with instances in relation to England in favour of their theory. It was all very well for them to look at England and point out how powerful a manufacturing country she was to-day; but they neglected to say that for centuries England had been the most Protectionist country that ever existed. In order to prove that he was right in saying so, he would quote from words written by Adam Smith, not a suspicious authority, more than a century ago, showing the high protecting tariff that existed in England at that time. Here were the words :

"The variety of goods of which the importation into Great Britain is prohibited, either absolutely or under certain circumstances, greatly exceeds what can easily be suspected by those who are not well acquainted with the laws of the Customs."

That showed well enough how Protectionist England had been for so long. If, afterwards, she became in a position to derive benefits from Free-trade, it was because Protection had paved for her the way to it. He was not more opposed to Free-trade than to Protection in the abstract, but he wanted Protection first so as to arrive at Free-trade in advantageous condition. However, it was not likely that absolute Free-trade would ever prevail amongst civilised nations, and for two reasons: first, the time

seemed passed forever when manufacturing industries were monopolised by a few capitalists. Almost every nation wished now to have manufactures of one kind or the other within the limits of its own territory, and the necessity of protecting new industries against competing old and more strongly established ones was sure to prevent general Free-trade from prevailing. Besides, the development of progress, as well as public security, necessitated more or less heavy expenses everywhere, and, in order to meet them, taxation was required. And between the different modes of taxation devised till now, none seemed more acceptable to the mass of the people than the Customs duties. If these taxes were wisely fixed, they bore the least upon the man who happened to be in adverse circumstances; for a tariff cleverly arranged would not impose duties upon prime necessities of life which were not, or could not be, easily and sufficiently produced in the country intended to be protected. That system had this advantage, that it allowed a person to pay his part of contribution to the public revenue when it was the most convenient for him to do so, and in the measure of his means. It was the tax on revenue, so eagerly looked after by many writers on political economy, but an indirect one, which operated in the most equitable manner, without hindering, as the direct tax did, enterprise and production. It realised, as much as seemed possible, the law of equalisation of the indispensable burdens imposed by the Government upon the citizens, for their mutual security and benefit. Very likely, most of the nations would retain it in force to a greater or less extent, thus preventing absolute Free-trade between each other. Hon. members of the left had spoken of Protection as being opposed to the progress of humanity, because they pretended that it increased the difficulties of relations between the different nations, and thus prevented them from knowing and liking each other better. It might appear so when only one side of the question was considered; but, in reality, it was the contrary that was true. In fact, supposing England was the only great industrial country in the world, Englishmen would be known everywhere, as they were; but other

nations would not know much of each other through commercial relations. But, as the manufacturing industries were spreading in almost every direction, the commercial relations of each country became more numerous and more extensive. Experience was there to teach us that two manufacturing countries often exchanged together products of the same kind. This was due to individual initiative. And, in order to favour individual initiative, there was certainly no better way than to diversify, as much as possible, the careers which your own people could follow. The more different careers there were open to the inhabitants of a country, the better the development of all kinds of talents and aptitude was favoured. Consequently, the mass of the people became so much more enlightened, so much more advanced in progress; while, at the same time, it was easier for a man to follow the career for which he had special aptitude, to get his living in it. And, what must be one of the principal objects and desires of a Government worthy of that name, if it was not to procure to the mass of the people the easiest means of getting along in the world, of earning their living? The hon. gentlemen of the Opposition pretended the contrary; they contended that a Ministry had nothing to do with the increase or the decrease of the prosperity of the people; that it could not legislate to help them in this way. That was the most extraordinary principle that ever was laid down so emphatically since the Christian nations had come out of the barbarous ages and assumed the control of their Governments. These hon. gentlemen were too much doctrinaires in political economy. They indirectly said to their people: "You can do this more cheaply than that, and you must do it, whether you like it or not, no matter if you have less aptitude for it than for other work." That was an absurdity. For instance, some wanted to make almost all the Canadians farmers, whether they liked or not, and were able or not to till the soil, and could succeed in that occupation. It was true that a large portion of our population made good farmers; but many had taste and aptitude for other callings. The great number of Canadians who left this country, where they could not find a

sufficient diversity of works, to go to the United States, where more protected industries offered them better employment, was a good proof of the correctness of his contention. He estimated the number of Canadians in the United States at least at six hundred thousand, including those born in Canada and those born of Canadian parents. Some people thought it was only the French Canadians who emigrated, and that it was almost impossible to prevent their emigration, attributed to their adventurous character. It was a mistake; the French Canadians preferred their native country to a foreign one, and they proved it by trying to return home as soon as they could improve their situation. And there were not only French Canadians in the United States; one could count there, also, English-speaking Canadians by thousands. For instance, there were so many Nova Scotians in Massachusetts alone that, some years ago, it was to his knowledge that there were in Boston intelligence offices exclusively kept for supplying Nova Scotian help. And he must add that Nova Scotians were highly appreciated by the Americans for their qualities as good and intelligent workers, as were, in general, all Canadians. Besides, there were about a couple of thousand of persons of British origin who, after having uselessly sought employment in Canada, for want of diversity and development of industries, had, in different times, crossed over to the other side of the frontier, and enriched the Americans with their skill and labour. So, it was not a question which affected only the sympathies of the French Canadians, but which ought to touch the feelings of all patriotic Canadians of every origin. The best way to retain our own population at home, and to attract a good immigration from the Mother Country, was to provide diversified and better employment for the working classes. The hon. the leader of the Opposition, and his hon. friend on his right (Mr. Cartwright), had laid great stress on the alleged fact that the United States were ruined by Protection. How was it, then, that a considerable part of our population was still leaving our shores to go and find employment there? But he would again answer the hon. gentleman on this point, with the utterances of the hon. gentle-

man himself. He would take the liberty of refreshing the memory of the hon. gentleman by quoting another extract from one of his speeches. At Sarnia the hon. gentleman had said :

"From the beginning of 1873, it was quite evident that the United States manufacturers had, to a great extent, regained their lost position. In 1874 they were able to export great quantities of cotton goods to this country, and pay our duties. They were actually enabled to export cotton goods to the English cotton markets, which are supposed to rule the world. During the last few months they have been able to export refined sugar to the very heart of the refining portion of Great Britain, London and the Clyde, and between them and the French they have almost succeeded in driving the British refiners out of the market! It was almost impossible that Canada could escape a considerable amount of suffering by this cause. The complaints of Canadian manufacturers have been that this has been made what is called a sacrifice market for these goods, and no doubt that has been productive of great provocation to our manufacturers, and injury to the trade of Canada."

Three years ago, the hon. gentleman acknowledged that the United States were making a strong competition to England, in the manufacturing industries, and that they were able to injure the commerce of Canada; now he said they were ruined by Protection. Three years ago, according to the hon. gentleman, it was the American producer who paid our duties, to come on our market; but, now, after the same authority, it was the Canadian consumer. For an adherent of absolute principles on political economical questions, that was a rather strange contradiction. But the hon. gentleman did not compare the distress alleged to prevail in the United States, with the one from which England was suffering, and for cause. For almost every day cable despatches were informing us that strikes occurred here and there, that wages were reduced, and reduced again to a minimum, that such and such establishments were shut in the different business centres of England. We did not hear of so much distress in the United States. It was not logical reasoning to quote two facts, and because they were contemporary, to say that they must be the result of the same cause; or, because one was anterior to the other, to say that the latter must be necessarily the effect of the former. They must look at all the circumstances, consider all the phases of

the question. For instance, the great strike which occurred in Pennsylvania, a few years ago, and terminated in bloodshed, and which the hon. leader of the Opposition gave as an illustration of the evils of Protection, was posterior to the establishment of Protection in the United States and contemporary of its being continued in operation; but that terrible strike was not the result of Protection at all. The strikers were not workmen in factories, but employes on railroads. Then there was no more protection for railroads in the United States than in Great Britain, or in any other country. As to the financial crisis, it was not either the result of protection to native industries. It was caused by that spirit of speculation which was so largely spread amongst the Americans to-day, and which had been so greatly stimulated by their long and ruinous Civil War. Railroad enterprises were especially the ground on which it had developed itself the most. Protection had nothing to do there. The signal of the discomfiture had been given by the heavy failure of Messrs. Jay Cooke & Co. That enormous failure of that banking-house, then considered one of the strongest, shook the confidence of the whole country, and damaged very badly its credit, and, as a natural consequence, it was followed by many others. Messrs. Jay Cooke speculated in railroad stocks, and were not engaged in industries. In spite of all the disadvantages under which the United States had been placed by the Civil War, which had burdened the nation with an enormous debt and heavy taxes, they had recuperated themselves very rapidly, thanks, in a great measure at least, to the protection of their native industries, which enabled them to increase considerably their power of production. They had reduced their national debt by over seven hundred millions of dollars; they had reduced the internal taxes; and, so abundant to-day was money amongst the American people that the Government of Washington withdrew hundreds of millions of dollars of its bonds from the markets of Europe, and asked its own people to subscribe for new loans, which they did, there being some days when several millions of dollars were subscribed for in a few hours. That

made the Americans retain for themselves the profits of the interest on their national bonds, and, at the same time, enable their country to have a large amount of interest. That illustrated, of course, the depressed condition of the American people, depicted in such gloomy colours by the hon. the late Finance Minister, and others. In 1860, the United States imported 362 millions of dollars of foreign goods, and exported 333 millions of their products; while in 1878, they imported 466 millions, and exported 694 millions of dollars; their revenue from Customs being 53 millions in 1860, and 130 millions of dollars in 1878. That showed pretty clearly how rapidly and considerably their power of production and consumption also increased with a protecting tariff, in spite of a ruinous Civil War of four years. In 1860 they bought from other countries 20 millions of dollars more than they sold to them; in 1878, they sold 227 millions more than they bought; always impoverished by Protection. Their agricultural products, in 1860, were worth 295 millions of dollars; in 1878, they were 592 millions. In 1870, they had 235 millions of bushels of wheat; in 1878, 365 millions of bushels. Did that show that the great source of wealth, agriculture, had been impaired by Protection? Certainly not. It was not necessary for the hon. leader of the Opposition to go so far to give examples; he could have given the example of Canada under his own administration. Was it richer and more prosperous than the United States? Well, why was our population leaving our shores by thousands, to go and find there employment that it could not have here? Was it not seeking the country where prosperity was most general and work most abundant; and work especially because it was the best measure of the wealth of a country. What was going on in Canada during about the same time? Our national debt had increased sixty-four millions of dollars. The interest on it had increased from four to six and a-half millions of dollars a year. Under the late Administration, there had been over six millions of dollars deficit of expenditure over revenue. From 1867 to 1878 we had bought from other countries 249½ millions of dollars'

worth more than we sold. The contrast told for itself. He would not like to be too long, but he could not help noticing some queer points raised by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. They said that the Government and its supporters were going to tax the poor more than the rich. One went so far as to speak of "the piano of the poor man." Well, that was certainly a tune that would not take amongst the people; for he who bought pianos was not a poor man, or at least could not be considered as such. Pianos were not a necessary of life, not even a commodity, but only a luxury. Others had instanced cottons, woollens, and so forth, and pretended that, for these goods, the poor were taxed more than the rich. It was not so in reality; for the class of articles upon which was put the heaviest duty was going to be manufactured in the country. The mass of our people would consequently buy an article not taxed at all, while the rich, who bought more imported goods, would have to pay a great deal more taxes. Besides, it was easy to understand that a compound duty, specific and *ad valorem*, was imposed in certain cases, only in order to prevent under-valuations, often resorted to by importers in order to defraud the public revenue and injure honest trade. Was not that in the interest of the people? Another gentleman, the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), had also remarked, with indignation, that china, the article of the rich, bore a less duty than pottery, the article of the poor. What was the fact? The rich bought china imported from other countries, and would have to pay a duty, while the poor could buy pottery made in Canada, and would have no such Customs duty to pay. And while they contended, on one hand, that consumers would have to pay much dearer for manufactured articles, thanks to the new tariff, they asserted, on the other hand, that manufacturers would be ruined by too great a competition between themselves, being obliged to sacrifice their goods at low prices. Well, such a competition was precisely what was in the interest of consumers. Goods sacrificed at low prices was what the poor wanted. Such were the illogical contentions of the hon. members of the left. He was

amazed when the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance and the hon. the leader of the Opposition told the House that the present Government proposed a policy tending to Communism. He thought that the policy advocated by these hon. gentlemen and their followers was a great deal nearer to Cosmopolitanism, another part of Socialism, than the National Policy now submitted to Parliament was like Communism. The Socialists wanted to abolish all nationalities. They said: "Why impose restrictions on relations between nations? It is not philanthropic, not according to human progress. We must have the freest relations between all the inhabitants of the world; there must be no distinction between men." Was not that resembling, in a certain degree, the policy propounded by the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, who wished to deny us the right of adopting a Protective tariff, because they pretended that there ought to be a universal Free-trade, and that it was wrong on our part to hinder it? So, in commercial matters at least, they laid aside all national considerations. That was Cosmopolitanism in one of its forms, and Cosmopolitanism was a part of Socialism, which was itself a part of Communism. So it was clear the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition were advocating a policy much more really in accord with the principles of Communism than that of the present Government was. It was very well to speak in the interest of humanity, but where was to be found the class of men able to govern the whole world? To undertake to legislate in the interest of the whole world would not result in the true interest of humanity, because Providence was as wise as the Liberal party of Canada, and the Free-traders in general, and it had established different nationalities in order that each might be, not perfectly governed, for nothing could be perfect when man was the instrument used to do it, but in the least imperfect manner possible. Let every Government legislate the best in the interest, and for the welfare of its own people; that was the surest way of promoting human progress and general happiness. But the hon. gentlemen on the left benches said: "You are going

MR. HOUDE.

to make the Americans angry with Canada because of your new tariff." Surely, it was not the interest of the Canadian people to give to their neighbours subjects of complaint, and it was not their wish or their intention either. But he had read the chief organs of public opinion in the United States, and found that they fully recognised the right of Canada to frame a tariff to suit her own interests. There were only a few unimportant exceptions, comprising some rabid newspapers, which, on another occasion, in regard to the fishery award, insulted Canada and Great Britain, and threatened us with war. Those newspapers did not reflect the true public opinion in the United States, nor echo the real sentiment of the American nation. The intelligent organs admitted that we were only following their example in adopting a Protectionist policy, which their own country had pursued itself. In fact, we were rather paying a compliment to their wisdom and practical sense in imitating their example. There had been made more serious charges against the supporters of the National Policy. These had been accused of being disloyal to the Mother Country. He did not believe the Mother Country thought so itself; that was, at least, if we were to accept as its opinion the answer given by the Imperial Government to a member of the Opposition in the British House of Commons, as well as the words of the principal organs of public opinion in the United Kingdom, such as the *Times*, the *News*, and others. They might disapprove of our tariff, but they were intelligent and fair enough to recognise that we had the right of arranging our fiscal policy according to our own interests. That was precisely what they were continually doing in Great Britain. We saw, often, the Mother Country making international treaties, and otherwise legislating for its exclusive interest, irrespective of ours, and we did not complain. The inhabitants of Great Britain had their special Parliament to look after their own interests, and so had we ours. This was our right. We might sometimes legislate against the interest of a certain portion of the inhabitants of Great Britain, but we ought to be as dear to the Mother Country as the

inhabitants on the banks of the Thames. The same loyalty was expected from us; consequently, the same regard was due to us. We did not enjoy all the political privileges enjoyed by the inhabitants of Great Britain, but we had the same natural rights as they had themselves. Natural rights existed whether they were recognised or not. And it was a natural right for a people to decide from whom they would buy or not, what kind of work they would do, what necessaries and commodities of life they would try to produce. But, far from being opposed to the great interests of the British Empire, our present policy would indirectly benefit them. The Empire did not comprise only the inhabitants of Great Britain, but all the British citizens living under the British flag; and so, to make one integral part of the Empire great and prosperous was according to the British interests. To-day there were in Great Britain hundreds of thousands of workmen out of employment and suffering with their families, half clad and almost starving, for want of necessaries of life. If this National Policy helped the progress of the industries of Canada, as there was no doubt it would, it opened to us an era of prosperity. We could better develop our vast North-Western Territories, and there provide homes for our suffering brethren in the Mother Country, who could emigrate here, instead of seeking a refuge in the United States, by thousands, as they did till now. And in coming here they would remain still under the British flag, and, in case of necessity, defend it. That policy was then in the British interest, well understood. He remembered that, a few years ago, the hon. the leader of the present Opposition entertained very different views on this subject of our legislative independence. In his great speech at Sarnia the hon. gentleman said :

"Sir Alexander Galt, who is a very distinguished public man, belonging to the Conservative party, in a recent manifesto, I suppose I must call it, refers to the policy of the country in this respect (Washington Treaty), and he hopes, or I should rather say advocates, that, for the future, all legislation, and all treaty obligations, shall be entered into by the Canadian Government from a purely Canadian standpoint. Well, that is precisely the policy of this Administration. We have, long ago,

passed the bounds of an ordinary colony of Great Britain; we have assumed the proportions of a nation."

The hon. gentleman contended, then, that all our legislation should be entered into from a purely Canadian standpoint. What a different position he had taken in regard to this new tariff, when he had been setting before the House pictures of angry Americans and dissatisfied Englishmen, in order to deter the Parliament from legislating from a Canadian standpoint. The hon. gentleman seemed evidently anxious to contradict himself entirely in reference to all questions connected with this tariff. The National Policy had also been alleged to be anti-Federal. The hon. gentlemen of the Opposition had said it would set Province against Province, class against class. They did not practice what they taught. For since the beginning of this Session he had heard almost continual appeals from the hon. gentlemen to prejudice, and attempts to raise sectional feelings, to set one class against the other, farmers against manufacturers, workmen against farmers, and so forth. The National Policy was not calculated to do that; far from it. It was calculated to promote public spirit in the whole Dominion; for instance, to make the inhabitants of Nova Scotia understand that, if we made the great Province of Ontario prosperous, they would benefit from that prosperity, because they were really members of the same social body, although imaginary lines separated them from the other part of the country; and *vice versa* for every Province. Some had spoken of salaries, of prices. He would not abuse, much longer, the kind indulgence of the House, especially in the English language, which he spoke so imperfectly, in entering into further details, but he would only say on this last point, that, taking the people as a whole, as the members of a same national family, it was delusive to draw a line between the interests of consumers and producers, as all were consumers, and almost all could be also considered producers, in one way or the other. Consequently, to increase the power of production of a nation was at the same time an equivalent increase of its power of consumption. It mattered not whether the people paid dear or

cheap for the necessaries and commodities of life that they bought; but it mattered whether their means of buying were equal to their wants. All was there. That was the elementary principle of political economy. He could not take his seat without alluding especially to the Liberals of the Province of Quebec—these enthusiastic admirers of the Papi-neaus, the Lafontaine, and the Morins. They did not seem to remember that those great patriots were so much in favour of a National Policy that they advised the people not to consume a single article that was not produced in the country, how cheap soever it was offered to them. He did not conceal that, some years ago, he had some confidence in these hon. gentlemen; but, since he had seen their numerous right-about-wheels, or, rather, left-about-wheels, on questions of the gravest importance, he had felt that confidence considerably shaken, politically speaking. They had constituted themselves the advocates of personal power; they were admirers of bureaucracy, and appeared now willing to sacrifice the legislative independence of Canada, under the pretence not to make the Americans angry, and the inhabitants of Great Britain dissatisfied with us. There were certainly details in the tariff of which he did not entirely approve; but, considering the tariff as a whole, he approved of it; he approved of its principle, and it was the principle, not the details, that was under discussion now, and for which the vote of the House was asked. He thought that, if his constituents were here instead of himself, they would vote for it. He had confidence enough in their intelligence and patriotism, to believe that they would approve of a measure calculated to make the country in general great and prosperous, since they must derive a part of its prosperity and share its greatness. Consequently, he would vote with pleasure in favour of the resolutions proposed by the hon. Finance Minister.

MR. ORTON said the abstract question of Free-trade *versus* Protection and revenue tariff *versus* a protective tariff had been pretty well exhausted in former Sessions of this House. They had had Adam Smith, Mill, Bastiat, Bright, Cobden and others, quoted in favour of

MR. HOUDE.

the one side, and eminent Protectionist writers quoted in favour of the other side. All the arguments that could be imagined in favour of either side had been presented to the people in the most attractive form. They had heard philosophical dissertations on the balance of trade, also long discussions with regard to the injury that would accrue by the building up of the cities at the expense of the rural districts, and the danger from over-production. Selfish sectional interests had been pitted one against the other; class had been set against class, and, indeed, there had not been a jealousy or prejudice that had not been introduced to convince, or cajole, or lead the people to the one view or the other. Party reviews had been held from one end of the country to the other, and party flags had been floated before the gazing multitude, to the music of the various bands. But all this was passed; the battle had been fought and won. Nor could the victory be called one of chance, even the great Mogul of the Reform party having stated candidly, in the *Globe*, that the fight had been a fair stand-up fight, and the victory fairly won. The people had declared, by an overwhelming majority, for the National Policy, which was based on Protection, and their sovereign will must be obeyed. It was part of their political faith, whether Conservatives or Reformers, that the verdict of the people was generally correct, and rebellion against it was nothing but heresy, which it also was to go on reiterating exploded doctrines condemned by the popular voice. It was too late to discuss now old abstract political questions. He was astonished to find that the gentlemen of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and calling themselves Reformers, should still continue to oppose themselves to the decisive will of the country. He had failed to observe, in the speeches of these hon. gentlemen, that fair spirit of criticism, that loyal desire to carry out the wishes of the people with the greatest amount of good and least of evil, even from their own standpoint. He could not think that the patriotism of the Reform party had vanished with their loss of the Treasury benches, but he thought that the great stream of opinion of the 17th September last had very consider-

ably dilapidated their order and bewildered their better senses. But, after all, practical experience was the best guide in human affairs of victors and vanquished. He thought there was no man who studied the carefully-prepared tariff just brought down by the Finance Minister, and who had listened to his able statement on the occasion, and subsequently, but must have felt that that tariff bore the impress of deep and serious consideration—not such consideration as one might expect from a heaven-born Finance Minister like the member for Centre Huron, but such as might be arrived at by a Minister like the present, with the counsel of the most able and experienced business men of our country. That tariff would not bear unduly on any class of the community; every individual would bear his full share of the taxation rendered necessary by the depressed financial condition of the country, which depression was, to a large extent, brought about by the mismanagement of the late Government. It not only pressed fairly and equally on all, but afforded encouragement to every class of industries, and would be, to a large extent, the means of stimulating the industrial energies of the people to the bringing about of a more prosperous state of affairs. From all sides they heard that the tariff had received the approval of the people. Only to-day he had received a letter from one of his constituents, stating that Reformers there, who had opposed Conservatives and their policy, had found it so beneficial that they had declared themselves not only in favour of that policy, but of its Conservative authors.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Name; name him.

MR. ORTON said a large number of other Reformers were of the same mind now. Of course, some who had fought a stout battle against Conservatives and their National Policy were not so ready to express their honest feelings; but enough was known to show the great extent of the belief that the tariff would be eminently successful. This fact was a great gratification to himself. He remembered the time that to speak about protection to the agricultural interest was considered heresy, when the idea

was frowned down by their large hostile majority, and when the organs supporting the then Government throughout the length and breadth of the country denounced all who rose to maintain the interests of the great agricultural class. He had always held—and was proud to see the doctrine about to be generally accepted—the principle expressed in these words of Sir Joshua Child:—"That trade and land are twins, which always have and ever will, wax and wane together. If it goes ill with lands, trade will feel it; if ill with trade, land will fall." He had endeavoured to show that it was to the benefit not only of manufacturers, but the general industries, to facilitate the development and improve the prosperity of the agricultural community. He was proud that this tariff had for one of its most distinctive features that assistance to the agricultural interest promised by the Conservatives, and that relief from the injurious competition of the farmers of the United States. It would secure our farmers the home market, and they could take their surplus, as in the past, to the foreign market. Their being obliged to compete unfairly with the farmers of the neighbouring Republic had been for a number of years a very great injury to Canada. Their agriculturists might be further protected, but he could not help feeling that, in general, they had received a fair share of justice. Every class had been called upon, more or less, to sacrifice something for the general benefit. There was one thing that would complete, in his opinion, the system just inaugurated, which had been advocated by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), a national currency, which would stop a severe drain on Canadian wealth. With it, the Government, instead of borrowing money in the British market, and injuring the country by sending away its gold to pay the interest on those loans, would stop the reduction of Canadian wealth, and confer a great boon on the country, thus completing the great National Policy, and helping to develop every resource in the Dominion. He hoped, before Parliament rose, to hear this great question discussed. He was very happy to find that the member for South Norfolk was bringing it forward in a practical way, and he hoped it would receive the careful and

earnest consideration of every hon. member on both sides.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. ORTON said he had been referring, before six, to the importance of the Government considering the inauguration of a national currency, or its assumption of a regulative power to a larger extent than hitherto over the credit system of the country. He thought there were very few in that House but had felt the injurious and baneful effects, especially in times of depression, of the prevalent want of confidence in the monetary system, the want of credit. They had felt the shrinkage of the public credit. Their various industries had been crippled through the drainage of money that had resulted, not only by over importation, but, by the diminution, to a large extent, of that credit based upon gold, and the payment of large sums for interest in Great Britain, thereby reducing the credit of Canada. He hoped the inauguration of a national currency would receive the serious consideration of the House. Great good to the people would result from it. He had also referred to the country's reception of the National Policy, and was about to notice its reception by men who had opposed it and the present Opposition. He had touched upon the emphatic way in which the people declared for that policy, and the way that decision had been received by the present Opposition. He wished to supplement his remarks with something in regard to the way in which the newborn baby, as hon. gentlemen opposite had called the National Policy, had been received by the Opposition. They might well recollect it when, after Confederation, when the Government undertook the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, the then Opposition used the same means to defeat it which to-day was employed for another purpose to defeat the National Policy. Before this hope of the country, this newborn babe, which had exalted the hopeful anticipations of our country to the highest pitch, was fairly allowed to breathe, they found the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite in the same unpatriotic way,

MR. ORTON.

and with the same murderous intent, as with the Pacific Railway, disregarding the expressed wishes of the people, had attempted to destroy this policy in its very childhood. But by the strong arm of the people, protected and nourished in their warm affections, he had great faith in the vitality and vigour of that child, and he hoped they would see it rise to manhood, and develop its strength throughout the length and breadth of the land. He regretted to see the course pursued by the leading organs of the Reform party. He had hoped they would take that patriotic position taken by the late Opposition in the last Parliament. They gave every facility for, and assisted in every way to carry out the policy foreshadowed by the late Government. They did not attempt to hamper that policy until they found that it was destructive to the best interests of the country. He hoped a better spirit would yet prevail, not only amongst the members of the Opposition, but amongst the leading organs throughout the country, and he hoped that a fair and honest trial would be given to the National Policy. They found that the *Globe* newspaper was attacking that policy in every shape and form, trying to arouse class jealousies, and set the various sections of the country against each other. He had in his hand a very graphic description of the attitude of the *Globe* newspaper on this question. He thought it described that attitude very clearly. There was also a graphic description of the supposed editor of that newspaper—the Hon. George Brown. He was facing both ways. On the one hand he told the farmer he would get no better price for his oats, and, on the other hand, he told the cabman he would have to pay more for his oats, and that the policy would result in the destruction of his business. It was true that the price of oats and other grains throughout the country had very considerably advanced since the inauguration of this policy. In his section of the country it had risen to about the full extent of the duty imposed. He knew wheat had risen in value in his country, not very largely. He did not believe that the most enthusiastic advocate of the National Policy ever hoped or expected that the price of wheat

would rise to a very great extent from the imposition of additional duties. He had claimed that it would have the result of raising the price of wheat *oc. a bushel*, on an average, and he was glad to see that that advance had already been made. But this policy would also advance the interest of those who had to buy food. It would give more work to the labourer, it would give more work to the cabman, it would give such an impetus to the trade and business of the country that he would require a larger number of carriages and a larger number of horses, and every industry in our land would be stimulated. He would confine his remarks to the consideration of some ideas that had struck him in the course of the debate. The hon. member for West Middlesex had stated in his speech that the new tariff was revolutionary in its character. He (Mr. Orton) thought, if it did produce a perfect revolution, it would be of immense benefit to this country. It would change the condition of the country from a condition in which the labouring men were wandering about the streets willing to work, but unable to earn enough money with which to buy bread to sustain the lives of themselves and their families. But they would be able to find plenty of work in a short time, and furnish plenty of support to their families; therefore he hoped they would have a complete revolution as the result of the initiation of this policy. But the hon. gentleman went on to argue that the result of this policy would be to discriminate against the Mother Country. The main arguments of the hon. gentleman in reference to that point had been well answered by the hon. the Minister of Finance. But, at the same time, thoughts had suggested themselves to him on that point, and he wished to show that, even if it did touch the tender feelings of some of the manufacturing interests of Great Britain, it might be the lever by which a broader and more comprehensive commercial policy would be inaugurated by Great Britain. He hoped it would be one of the means that would bring about the inauguration of a commercial policy on the part of Great Britain that would not only regard the immediate interests of those that inhabited the United Kingdom, but would comprehend, in its broad particu-

lar embrace, not only the British Isles, but every colony in the British Empire, every portion of the globe that owed allegiance to our Gracious Sovereign. If he was not mistaken, they had, in their great Colonial Empire, everything necessary for man, and everything that the varied fancy of man could desire. It was a world within itself, and, with those possessions, he maintained Great Britain would consider her own interests and the interests of the Colonial Empire if she were to inaugurate a policy, with regard to those countries, which excluded her manufacturing products of high protective duties. Were she to impose a duty upon their breadstuffs and their meatstuffs, and to allow the breadstuffs and meatstuffs of the Colonies to come in free, the result would be to largely increase the wealth of that Empire, and give a market for her manufactures, and employment to her starving masses. What effect would it have upon the Dominion of Canada? Why, if only a small duty were placed on foreign bread and meatstuffs, the effect would be almost inconceivable. Our great North-West would soon be filled up, and lands, which were now valueless, would become very valuable. The Dominion of Canada, together with other Colonial possessions, would be able to produce all the bread and meatstuffs Great Britain would require. The United States would not then continue to pursue that purely selfish policy she had pursued in the past. It would be utterly impossible for her to continue it in the face of such duties imposed by Great Britain. Her country would soon become, to a large extent, depopulated, and Canada would have the advantage of attracting not only emigration from Europe, but emigration from the United States. The ulterior consequence would be that the United States, instead of occupying the position she had occupied during the last ten or twelve years; instead of refusing reciprocity and fair trade relations to Canada, notwithstanding the humiliating advances that had been made by this country, would come to sue to Great Britain to save her commercial interests. This was a matter engaging the attention of men in high positions in Great Britain, and they had urged upon the British Government a consideration of this ques-

tion, which was hampering the industries of England to an alarming extent. Foreign countries would impose duties hostile in their character to Great Britain, which had resulted in reducing her commercial greatness to an enormous extent. He noticed, the other day, that Lord Beaconsfield had said that the wealth of Great Britain had been reduced, within the last few years, £80,000,000. How was that reduction brought about? It was brought about by the protective tariffs of other countries, in hostility to the Free-trade policy of Great Britain. He would take the liberty of reading some remarks made at a meeting of a Chamber of Commerce, held at Heckmondwike, on the 12th February last, by Mr. Zossenheim, of Huddersfield, a very important manufacturing centre. He said :

“Let us see what line of policy Cobden followed in the French Treaty, and how it happened he was successful. I think a more erroneous view than is generally taken of that Treaty can hardly be conceived. Do you suppose that a Free trade spirit came suddenly over the French people when they opened their commerce to us? It was nothing of the kind. We reduced our duties on wines, abolished our duties on all manufactured goods, 15 per cent. on silks, and 10 per cent. on woollens, etc., and by doing this we created in France a powerful interest in our favour. The wine growers, silk manufacturers, and other parties interested, formed a strong party to fight our battle, because it was their interest to do so. Times have changed; they don't fear our retaliation now, and the Protectionists are clamouring for higher duties, although they can compete with us easily, and beat us in many of their productions. Now, if that was the successful policy in France, why not apply a similar one to other countries? In the first place, it is of importance to call into life an interested party in a country to fight our battle of Free-trade; without that you can never succeed. I should begin the struggle with Spain. We take from Spain the greater part of her wines and other products; in return she has put higher duties on our productions than on those from any other country. She has virtually excluded our commerce. Is it reasonable that we should stand such nonsense? One energetic friendly letter from Her Majesty's Government would settle that question satisfactorily. Only give them notice that our ports will be closed to their wines and their products if they do not treat us on reasonable terms; you will then see a strong interested party rise in Spain in our favour, and the result will be a certain victory. We can, without difficulty or inconvenience, exclude Spain from our commerce for any length of time until she treats us

fairly. Once the Spanish question settled, I should treat with Portugal in a similar manner, and a speedy victory may safely be predicted. I should continue the operation with one country after another, keeping our biggest and best friends to the last. If you have once established that policy, and acted upon it, the cause of Free-trade will be saved. You will see spring up, as by magic, such vigorous action on the part of interested parties in every country, that there will be no difficulty to establish international commercial relations on a satisfactory basis. As an example how efficaciously the fear of retaliation works, I will, with your permission, read a small paragraph which appeared in the newspapers of the 6th of February:—‘The apprehended prohibition against the importation of American cattle into England is exciting considerable attention in the States. The President, telegraphing in reply to the Governor of Illinois, says Mr. Evarts had made a full statement to the British Government, and adds that there were prospects of a favourable settlement of the matter.’ Well, all the representation on the part of our Government, and of all our Chambers of Commerce, since the American war, have not called forth as much notice in America as this apprehended temporary prohibition against the importation of American cattle into England. The reason is easily explained; the former were based on theory, the latter upon practical interests. Depend upon it, you will never advance a step in the direction of Free-trade abroad by theory or moral example; but once adopt an energetic, practical policy, and Free-trade will make rapid strides in the whole world.”

He had always thought the inauguration in Canada of a National Policy should be merely a means to an end, and that end the obtaining of favourable commercial relations with other countries. He hoped, in a short time, we would be in a position to compete favourably even with our more formidable neighbour across the border, and that they would see it to their interests to give us fair trade relations and open up their ports to us in return for our admitting their products on favourable terms. He was very glad that such a policy as the one before the House had been enunciated by the Finance Minister. He regretted that he did not further state that the influence of the Government would be directed upon the Government of Great Britain, in order to draw the attention of Great Britain to the importance of the Colonial Empire, and its ability to supply her with all the breadstuffs and meatstuffs she required, and the mutual benefit which would accrue from admitting such on more favourable terms than from for-

eign countries, who levied hostile tariffs against Great Britain. He was of opinion that this would be a step towards inaugurating a policy which would result in having every colony in the Empire represented in the British House of Commons, and when they would have a British commercial policy inaugurated, not only in the interests of the Central British Empire, but in the interests of the Colonial British Empire as well. To show how strong this feeling had become in Great Britain, he could read an extract from a pamphlet which he had received from a friend in England, on the depression in agricultural pursuits, written by Mr. Haughton, a gentleman largely engaged in agriculture, showing that, when the price of grain was reduced beyond what would pay the producer for the labour required in producing it, it would result in great depression in grain, and to a very large extent damage the landed interest of that country, and thereby reduce the wealth of Great Britain. He advocated the imposition of duties upon foreign grain. He (Mr. Orton) thought that it would be the duty of the Government to watch carefully the result of this agitation in Great Britain. He believed it would result, in the future, in the inauguration of a policy such as he had very feebly foreshadowed. It seemed to him that the attempt to carry out simply Free-trade views, was just as absurd as for Great Britain, to-day, to attempt to place her old wooden men-of-war against the iron-clads of foreign countries. The only way in which Great Britain retained her prestige was in being prepared to maintain her rights and defend herself against the first hostile approach, from whatever direction it might come. It should be the same in reference to her commercial policy. He was sure there was not an hon. member in the House that would favour the peace-at-any-price policy advocated by certain gentlemen in Great Britain. He would refer to some other arguments advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for West Middlesex declared that the doctrine of this country should be revenue first and Protection afterwards. He (Mr. Orton) believed that, if their various industries were properly fostered by a protective system, such as that now

proposed, and the country made prosperous, a sufficient revenue would flow afterwards. He (Mr. Ross) had also stated that the result would make the rich richer, the poor poorer. He (Mr. Orton) believed that the policy pursued by the late Government had the effect of enriching manufacturers in foreign countries, and impoverishing those of our own country. Under the present tariff, wealth would be created, labour would receive its just reward, and the manufacturing and agricultural resources of their country would be developed, instead of conducting to enrich foreign countries. He (Mr. Ross) had also stated that the policy pursued by the Government at the last general elections was, in effect, a huge bribe to the people of this country, and he had reiterated the statement made, some time ago, by the *Globe*, that the people did not know what they were doing. He (Mr. Orton) thought they had had ample time for considering that policy, and they had come to the conclusion that it would enhance the value of property, and give prosperity to the people. The present Government had brought this National Policy question before the people in such a manner that it would receive their most careful consideration, and the people had given their verdict, and that verdict, he considered, was a sufficient answer to such statements. He (Mr. Ross) then said it was doing violence to the great law of supply and demand. The law of supply and demand was one which ought to regulate the affairs of the country, as well as our relations with foreign countries, if foreign nations would be satisfied with that law as long as under it they had the same favourable terms as other people had. But, when that law was violated by other countries, it was time to defend ourselves against these nations, who, by such violence to a sound principle, were injuring us. He (Mr. Ross) had then referred to the paternal character assumed by the Government in this Bill. He (Mr. Orton) was ready to believe that above all things a Government should be paternal, that it should be ever watchful over the welfare of the people of the country; and he thought it was one of the special characteristics of the present Government, but could not be claimed for the late Gov-

ernment, who had been utterly regardless of the industries of the country and of the welfare of the people. He was proud to be able to say that the present Government had been most considerate of the interests of the people of this country, and that they were not so much desirous of retaining office as of retaining the affections of the people. The hon. member for North Oxford had said that this policy would have the effect of reducing the amount of importations. He (Mr. Orton) believed and maintained that that would have a beneficial effect upon this country, as the reduction of the importations would result in the retention in this country of the wealth that was created by our labour, and which would be distributed amongst every class. When the hon. gentleman said that it would take twenty years before the people would recover from the ill effects of this policy, he looked forward to it being twenty years before the gentlemen now in the Opposition got back to the Treasury benches, and perhaps it would be to the benefit of our people if such would be the case, judging from the injury they had done in five years. The hon. gentleman had then, apparently with great pleasure, referred to the fact that, having been returned for the North Riding of Oxford, his constituency had thereby shown their approval of his course, but he forgot to state that his former large majority had been reduced some 200, which he (Mr. Orton) thought was a very emphatic disapproval, on the part of his constituents, of the course he had pursued in Parliament. As an instance of the want of prosperity in the United States, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) had referred to the fact that there was a vast amount of money there seeking investment at four per cent. If he (Mr. Orton) had any idea of such matters at all, he was of opinion that that was conclusive evidence that a vast amount of wealth had been created in that country, and that that accumulation of wealth was the money now seeking investment at a low rate of interest. That had always been the result in countries that had accumulated wealth. He (Mr. Oliver) had then, as another evidence of the want of prosperity on the part of the United States, referred to the fact that she exported only \$75,000,000 worth of

manufactured goods. He (Mr. Orton) thought these \$75,000,000 were an evidence of the vast increase of material wealth of that country, as but a few short years ago she did not supply her own people with any vast amount of manufactures, but now the United States not only supplied her own people, but had a surplus of \$75,000,000 worth to send abroad. To the hon. gentleman's statement that the smelting furnaces now idle in the United States were an evidence of the want of prosperity in that country, he would remark that many of those furnaces had been brought into existence by a condition of affairs which it was to be hoped would not occur again. He referred to the great Civil War there. But these furnaces had not only remunerated their owners handsomely, but had added an immense wealth to the country. Allusion had been made by many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to the total ignorance of the farmers of this country at the present time. He denied this assertion. He had always been led to believe that their great educational institutions had rapidly and marvellously increased the intelligence of their people. He thought that the policy that was being inaugurated would afford means of acquiring wealth and give employment to their people. The hon. gentleman had then brought forward, as an argument, another fallacy, that the want of prosperity to the people of the United States was very markedly shown by the fact that, as the agricultural products increased in that country, prices had been reduced. If that were any evidence, it was an evidence of the vast area of land that had been brought under cultivation, and that the wealth of the country had been correspondingly increased. The effect of the protective policy in the United States had been to increase the population at a large ratio from 1863 to 1873, whilst, during that time, the wealth had increased almost one-fourth of the whole previous wealth, and he hoped that would be the result of the policy in Canada. It was very true that there had been another stimulus given to the farming industry of the United States that Canada could not hope and did not desire to have. In consequence of the late war, the United

MR. ORTON.

States had issued an immense amount of national currency for destructive purposes, which had stimulated every industry in the country, and perhaps even led to over-production. The hon. member for South Huron challenged the policy of the present Government in raising a duty on breadstuffs, stating that the fact that the Finance Minister expected to collect \$250,000 by the duty on coal, breadstuffs, and meatstuffs from the United States proved that the policy would be the means of taking that amount out of the poor man's pocket. If that were the case, which he denied, it would, to carry out the argument, prove that it would put into the pockets of the farmers of the country, not \$250,000, but a great deal more. The amount of farm products imported for use by the people of this country, compared with the total amount consumed, did not bear a greater proportion than one-fifth, according to which, there would be placed in the pockets of the farmers, at the same ratio, not \$250,000, but \$1,250,000, which would be distributed amongst our people, the labourers, manufacturers and all classes receiving a share, because, after all, the great source of wealth was the land. Increase the productive power of the land and the wealth of the nation was increased; means and facilities of employment would be given to the labouring people, a market to the manufacturer, and the whole machinery of industry would be put in motion. The hon. member then referred to the closing up of mills. He (Mr. Orton) denied that. He was glad the Finance Minister had given such Protection that it was now almost impossible for the manufacturers of flour or oatmeal for consumption in our own country to import the raw product from the States, and that they would be obliged to buy their oats and wheat from our own farmers. The miller had a very fair protection, which would enable him to supply our own country, and, if he desired to do a foreign trade, he could manufacture the cheap grains of the Western States in bond, and ship to Europe without paying a cent of duty. He might refer to some of the remarks of the hon. member for South Brant, in his celebrated speech—a speech characterised by

a great deal of noise and very little matter—a speech he did not wish to hear repeated, especially considering the peculiar indelicacy of expression which characterised it. He had a number of notes from other speeches on the opposite side to which he might refer, but it was not his intention to occupy longer the time of the House, because, as a member of the previous Parliament, he had expressed his views on the abstract principle involved, and had come before the people and obtained their verdict in favour of those principles. He congratulated the Minister of Finance upon the policy he had brought down, and hoped that it would be the means of removing the almost despair which existed amongst our people, by giving renewed prosperity to all classes, and, at the same time, aid in inaugurating a broader Imperial policy, which would embrace all the Colonies of the Empire, by which we would have, not only favourable commercial relations with Great Britain, but with the Colonies, on the most favourable terms; which would be mutually advantageous, and be able to draw in other countries to unite in the great object desired by all British statesmen, namely, fair trade relations with all countries.

Mr. MILLS: It is not my intention to answer the observations addressed by the speaker who has just preceded me. I may, however, say, with regard to the hon. member's expressed surprise, that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who went to the country on a revenue tariff, expressed themselves in opposition to the system of Protection which these gentlemen had seen proper to dignify by the title of the National Policy. I was returned to this House as an exponent of the principles of Free-trade, as far as our circumstances will permit us to adopt that policy, and I would be recreant to my own convictions of public duty, and to the views of those who saw proper to support me, if I were to adopt the views and support the policy of the Government, simply because they had secured a majority at the elections. I have a very great respect for the system of popular government. I have no doubt whatever that it is decidedly the best, not only for the people of this country, but for every people who are sufficiently

advanced, morally and intellectually, to give it a fair and independent trial. I never supposed that the system of popular government was a system of political infallibility—that the majority were always right and the minority always wrong. If a Government were composed of a select few, if the standard of qualification for the electors were greatly raised, so that we had experts as electors, more advanced opinions might be adopted than with a broader franchise; but the system of popular government was itself a powerful educator, and even should the people occasionally go wrong, and the Government be less efficient than a Government under a more arbitrary or a more restricted system, I would still prefer the present, as it was the one which contributed most largely to the moral and intellectual progress of the people. It was better that we should occasionally go wrong—that we should occasionally blunder, than to go always right by force or by coercion. I am not going to discuss the question of an irredeemable paper currency. The hon. the Finance Minister has not put that forth as one of the principles involved in the so-called National Policy. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has subscribed to the views of the Speaker of the Senate and of some of his supporters behind him, who hold that it is possible for a Government, by mere Act of Parliament, to give value to paper; that all that is necessary to make a nation wealthy is to employ an engraver, and use a paper mill. It had been well observed many years ago by a distinguished English statesman, Mr. Pultney, that the leaders of a Government were like the heads of snakes,—propelled onward by the tail,—and although the Government may not subscribe to the paper currency views of some of their supporters, if hon. gentlemen behind the Treasury benches could accumulate sufficient amount of force, they might propel the hon. gentlemen who occupied them in that particular direction. Like many hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, I regard this as a very grave question. I cannot congratulate hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches on the fulfilment of these promises. The most important of these pledges cannot

Mr. MILLS.

be kept. The hon. the leader of the Government promised the people of the Maritime Provinces that there should be no increase of the tariff, no additional taxation. Has that promise been kept? The word of the hon. gentleman was pawned, and it has not been redeemed. It has, in fact, been forfeited. This is, on the whole, a thirty-five per cent. tariff. Last summer when a Western journal, the *Advertiser*, charged the hon. gentleman with proposing what we now have before us, what did he say? Why, that “it was an absurd falsehood; neither at London nor elsewhere had he gone beyond his motion in Parliament; that he had never proposed an increase, but only a readjustment of the tariff.” How were these words understood by the people of New Brunswick? How are they now being kept? In the Toronto Amphitheatre, that arena where the intellectual gladiators of the Tory party assembled, the hon. gentleman also appeared, and declared himself in favour of the free importation of sugar, tea, coffee, tobacco, and silk. The loss of four and three quarter millions to the revenue was to be made up by better times, and the consumption of more whisky. Has this pledge been kept? The hon. gentleman has a majority in this House—which he calls a mechanical majority—why, then, does he not remit these taxes? why does he not keep this promise to the workingmen? We heard a great deal here last year about a free breakfast table. How has this hope of the poor man been realised? How earnestly you have laboured to fulfil this pledge! Look at what you have done for the labourer! You tax his cooking stove, you tax his kettle, you tax his fire, you tax his table, you tax his chair, you tax his table linen, you tax the dishes upon the table, you tax his tea, you tax his coffee, you tax his sugar, you tax his salt, you tax his bread, you tax his meat, and when he returns thanks to his Maker, what is it for? Why, that your tax has not yet been extended to the pump and to the hen-house. This is the way you have kept your promise to the poor about a free breakfast table. What now do you tell him? “Why, bless you, my dear sir, you do not know what is good for you. Do you not know that the way to make you prosperous is to take the money out of your pocket?”

People are made rich by what they pay. You have been well nigh ruined by getting too much for your money. Cheap tea and cheap sugar, cheap coal and cheap furniture, cheap food and cheap clothing have well nigh made you a beggar. They are infinitely worse than the cheap labour of the 'Heathen Chinee,' or any other man who may come hither from abroad. Here is our remedy: 'Be ye warmed, clothed and filled, not by means of coal, cotton, and food, but by a tax of thirty-five per cent. on what you consume.'" I am sure the workingman will understand this. The Finance Minister explains his new system of political economy in this way. He says: "My friends, the Conservative party understand what is best in this matter, but they do the contrary. I do not belong to that wild and visionary class of theorists called political economists. I am a practical statesman, and must look at things as they are. You know that human nature is perverse; that men know what is right, yet they are inclined to do the opposite. We, on this side, all know that Canada is a sacrifice market. The foreign producer pays a part of the price of our cottons, and the United States Government tax their own people, and take the money from the National Treasury to pay part of the price of the sugar consumed by our people; and Reformers are blindly enticed on to their ruin by getting too much for their money. We Tories who know better, I am sorry to say, do the same thing. When you find out where you can get most dry goods or groceries for your money, there you foolishly go. You should go to the man who asks much and gives little. This may ruin him if he should find customers; but I am not considering his case, but yours. We propose to put an end to this state of things by an Act of Parliament. We propose to impose taxes, not simply for revenue, but to check trade and commerce, and by this means 'diminish the volume of our imports from all parts of the world.'" This is the doctrine proclaimed from the Treasury benches. How will this help the depressed trade? How will it promote the prosperity of your shipowners? The Finance Minister and his friends promised a home market for everything. If successful what became of the revenue?

The hon. gentleman complained of the balance of trade. Up to the 1st of July last there was a balance of \$266,000,000 against this country. Had the hon. gentleman brought himself to believe that this represented the indebtedness of the mercantile community of Canada, to the English and United States merchants, and manufacturers? Men do not get credit in that way, for a long series of years for large sums beyond what they were able to pay for. The evil of over-trading was one that, if left alone, would correct itself. I could, without difficulty, show that the seeming balance against us, represents mainly the profits and earnings upon our commerce. I am opposed to this policy of restriction. I say to the Finance Minister that I do not agree with him. The people of this country are, in buying and selling, pursuing their own interests, and they ought not to be hindered or impeded in doing so. Each is seeking his own welfare in what he is doing. Why should he be restrained? I think that each man is more likely to judge rightly than we are to judge rightly for him. If no one buys there will be nothing sold. We have a law empowering a court to take care of the estates of those who are incapable of taking care of them. This tariff is a general commission of lunacy for the whole nation. A commission to keep people from ruining themselves by buying at too low a rate, and in the wrong market. Let me propose a compromise. I say to gentlemen opposite, you feel that you cannot trust yourselves in the conduct of your private affairs. We have no such misgiving. You take your own course as to your own affairs. You feel, without the interference of the State, that your folly or your perversity will surely make you go wrong. It may be so. We have no such weakness. Leave us free. We are ready and willing to take the risk. Enlarge the jurisdiction of Chancery, and empower it to exercise its jurisdiction on your behalf, that restraint upon your liberty and supervision of your private affairs, which you feel is necessary to your material prosperity; but let us alone. I have said that this is but a mere instalment of the National Policy. The so-called National Policy professedly covered the whole ground.

It dealt with every branch of industry. It promised to the capitalists a larger market and higher prices. It promises to the labourer constant employment and higher wages. It proposed to add to the wealth of all. This measure attempts but in part to fulfil these promises. What steps have you taken to prevent the market, to which the labourer brings his offer of toil, from being made a sacrifice market? You promised that Canada should be kept for Canadians. This is the policy you broadly avowed. When do you propose to redeem this promise? Or is this, like others, to be dishonoured? As you are dealing with the manufacturer, so did you promise to deal with the workingman. You have prohibited the importation of British and United States goods in order that you might protect the home producer. Do you propose to prohibit the foreign labourer from coming in and bringing down the price of labour, or will you allow the labourer to remain unprotected? Do you propose to keep this promise? You know that the exclusion of foreign industrial products will not accomplish this result? The condition of the workingmen of Lowell, Boston, Springfield, New York, Paterson, Pittsburg, Philadelphia, and other United States cities, conclusively settles this. You know that protection to the manufacturer promises no certain reward to the labourer. You propose to take from him thirty-five dollars out of every hundred dollars that he spends on food, furniture, and clothing. How are you going to compensate him for this system of legalised blunder? Nothing has been established by a wider induction than this—that the cost of living may be increased without any increase of wages—increased frequently when wages are falling. Now, what is your policy of helping the working man? You dare not say to him that the price of labour is regulated by the law of supply and demand, and that you cannot prevent labour becoming cheap when it becomes abundant! You denied this. You called those who held to such theories, flies on the wheel. You belonged to a different class in political zoology. We ask you now to tell the House and the workmen what you propose? This Parliament, you declared, could be made, in the hands of wise men, such as you

MR. MILLS.

yourselves modestly claimed to be, a benevolent institution for the relief of general distress, without any charge upon the National Treasury. I know, Mr. Speaker, that this is a part of the National Policy platform upon which gentlemen on that side stood at the last elections. It is a part about which they now do not care to hear. It is, no doubt, a disagreeable subject. It was most unhealthy food to give the poor man, but let me say to gentlemen on the Treasury benches, you gave it. You profited by its use, and now I ask you what do you propose to do? You brought crowds of labourers to the doors of Parliament last Session to demand work. You traded upon the misfortunes and the sufferings of the poor. You told the country that, if you were put upon those benches, you would untie your bag and exhibit your "ready relief." It is not yet forthcoming. When is it to be exhibited? It is, Sir, to me a matter of astonishment to find gentlemen still at large advocating the interposition of Parliament, not to remove the shackles of a darker age, but to impose new shackles upon industry, upon commerce, not for reasons of State, but to contribute to the production of wealth. Do hon. gentlemen propose to fix the price of commodities by Act of Parliament? Do they propose to take into consideration the advantages or disadvantages of locality, and vary their protection accordingly? When I speak of gentlemen being at large, I did not mean to include the Minister of Finance. We know he is not. He may not have been confined, but he is, and has been, in the custody of a self-constituted national police. They have taken possession of him, and he sits here as their hostage, and as the exponent of their demands. They have put him and his colleagues where they are. They have made these hon. gentlemen officially what they are and they are bound to perform the work assigned to them by their masters. This body is distinct from the Tory party. They will support Ministers just so long, and no longer, than it is their interest to do so. We know, Sir, the Tory party. They are under the guardianship of the Premier, and are whatever he may desire them to be. They are his people, the goats of

his pasture. They follow him. When he favours Free-trade, so do they. But they have instinctive preferences, and, when he proposes a Jingo policy, even though it be in a small way, they are specially pleased. It is true the hon. gentleman has a large majority in this House, but when we look at the electoral vote, we know that the hon. gentleman has not a large majority outside; we know that, upon the policy of Protection, the country is nearly equally divided. Nearly one-half have pronounced against the course which gentlemen opposite vaguely proposed to take. We see how far you have gone, and what you have still to undertake. I know, Sir, it has become fashionable on that side of the House to deride political economy. Smith and Mill, Cairnes and Fawcett are regarded as visionaries whom men of common sense, whom real statesmen, would never consult. Well, Sir, I am afraid but few of the men, who, in England have, for the past forty years, been regarded as statesmen would escape this ban. I look at the speeches of Huskisson, Villiers, C. P. Thompson, Sir James Graham, Sir Robert Peel, the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Palmerston, and Lord Russell; and, in the discussion of financial subjects, I find them everywhere interspersed with quotations from Smith, Ricardo, and other writers upon political economy. They would be classed by gentlemen opposite among the visionary and speculative members whose habits of mind excluded them from the domain of practical statesmanship. I know, Sir, that hon. gentlemen on that side look with contemptuous pity on that deluded nation across the Atlantic, with which we are politically united. They turn away with loathing from the expository and argumentative statements made by those incompetent and imbecile men, such as Sir Robert Peel, Sir G. C. Lewis, Mr. Cobden and Mr. Gladstone, by whom the people of Great Britain have been blindly guided for a third of a century. These gentlemen declare they dislike political economy; that Butler understands questions of finance better than Gladstone, and that the political atmosphere of Washington is more invigorating than that at Westminster. We must not, upon the fiscal policy of this country, think for ourselves. That,

Sir, would be presumptuous. Standing with our heads uncovered, we will not dissent from the superior wisdom of our august neighbours. They are wise. We will walk in their footsteps. We will imitate Congress. Whatever they do at Washington, at Ottawa we must do likewise. Gentlemen opposite mingle menace with worship, bluster with adulation. To this the Premier has educated his party. I congratulate him on his success. Let us see from what and to what the Tory party have been led. Sir, we all remember the great Civil War in the United States. We know, in one-half of that Republic, four millions of human beings were held as property. That war became a struggle for freedom upon the one side, and for oppression upon the other. The hon. leader and his party, true to their party instincts, took the side of the oppressors,—for what people or what cause ever had the sympathy of that party unless they or it were opposed to freedom and to progress? Every success of Southern arms was cheered. To emancipate the poor negro was regarded as a calamity. And above all things, and before all things, they desired that the mighty Republic, which had stood for ninety years a visible testimony to the capacity of man for self-government, should be broken up. They were doomed to disappointment. The spirit of freedom was unchained by the execution of John Brown. It called all the North to arms, and the Northern volunteers marched to the battle field to the music of his name. The South was subdued. The Union was restored. Slavery perished. The cause of popular freedom triumphed. During the struggle of the Civil War high taxes were imposed. The spirit of avarice followed in the footsteps of the spirit of freedom. Abuses grew up. Oppressive monopolies were established. Rings were formed as powerful in the State as were the great barons of the mediæval period. There was now another system of servitude only less hateful than the one Providence had forced the nation to destroy. Well, Sir, this was something with which the Tory party could sympathise; and the Government, which fifteen years ago, was an object of insult, has committed a folly that has made it

an object of worship. We see the Tory party, in changing the language of abuse and insult for the language of praise, have not travelled very far. Upon questions of trade and taxation our American neighbours lag far behind the statesmen of the United Kingdom. The hon. the Premier and his party dislike this onward march of Fatherland. It wearies them. It may be sweet to dream of the sea-girt isle; but on the whole they prefer the company of those in the rear. Their island home is far beyond the wave, and the profound thoughts, wise maxims and generous sentiments of her statesmen, which, for a time, were stumbling blocks, have now become foolishness to gentlemen opposite. They have fallen in with another people by the way, for whom they have learned to entertain the highest admiration. The hon. gentleman, in his educating process, has, in some respects, metamorphosed the Tory party. We remember the Tory of former years, who loudly proclaimed his resolution to stand by a united Empire at all hazards. He was a wholly different person from your Tory whose loyalty is measured by 35 per cent., your dealer in pinch-beck and the second-hand clothing of Congress, who is ready to stand by his own pocket if given a share of the contents of his neighbour's pocket. It is true that he is still noisy. He still dislikes that any dissent from his leader's views should be tolerated. He still dislikes the trouble, the labour of seeking for truth, and he still cherishes an unrelenting animosity against whatever and whoever shakes his faith in the infallibility or public impeccability of his chief. Fortunate leader! Contented party! Unfortunate country! The hon. gentleman and his friends have taken a new departure. They have asked the people, for the first time as a matter of choice, to put them in a position of commercial antagonism to the Mother Country. There have been times when the Tory party confounded their interests with those of the Crown, and sought to bully the Sovereign's representative into becoming an instrument of injustice and oppression in their hands. There have been times when, in the heat of passion, they threatened the connection. But this is the first time that, while profiting by the free markets of the United Kingdom, they proposed a policy

of prohibition in return. Hon. gentlemen had denounced the commercial policy of the United States as narrow, illiberal, grossly unfair to Canada. Be it so, I am not going to dispute the accuracy of this statement. Canada had not lent its credit to the United States. Canada incurred no expense to give security to the commerce and shipping of the United States. There is illiberality. There are very mistaken and short-sighted views of public policy exhibited towards other nations in the fiscal legislation of the United States, but there was not ingratitude. We can say to them no more than King Lear said to the storm; but England may say of us what King Lear said of his daughters. England has adopted a Free-trade policy. Her Government put no barriers in the way of your trade. Her people take millions every year of the products of your industry. They offer in exchange goods cheaper and better than you can make for yourselves, and how do you deal with them? You propose to erect fiscal barriers that will prove insuperable. You tax her iron, you tax her cutlery, you tax her calicoes, you tax her carpets, you tax her porcelain. It is true, if these goods are purchased, the tax is paid by the people of this country. But they do not complain that you tax them. They understand the question too well to make such complaint. But they do complain that you made it impossible for your own people to buy from them. You say that for twelve years this country has been on its knees to the authorities at Washington. That you have been praying for more liberal trade relations with the United States. You have abased yourselves to no purpose. You now raise yourselves from the dust, and by the superior wisdom of your leader you are going to evolve from his head all that is necessary to make you great and wealthy, and also the means of making them your tributaries and dependents. This, we know, Sir, is the merest gasconade. But suppose it all true, you have been all wrong before. If Protection is a good thing, why did you seek for freer trade with them? What made you go on your knees to them? Why did you so earnestly strive for more unrestricted trade with a people whom you say sell you

goods at ruinously low rates after their goods are burdened with costs of carriage and 17½ per cent. duty? Not ruinously low to the producer, for you have gravely assured us that it is one of the elements of his prosperity, but ruinously low to the consumer. How strange is this gospel of Protection! This world of the Protectionist is a new world of thought. Twice two will not make four in it. Men are made wealthy by what they pay out. They are made poor by getting too much for their money. I again revert to this effort to secure reciprocity. Why did you seek more intimate trade relations? If Protection, as you say, is necessary to vary your industry; if a whole people are forever doomed to till the soil without Protection, why did you so long, so earnestly, so importunately, so unwisely, strive for Free-trade upon the basis of reciprocity, or upon any basis? Let me here read the motion of the Prime Minister when he was leader of the Opposition last year. The hon. gentleman's motion reads as follows: "That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of the National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff would benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and the other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home; will restore prosperity to our struggling industries now so sadly depressed; will prevent Canada being made a sacrifice market; will encourage and develop an inter-provincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for the country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade." This, Sir, is the National Policy in the germ. We have before us a part of the monstrosity, after thirteen months' gestation, by the hon. leader of the Government. What does this mean? What does the hon. gentleman mean by fostering inter-provincial trade? For what reason is it to be fostered? If it is profitable, it does not require to be fostered. Self-interest will keep it alive. For what reason, then, is it to be fostered?

Is it on grounds of public policy, wholly apart from economic reasons? I admit that inter-provincial trade, mutually advantageous to those who engage in it, is of great political importance. But the political importance of our inter-provincial trade is not diminished by Free-trade with our neighbours. If it is a political necessity that Ontario should use Nova Scotia coal, and that Nova Scotia should use Ontario flour, why do you wish to divert the coal trade to Boston and the flour trade to New York by a treaty of reciprocity? The fact is, the resolution is made up of mutually destructive propositions. If inter-provincial trade in all things produced in the Dominion is necessary, why should you seek a reciprocity of trade with our neighbours, when you know it will greatly diminish our inter-provincial trade? If Ontario ought, for reasons of State, or for occult reasons of political economy, hidden from Free-traders and Englishmen, but revealed to the Premier and those who follow him, to purchase Nova Scotia coal, why seek to bring about reciprocal Free-trade in coal? The resolution of last year affirms that Protection is necessary to stimulate and vary the industries of the country; that it is necessary to keep up inter-provincial trade; that both are necessary to national unity and to diversified industry. So far your course is consistent, your aim intelligible, but you intimate your desire to eventually secure a reciprocity of trade, not with all the world, but with the United States. And what is to be the effect of this ultimate blessing? According to the doctrine of this resolution, it is to stop the growth of manufactures and diminish inter-provincial trade. Hon. gentlemen will find that they have surpassed the public expectation. I say to these hon. gentlemen, you pointed out to the people of Canada what an illiberal policy the Congress of the United States had pursued towards this country; you aroused their indignation; you told them that they paid some millions of dollars yearly into the United States treasury. The majority had too much sense to believe you; but—no matter what the consequence might be—they were ready to retaliate because they were offended at the unwise and illiberal course which Congress had pursued. They favoured retaliation, but

they were not converts to the policy of Protection. We, Sir, took a different view. We were not disposed to engage in a Japanese duel with them, because we knew well that it was greatly against the interest of the people of this country, and we preferred being the victims, rather than the instruments, of public folly. Our part was the part of honest men, and I rest contented, notwithstanding the taunts of hon. gentlemen opposite, being perfectly confident, when passion has subsided, what the public judgment will be. But I say, Sir, to these gentlemen upon the Treasury benches, and to those behind them, you have exceeded your authority, you have fallen short of your promises. Much that you promised you have not undertaken. Much that you have undertaken you dared not have promised. You profited by the indignation that you aroused against the United States. You won by it. It was a foul success. How have you used it? Why, Sir, to make war on the commerce of the United Kingdom. You told the farmers that you favoured reciprocity (although we knew the contrary)—that you did not want a one-sided reciprocity. Why, then, do you level the shafts of your malignant policy against the commerce of the British Islands? Why do you make our trade with them a one-sided reciprocity? You know that this is a part of your policy that you concealed—that you denied; for we told the people that the instruments of gain into whose hands you had fallen would lead you irresistibly forward into a policy of the deepest consequence. But you vehemently protested your innocence. That policy is now upon us. The Finance Minister informed the House that, under the system of taxation adopted, a large portion of the taxes were to be raised upon imports from the United States. He said that this was the proper course to pursue. He said that this House would not object to taking a larger proportion of the additional taxation out of the people of the United States than out of the United Kingdom. Why? Because the people of England receive everything we send them without taxation. In my opinion the hon. gentleman, by this scheme, taxes neither. He proposes to burden most heavily the people of Canada. It is we, and not they

MR. MILLS.

of England, or of the United States, who will have these taxes to pay. Yes, Sir, and millions more, for I shall show that by this fell measure many millions will be taken from the pockets of the people that will never reach the public treasury. This measure imposes a tax upon the entire trade of the country—domestic and foreign. But I deny that the hon. gentleman has, by this measure, placed his burdens mainly upon our trade with the United States. Let me, for a moment, examine the scheme of taxation here submitted for our approval. The hon. gentlemen, I suppose, does not claim the tax imposed upon wheat, flour, corn and oats, which are re-shipped for the European market. These taxes, if paid, are to be returned, and if hon. gentlemen are right, most improperly returned to the exporter. There may be serious impediments in the way of trade, but they are not sources of public revenue; and, therefore, must be left wholly out of the calculation. On the quantity of brandy imported last year the present tariff will impose \$84,173 additional taxation. Of this sum, \$23,018 will fall upon English and \$1,162 upon United States trade. Upon gin you impose an additional tax of \$42,400, \$12,800 of which falls upon English trade, and \$247 upon the trade with our neighbours. Upon whisky, \$13,800 additional taxation, of which \$12,800 will fall upon the trade with England, and \$1,000 upon that with the United States. At your proposed rate of taxation, we would have paid on iron and other metals imported from the United States last year, \$100,000, instead of \$16,500; and upon similar imports from England \$655,000, instead of \$86,000. You would have imposed upon metallic imports from the United States \$83,500 additional taxes, and upon metallic imports from England \$569,000—nearly twenty-five per cent. of the whole sum that you propose to raise. Last year you collected a Customs tax of \$108,500 upon woollen goods imported from the United States. You, at the same time, collected \$1,416,000 upon woollen goods imported from the United Kingdom. You have changed a tariff of 17½ per cent. into a tariff varying from 20 per cent. to nearly 40 per cent. You have scrupulously provided that the best

goods shall pay the smallest tax. I assume that you did this in the interest of the workman, since you have proceeded upon the theory that it is the man who is most burdened that is most benefited. As you have put these burdens on, not to meet the public necessities, but to promote the private interests of the population, it is plain that you have not overlooked the poor man, the widow, and the orphan. You have carefully provided that they shall feel the weight of your paternal hand. I find that if we should import from England and the United States under the new tariff the same quantities of woollen goods that we did last year under the old, that \$57,000 of additional taxation would fall upon the imports from the United States, and \$614,000 upon woollens imported from the Mother Country. Let me now, Sir, refer to the tax upon cotton goods. Last year we collected upon cottons imported from the British Isles a tax of \$770,549, and upon cottons imported from the United States \$470,185. Under the proposed tariff you would have imposed upon the same goods from England \$1,491,000, and upon those from the United States \$828,000. How, then, does your tariff stand so far?

| | |
|--|-----------|
| English imports pay of the additional taxation upon strong liquors, brandy, gin, rum and whisky..... | \$ 50,000 |
| Upon metals..... | 569,000 |
| Upon woollens..... | 614,000 |
| Upon cottons..... | 720,451 |

Making a total of.....\$1,953,451

When you foot up the additional tax upon these same classes of imports from the United States, you have a very different result upon them :

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| The additional tax would be, on | |
| liquors..... | \$ 2,500 |
| Upon metals..... | 83,500 |
| Upon woollens..... | 57,000 |
| Upon cottons..... | 358,000 |

Making a total of.....\$501,000

I need not pursue this part of the subject further. I have said enough to show this House and the country that the new burden does not fall mainly upon our commerce with the United States. The hand of the Finance Minister is raised, like the hand of Ishmael, against all who

have the temerity to trade with us ; but the chief blow is aimed at the parent State. Last year, Sir, we imported into Canada raw materials—products of various kinds—to the amount of \$31,423,000. Under the present tariff upwards of two-thirds in value of these free imports would have been subject to taxation. But why not the whole? Why not tax raw cotton? We object because we think it adds to the price; but you hold the contrary. Why, then, do you not compel the southern planter to pay something on the cotton wool? Upon this there will be nothing to remit. You know that much of these imports which you pretend to tax really do not enter into consumption, but are manufactured, or partially manufactured, and sent abroad; the money collected upon them on the plan proposed, will be returned to the parties by whom it is paid. From much the hon. gentleman expects no revenue. Why, then, does he impose the tax to the great injury of commerce? The Minister of Finance and his colleagues have entered upon a policy that will produce untold mischiefs to the prosperity of this country. We imported last year cotton to the value of \$7,104,517. Upon that we paid \$1,248,000 duty. The new tariff will add \$1,100,000 more. Then, we manufacture in Canada about 26,000,000 yards of cotton. The tariff will advance the price of this home production by not less than \$270,000. The cotton that now costs the wholesale dealers \$10,000,000 will cost them, under the new tariff, \$11,400,000. If we suppose that the population retained the same power of purchasing under the new tariff that they possessed under the old, they would not be able to purchase as much cotton as before by nearly 15,000,000 yards, or 18½ yards less to every family of the Dominion. Your measure is not one to clothe the naked, but to denude the poor. But this, Sir, by no means represents what must be the actual results. This measure re-distributes annually the profits upon industry. It will diminish the profits of not less than 70 per cent. of the population by not less than 15 per cent. You are inflicting a double wrong upon the poorest part of the people. You increase the cost of what they have to buy. You largely diminish the

amount of their earnings. Take the case of the young mechanic who just begins housekeeping. You now tax him from 30c. to \$1 a yard upon his carpet. You tax him 30 per cent. upon his stoves for Messrs. Gurney, and 30 per cent. upon his porcelain for some one else. He buys his furniture, for which he pays \$300, and he discovers that \$105 of this sum is tribute money, that, by this tariff, he is compelled to pay to the hon member for Centre Toronto. How will he regard this Parliament, which has proved itself a stepmother to him? Do you think, when he sees the palatial mansions of these pensioners of the State, and when he learns of the immense fortunes that have in this way been secured to those whose names are in your golden book, that he will not regard property as robbery? You have upwards of 40,000 carpenters upon whose tools, food and clothing, you propose to lay a duty of at least 20 per cent., what compensation have you given them? Their wives and children, for whom they must provide, number 160,000; how are you helping them? It is not in your power to give them any help. To them your policy is worse than the policy of the "fly on the wheel." You can do nothing for them. You are doing much that is to their detriment. Let us see, Sir, what the Finance Minister does for the blacksmiths of Canada. In 1871 there were 15,694. Now there cannot be less than 20,000. They represent a population of 100,000 souls. What have you done for these people? You have taxed their tools 30 per cent.; you have taxed their steel 10 per cent.; you have taxed their iron 17½ per cent.; you have taxed their horse shoe nails 30 per cent.; you have taxed their coal 50c. per ton; you have taxed their bread and meat; everything they wear; you have taxed all they use to make their houses decent and their families comfortable. There is not one of them whose burdens will not be increased by at least fifty dollars a year. What have you done for them? Why, you have sent your agents to scour the United Kingdom and the Continent to find others to come out and settle down beside them, and compete with them to keep down their charges. Is this your policy of Canada for the Canadians? Is

MR. MILLS.

this the way you keep your promise to these 20,000 people, and the 80,000 women and children depending upon them? Why is this system of extortion and robbery to be practised upon them? Why, Sir, the reason is obvious. It is that some half-dozen speculators, greedy of gain, may produce a small quantity of very dear iron. They are the poor wretches to whom you have listened, and for whose welfare you have shown your tender regard. Do you think the mechanics will not understand you? You propose to help the farmer by taxing the farm produce of the United States, which is imported into this country. What is this but another act of your injustice—your folly! I hope, Sir, to be able to make plain to this House, and the country, that what you proposed may do much mischief, but can do no good. When you have a fair foreign trade well established, the productions from abroad of a similar kind sent into your market will always do much more good than harm. You prevent waste both in labour and carriage. In many cases, vessels can bring return cargoes of breadstuffs from Boston or New York, at but little cost to the consumer. Now you make it a choice between paying the tax or incurring the expense of a long drive to some distant railway station. You propose not to recognise, but to waste labour and capital. The untaxed trade gave to the consumer a greater liberty of choice. They, from superior facilities of transit, lessen the cost to the consumer; they tend to open new markets for the surplus products of your country. Permit me to illustrate this principle by our trade as it has been. Last year we imported into Canada 7,387,477 bushels of corn from the United States, at 47c. a bushel. We used about 1,000,000 of bushels for purposes of distillation, upon which there was paid to the forwarder 6c. a bushel. We consumed for the purpose of stock-feeding 2,400,000 bushels, upon which the freights and charges were 8c. a bushel; and we shipped abroad 3,987,600 bushels, upon which the freights and profits were 38c. a bushel. The prices quoted as the value at the place of shipment in Canada, is 67c., and the ocean freight 18c. Now let me point out to you the whole effect

of this transaction. You have, first, 1,000,000 bushels of corn upon which the profits and earnings amount to \$60,000; it is made into 3,500,000 gallons of whiskey, which you tax \$2,800,000. I do not speak of this business as contributing itself to the production of wealth. The farmers used 2,400,000 bushels, upon which they pay \$196,000 for freights and profits to the forwarders and dealers, and 3,987,600 bushels are sent abroad, upon which the earnings and profits amounted to \$1,515,288. In other words, for these 7,387,000 bushels of foreign corn, our dealers paid \$3,481,172, and received \$5,252,460—a difference of \$1,771,288. But this by no means represents the whole of the earnings and profits of the forwarder. If our farmers did not consume this corn they would consume some other kind of grain, the product of their farms, having a greater market value, but no greater value for the purpose of stock-breeding. Whether the corn sets free peas or barley, depends upon the market value of each. Whichever has the greatest market value for the time being will be most largely displaced, for the substitution of corn for either is a matter of profit. Last year we exported 2,420,000 bushels of peas for \$1,984,000. Now, as we imported for stock-feeding 2,400,000 bushels of corn, we were enabled to export 2,400,000 bushels of peas, that would otherwise have been retained in the country for farm consumption. The corn costs the forwarder 47c. It costs the farmer 8c. more, or 55c., so that the corn used by the farmers cost them \$1,344,000. The peas sold for \$1,967,000, or \$623,000 more than was paid for an equal quantity of corn. The forwarder received his 18c. a bushel ocean freight on these 2,400,000 bushels of peas, the same as if he had carried directly through the corn that the farmer took in exchange. Upon these he receives \$432,000. How, then, does this matter ultimately stand? The forwarder earns \$2,209,288, and the farmers gain \$632,000; in all there are \$2,832,288 gained or earned by Canadians by their being allowed to deal without restraint in United States corn. This trade gives our vessels 200,000 tons of freight to carry from the Detroit River to Liverpool. In 1878 we imported 2,160,000

bushels of oats at 30c., and exported 2,430,000 at 43c. The latter were exported from Prince Edward Island, and the former were brought into Western Ontario. The 13c. a bushel difference are due to freights and an eastern market. A large portion of the oats imported were ground into oatmeal and sent to the European market. A very small proportion was consumed in Canada. If oats and corn were not produced more largely in the west, it was simply because the farmers could more profitably employ their land, labour and capital. In carrying these imported oats to Europe the sum of \$280,000 is earned yearly, and this would be sacrificed under this policy, which is seriously against the interests of both farmers and shipowners. You propose to restrain this trade and turn it away from Canada, and you propose to secure for your merchantmen one-sixtieth the tonnage from China to Montreal which they already have from China to New York. These people are not calling out for restrictions upon other people's freedom. They ask for no special favour at your hands. Is not the capital they have invested in ship-building well invested? Does it not serve to diversify labour? Are not the masters and their hardy and adventurous men as well employed for the country as those who are in the workshops and in the factories? Look at the consequence of their employment. See your ship-yards with their workmen. Look at your lumbermen in the forest. Whether they labour or starve depends upon the prosperity of your commerce. I speak for the capitalist who has put his money in your ships—that you shall not deny him the privilege of freely earning what he can. I speak for the ship-builder in your ship-yards, and for the mariner who goes down to the sea, that you shall not deny them the liberty to toil. They want to be let alone. Your paternal policy will be as fatal to them as the tunic of Nessus was to Hercules. You may talk of free ships and cheap and untaxed material for ships, as if you had a special interest in their prosperity. Why, if taxation confers special blessings upon those upon whom it falls, do you deny the shipowner the privilege of sharing it? You profess special regard for his welfare, while you have deliber-

ately set yourself to work to destroy the commerce upon which his prosperity depends. Your taxation may destroy, but it never can protect. Let me, for a moment, invite the attention of the House to the grain trade for the past three years. Our imports and exports were as follows:—

IMPORTS, 30TH JUNE, 1875, TO 30TH JUNE, 1878.

| | Bushels. | Value. | Value per bushel. |
|-----------------|------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Wheat..... | 16,059,916 | \$17,425,274 | \$1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Corn..... | 19,281,717 | 10,150,861 | 52 $\frac{3}{8}$ |
| Barley..... | 703,350 | 390,449 | 50 |
| Peas and beans. | 27,342 | 51,531 | 1.66 |
| Oats..... | 4,479,918 | 1,470,689 | 33 |
| | 30,552,273 | \$29,488,804 | |

EXPORTS, '75-'78

| | | | |
|-------------|------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Wheat..... | 21,317,728 | \$26,149,974 | \$1.22 $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| Corn..... | 10,117,814 | 6,709,369 | 66 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Peas..... | 6,644,395 | 5,541,420 | 83 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Oats..... | 9,071,236 | 3,843,820 | 42 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Barley..... | 24,298,698 | 16,689,693 | 68 |
| | 71,446,371 | \$58,884,281 | |

EARNINGS—LAND AND RIVER TRANSIT.

| | Quantity. | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Wheat..... | 16,059,945 at 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ c | = \$2,288,541 |
| Corn..... | 10,117,814 at 13 $\frac{3}{8}$ c | = 1,382,767 |
| Barley..... | 703,350 at 18 c | = 126,603 |
| Oats..... | 4,479,918 at 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ c | = 215,892 |
| Peas..... | 6,644,395 at 6 c | = 398,663 |
| | 38,005,423 | \$4,412,466 |

| | Ocean Bushels. | freight. | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------|-------------|
| | 38,005,423 | 18c | \$6,840,976 |
| Total freights '75-'78..... | | | 11,252,442 |

If, Sir, the House will consider how largely our own products are set free for the foreign market, the carrying of which is wholly in our own hands, we will see how much we have gained. We would have shipped across the Atlantic about 31,000,000 bushels of agricultural products, instead of 71,450,000 bushels, and the ocean freights earned would have been \$5,800,000, instead of \$12,300,000. We import from the United States about 15,000,000 of bushels of grain annually. Except the corn used for purposes of distillation, it all goes abroad or sets free some product of this country, which takes its place as ocean freight. The average annual surplus of agricultural products at the cities upon the lakes for the last four years has been 66,000,000 bushels of wheat, 5,000,000 barrels of flour, and 65,000,000 bushels of corn. That is from the United States cities of

MR. MILLS.

the St. Lawrence—for the lakes are but a part of this great river—153,000,000 bushels of wheat and corn are carried to the European markets. By whom is this to be done? At one time you thought it was a wise course to put forward an effort to secure this mighty trade of nearly five millions of tons of freight yearly. You ran into debt to obtain the money to enlarge your canals, in order that you might secure this trade. You are paying yearly the interest upon this money. How have you succeeded? You have carried one bushel in seventeen of the wheat, and this you did mainly through the agency of your millers. Apart from these, you have done nothing. They have given additional freights to your railways, and to your shipping. They have given employment to your coopers. They have given better prices to your farmers, because they have been enabled to make a better article of flour than they could from the Canadian wheat alone. You say here that this is hurtful, and in order to cripple the business you tax it. You know this tax does no good, and great harm. It does not advance the price of wheat or flour one cent. The United States tried it, and had it been successful neither their wheat nor their flour would have been brought here. Men do not buy in a dear market to sell in a cheap one. Why then do you persist in ruining the trade to keep up the delusion of your being the farmer's friend? If your tax comes out of the producer, why do you remit duty to your millers when they export the produce they have imported? You forbid the cooper and the carrier to buy the article upon which his labour has been expended, and by which his wages have been earned, and you do this to give the idle employment, the employed better wages, and the capitalist larger profits! But we see, in this case, how it produces the very reverse of what you promised. And what about your canals and the carrying trade? You see how great it is. You see how little you have secured; upon that little you now propose a war of extermination. Is this wise? Why then did you burden the people with the canal debt? Was the hope drunk in which you then dressed yourself? Has it slept since, and is the scheme you now present your sober,

second thought? I do not think the public will long agree with you. I am consoled by thinking so, for I regard this tariff on economic grounds, on general grounds of public policy, and on social and moral grounds, as the greatest calamity that has ever befallen this country. I pass on, Sir, to another feature of this tariff—that connected with the sugar trade. I find that the changes in the tariff are very far from being in the interest of the people of this country. It will give them an inferior article at a higher price. It will largely diminish the revenue from sugar. The tariff which has been superseded was framed by Sir John Rose in 1868. It remained in force for ten years. A slight reduction was made in April, 1875, upon the lower grades of raw sugar—25c. per hundred pounds. The duty imposed upon sugars imported into the United States are remitted when the sugar is re-exported. It is precisely the same to us or to any others who purchase it as if no such duty had ever been imposed. The quantity of sugar imported into the United States is very large. The quantity exported is very small. They import about 1,500,000,000 pounds annually. They export to this country about 45,000,000 pounds, and to all other countries not much more. Of the 1,500,000,000 of pounds imported, not more than 80,000,000 are exported—about one pound in twenty. It will be seen from this statement how very slightly, indeed, any excess of drawback that it would be possible to give could affect the general prosperity of the refiner. I pointed out to the House in 1876 the only way in which it was possible to receive a bounty at all by importing superior grades of raw sugars, degraded according to the coloured standard by the use of aniline dyes. In so far as the duty upon sugar is regulated by the colour, it is always capable of being diminished by the introduction of dyed sugars. A sugar dealer going from Canada or the United States to the West Indian sugar market, and finding very dark sugars offered for sale, some of which are very dark on account of their impurity, and some because they have been coloured, will buy whichever proves most profitable. In calculating the probable profit from each, the ques-

tions of duty and remission of duty become elements in the calculation. Now, there was a chance of paying less, and receiving more upon sugar re-exported under a tariff based upon the Dutch standard. A larger quantity of superior refined sugars were made from those coloured sugars, and for a time some bonus was secured upon a part of what was re-exported. But the small percentage of exports shows that this applied to but a small quantity of United States refined sugars. The people of the United States have imported, for some years, about 1,500,000,000 of pounds of sugar, and their exports amount to about 90,000,000 of pounds. Their tariff, as I have already said, induced their refiners to import superior low sugars to refine for exportation, and we had accordingly received from the United States refined sugars of a very high quality. This is the conclusion to which we have been led from the probabilities of the case. Let us here again refer to them. The American tariff is based, to the extent of $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., upon the Dutch standard. The dyed sugars are of a very high quality intrinsically, containing from 95 to 98 per cent. of crystallisable sugar. They contained but little glucose and very little ash. They, being coloured, paid in part the duty of a low standard, and received, as a drawback, the duty they would have paid if undyed, and when tested they were found to contain nothing but pure cane sugar. So far then as the consumer was concerned, it was his interest to obtain the United States refined sugar. Now, what is to be the effect of this tariff? It would be simply this: to exclude every pound of sugar from our markets, except the lowest grades of raw sugars from the West Indies or South America. Last year we imported sugar—he left melado, molasses and syrups out of consideration—to the value of \$5,982,078, which paid a tax amounting to \$2,515,655, being about forty-two per cent. *ad valorem*. What we imported below number 9, Dutch standard, paid a duty equal to 39 per cent. *ad valorem*, which showed that the assertion that the lower grades of sugar, under the former tariff, paid a higher duty upon value than those of a superior quality, is not well founded.

What I now wish to point out to the House is, that this tariff is especially arranged against the consumer, and against the interests of commerce, but in the interest of the refiner and the refiners alone. Let me take in the first case, the American refined sugars. These averaged, last year, \$6.26 per hundred pounds, say 6½c. a pound. The account under the new tariff will stand as follows:—

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| 100 pounds..... | \$6 25 |
| U. S. Custom tax..... | 3 16 |
| 1 cent per pound specific tax..... | 1 09 |
| 35 per cent..... | 3 29 |

Total cost, freight and charges excluded, is..... \$10 54

| | |
|--|--------|
| Under the old tariff the cost would have been..... | \$6 25 |
| 1 cent per pound specific duty..... | 1 00 |
| 25 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 1 56 |

The total cost..... \$8 81

or \$1.73 less than under the new tariff. This would be additional tax paid upon United States sugars, or upon any sugars of the same quality.

MR. TILLEY: You stated we would not get our sugar from the United States.

MR. MILLS: I do not think we will in legitimate trade. I am of opinion that the hon. the Finance Minister will discover by and by that the people along the border will consume sugar that, somehow or other, does not appear in the Custom House returns. Now, the moment a refinery is started, the importation of United States sugars would be at an end. Take English and Scotch sugars:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| They average per 100 pounds..... | \$5 20 |
| Specific duty..... | 1 00 |
| 35 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> | 1 82 |

Total..... \$8 02

As against \$7.50 under the old tariff, being an increase of duty of 52c. on every hundred pounds.

MR. TILLEY: We do not collect it from England that way.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman collects a tax on all imported sugars.

MR. TILLEY: There is no duty in England.

MR. MILLS.

MR. MILLS: I speak of the tax here. Would the hon. gentleman contend that this advance of 52c. a hundred in the price of English and Scotch sugars would not bring sugars refined in Canada up to the price that would barely exclude foreign sugars to a price above that which sugars now command in the Canadian markets? The moment refineries were started in Canada, these sugars would be as effectively excluded as those of the United States. Let me call your attention to the operation of this tariff upon the better class of raw sugars. Since sugars have ceased to be refined in Canada, our West Indian imports have been mostly of this class, and they have cost:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Per 100 pounds..... | \$4 36 |
| 1c. per pound specific duty..... | 1 00 |
| <i>Ad valorem</i> | 1 30 |

Making a total value of..... \$6 66

These higher grades of raw sugar will also be shut out of the Canadian market. Now, I have before me the prices of three cargoes of sugar purchased in Cuba this year, and they are as follows:—10th March, 812,900 pounds gross, 716,353 nett, \$18,226.86 = \$2.54; 24th January, 389,742 pounds gross, 342,973 nett, \$8,145.60 = \$2.37; 3rd March, 226,600 pounds gross, 199,408 nett, \$5,047.51 = \$2.53. Now, if we take \$2.50 as the average price of ordinary refining sugar, we have this result:

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| 100 pounds..... | \$2 50 |
| Specific duty..... | 50 |
| <i>Ad valorem</i> | 75 |

Making a total value of..... \$3 75

I assume that the freights will not vary much. What results, then, have we? We have these sugars imported, less the freights, at \$3.75. The refiner has then to cover the cost of refining and waste the following sums:—As against United States sugars, \$6.79; as against English and Scotch, \$4.27; as against superior raw sugars, \$2.91. If \$3 per hundred pounds were paid, we would have:

| | |
|-------------------------|--------|
| 100 pounds..... | \$3 00 |
| Specific duty..... | 50 |
| <i>Ad valorem</i> | 90 |

\$4 40

And if you suppose the price paid would reach the high sum of \$3.50 a hundred,

the tax would only amount to \$1.55. Would the hon. gentleman say that this will not at once call into existence establishments for refining sugar in this country, and if it does, what must be the effect upon the revenue? In 1875, we collected upon every hundred pounds imported from the United States \$2.26; from Great Britain, \$2.25; from the West Indies, \$1.80. In 1876, we collected from the United States, \$2.11; from Great Britain, \$2.12; from the West Indies, \$1.67. During these two years the Montreal refinery was in operation, and a large portion of the West India sugar was of low grade. In 1877, we collected upon every hundred pounds of sugar from the United States, \$2.43; from Great Britain, \$2.28; and from the West Indies, \$2.02. Last year we collected \$2.19 per hundred upon West Indian sugars; \$2.26 per hundred upon English and Scotch sugars; and \$2.54 per hundred upon United States sugars. Your duties averaged \$2.39 upon all you imported. You propose a very much higher tax, which will result in what? Why, within a few months in bringing down your revenue to \$1.25 per hundred, or, at most, \$1.55. Now, this sum upon 120,000,000 of pounds of sugar gives a revenue of from \$1,500,000 to \$1,860,000. Well, this is a very serious inroad upon the revenue. How does it affect the consumer? I think I can show hon. gentlemen that it must largely increase the price to him. If they took the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1878, they would find that 93,490,878 pounds were imported for consumption at \$5.79 per hundred pounds. Under the old tariff there was collected upon this sugar a customs tax of \$2,289,840. Under the new tariff this sugar would have paid \$2,735,543—an excess of \$445,703. There was also imported 10,624,336 pounds of sugar, upon which there was paid, under the old tariff, \$209,066, but upon which the new tariff would have imposed a duty of \$286,857—an excess of \$77,791. Upon all the sugars imported last year the new tariff would have imposed upwards of \$550,000 more than the old. If we take, then, these two classes of sugars, we find that they comprise 104,115,214 pounds, costing \$8,436,149, that is the increased price with the duties added. I

have omitted all estimates for freight, assuming that these will be much the same in both cases. Under the new tariff, the cost would have been \$8,988,149. Now the inferior raw sugar, necessary to produce this same quantity, will cost in the West Indies \$2,780,000, and the duty will amount to \$1,450,000. Cost and duty amounts to \$4,200,000, leaving a margin to cover the cost of refining and the excess of the cost of transportation of \$4,788,000. What is, then, to prevent refiners in this country asking this sum? You have had an active competition among importers in your markets. You have been told that you have bought American sugars below their actual cost. You cannot expect to get foreign refined sugars for much less than you have purchased them heretofore. The tax paid will be greater. It is only necessary for your refiners to keep a shade below the figures I have mentioned, and your door is closed against refined sugars from Glasgow and from New York. There is no industry giving so little employment to labour. If we refined as efficiently as in England, 266 men would refine all the sugar consumed in Canada. I have no hesitation in saying that in the sugar trade we should consider nothing but the interests of the consumer and the public revenue. Under this tariff you have done neither. You have excluded the best sugars of every class, whether raw or refined. You have made special provisions for refining here inferior yellow sugars. You have specially provided that your people shall have an inferior article at a high rate, and you have provided for dividends of 10 per cent. a month upon capital invested in the business. Redpath's refinery at Montreal will, if put in operation, refine 60,000,000 pounds a year. Its capacity may be easily doubled. With your limited market, you provide for a monopoly. The hon. member for Stanstead last year undertook to defend himself from the charge of inconsistency for taking an anti-Protectionist view in the matter of coal oil refining. How did he do it? Why, he told us that, whenever Protection produced monopoly, it was mischievous, and ought not to be granted. He knows that this tariff will create a refining monopoly, and I trust he will be

prepared to vote on this as he voted upon coal oil refining. This is a tariff to make a few very rich and the many very poor. Better extend your list of pensioners, and leave your trade unfettered. Why do you not imitate the oligarchy of the old republic of Venice—let them write their names in the golden book, and draw their money direct from the National Treasury? This tariff does not favour Free-trade, but it does favour freebooting. The hon. member for Centre Toronto is no doubt pleased with the tariff, but he will remember now that, whenever he receives \$100,000 for furniture under the new tariff, he has \$35,000 that rightfully belongs to someone else. What an agreeable thing it will be to know that your debtors will feel that the only way that they can be even with you is by cheating you out of 35 per cent. of what they have promised to pay. The Finance Minister has, in the tariff he has submitted, leaving out all grain but corn, increased the taxation upon the present amount of imports by nearly \$7,500,000, which, added to the existing tariff, amounted to \$22,300,000. But the Finance Minister expects to produce such a diminution of imports as will reduce this sum by \$5,400,000, a diminution of about \$22,000,000. How does the hon. gentleman expect to accomplish this? There is but one way—by producing goods at home like those excluded by the tariff. Now, as these have not been produced under a tariff giving a protection of 17½ per cent., it is obvious they will sell for the natural price plus the tariff, or very nearly this much, so that the hon. gentleman will succeed in adding, by this Customs tax, not less than seven and a half millions of dollars, although, but a small portion of it will find its way into the Public Treasury. A few years ago, in addressing this House upon a like question, I pointed out what an enormous tax the people of this country were paying beyond the sum received into the Public Treasury. There is much to be said in favour of indirect taxes if properly levied. They are paid when convenient, and when the consumer has the means; but, they should be confined either to articles not produced in the country, or, if this is found impossible, they should be met by a corresponding excise duty. I do not

MR. MILLS.

say that this is possible at this moment, but I do say that, besides the tax that the hon. gentleman succeeds in taking from the people, not less than \$20,000,000 yearly will pass from the pockets of those to whom it rightfully belongs to a small number of the population, whom hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches have taken under their special favour. Mr. Mill has been quoted in favour of Protection. Mr. Mill admits that so long as Protection is necessary, the country is sustaining a loss. He favours it for a limited time, until the necessary skill may be required. Longer it is not to be continued. Not one of his conditions here exist. Do gentlemen opposite admit that while this system continues that the country loses? Do they admit that this is a burden upon the industry of the people, to be endured for the benefits to come? I say to the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, that you are never tired telling us how great and prosperous Protection has made the United States; how they are driving the products of British skill and British industry out of, not only the markets of the world, but out of their own. What are the facts? I will take the two most advanced industries of the United States—the manufacture of cotton and of iron. From 1856 to 1875, inclusive, the iron manufactories of the United Kingdom, sold to the people of the United States \$248,318,243, notwithstanding they had a protective duty of not less than 60 per cent. What are the facts as to the cotton trade? Let me read the United States imports of cotton goods from England, and her exports to all the world:

| | <i>Imports from England.</i> | <i>Exports.</i> |
|------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1865 | \$ 7,324,438 | \$3,451,501 |
| 1866 | 27,652,413 | 1,781,175 |
| 1867 | 22,817,923 | 4,698,235 |
| 1868 | 11,928,461 | 4,871,054 |
| 1869 | 16,474,036 | 5,874,222 |
| 1870 | 18,645,518 | 3,787,282 |
| 1871 | 24,790,648 | 3,556,136 |
| 1872 | 29,855,924 | 2,303,330 |
| 1873 | 29,752,116 | 2,947,528 |
| 1874 | 23,572,610 | 3,095,840 |
| 1875 | 22,790,377 | 4,071,882 |
| 1876 | 18,042,727 | 7,722,978 |
| | \$253,647,250 | \$48,074,223 |

This did not look as if the Protection of the United States was triumphing over the Free-trade of the United Kingdom.

Hon. gentlemen seemed never to weary of repeating the preposterous theory that a Protective system was necessary to diversify industry, and prepare a country for Free-trade. They might as well argue that we should begin our astronomical studies by believing in astrology. During the three years ending 1842, England exported nearly 84,777,886 yards of linen; during the three years ending 1874, she exported nearly 316,808,525 yards. During the first of these periods, she exported yearly 760,181,073 yards of cotton; during the second period she exported yearly 3,543,679,647 yards. The exports of woollen goods increased more than four-fold; and a progress equally wonderful was made in every branch of manufacturing industry. I know, Sir, there are gentlemen who seem afraid that this country will be without a diversified industry, unless a system of Protection is adopted. I do not subscribe to this view; it is founded upon totally erroneous views of the production of wealth, and the growth of a diversified industry. I do not desire that isolation from the rest of mankind which Protectionists call independence. I feel sure it would not contribute to our material prosperity, or to our mental enlightenment. I cannot do better than to quote from a speech made by Lord Palmerston, thirty-six years ago, on a similar subject: Lord Palmerston said, "But, Sir, there are larger grounds on which this doctrine ought to be repudiated by this House. Why is the earth on which we live divided into zones and climates? Why, I ask, do different countries yield different productions to people experiencing similar wants? Why are they intersected with mighty rivers—the natural highways of nations? Why are the lands the most distant from each other brought into contact by that very ocean which seems to divide them? Why, Sir, it is that man may be dependent upon man. It is that the exchange of commodities may be accompanied by the extension and diffusion of knowledge, by the interchange of mutual benefits, engendering mutual kind feelings, multiplying and confirming friendly relations. It is that commerce may freely go forth leading civilisation with the one hand and peace with the other, to render mankind happier, wiser, better. Sir, this is the dispensation of Providence; this is

the decree of that power which created and disposes the universe; but in the face of it, with arrogant presumptuous folly, the dealer in restrictive duties fly, fettering the inborn energies of man, and setting up their miserable legislation instead of the great standing laws of nature. Sir, I am convinced, whatever may be the result of this night's debate, that reason will prove more powerful than error. I am satisfied that the truth is strong enough to sweep away the cobwebs of fallacy, by which it is attempted to entangle it." But it is not more certain that day succeeds the night than it is certain that the dishonest and barbarous policy upon which we have this Session entered will be overthrown. Look at France before the Revolution. Society was segregated into orders. The rich ground down the poor. Those who possessed most of the nation's wealth were wholly exempt from taxation. Carlyle has drawn a vivid picture of the state of society; of the attempts to grow rich by Acts of Parliament; of the visionary schemes of the practical men. We know how the privileged classes—those who ruled—strove to turn the people into beasts of burden, and they became beasts of prey that devoured their adversaries, and distributed their estates. Why? Because heaven is not mocked; what men sow that shall they also reap. Property, through privilege, had become robbery, and the robber was despoiled. What was the history of the United Kingdom from 1815 to 1845? Was it not the history of the folly of a Government interfering with the industries of its people? Factories closed, workmen idle, poorhouses filled with paupers, cities filled with rioters, jails filled with criminals; the cries of suffering, and the shouts of sedition heard in every part of the United Kingdom. Sir, it is the business of statesmen to profit by the experience of other people, and to avert similar calamities from their own. Look at the people of the United States. Oppressing their fellow-men, they would not believe that Providence would execute the vengeance that justice willed against oppression. The punishment came—five years of Civil War. The waste of life, industry and capital was enormous—more than was ever gained by the unpaid labour of the slave. Another

abuse—that of Protection—has taken its place. It has brought in its train mischiefs, industrial, moral and political, of enormous magnitude. It has centralised wealth. It has plundered the poor. It has doomed thousands of the most industrious to a cheerless life of severe toil, with no prospect, but increasing poverty with increasing years. This is but another phase of injustice and oppression, which is doomed to perish by quiet means—possibly, by violence, if necessary. Will the cause of justice and humanity triumph? What is now overtaking them will certainly befall you. There is a power in the world, says Matthew Arnold, which makes for righteousness. Against this power you have set your faces, and you have attempted to found your system of taxation and the industrial pursuits of your population in a system of injustice. It cannot endure. It ever has been so—it must continue to be so—to the last syllable of recorded time, that every such effort is but the continuance of those follies, which, after much disaster, peacefully or by revolution, a progressive people will certainly destroy.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas) said there was a striking feature of the great scheme before the House worthy of notice, namely, that the people of this country had asked for it. They were endeavouring to give it to them in the shape that would produce the greatest possible good. He thought they had a right to be thankful to the Finance Minister for the great pains taken in his endeavour to perfect that measure, and gain for it not only the approval of this House, but of the country. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had, in his able speech, sketched a rather doleful prospect as to the results of this tariff; but it should attract him for this reason: that, if it did all the harm he fancied, it would usher into power again himself and friends, who mismanaged the affairs of the country to an extent not esteemed by the people. He (Mr. Ross) was certain the people would not sustain a Government that should act so badly as the hon. gentleman feared the present had in regard to this policy. It was to be hoped that, if the hon. gentlemen opposite did return to power, they would be more careful

Mr. MILLS.

than before, and adhere more to their promises made in Opposition. The present tariff, he believed, would have been forced on this country sooner but for its peculiar circumstances. The condition of the United States helped the prosperity of Canada, years ago, giving her facilities for making money that helped her vastly. But for that, they would have come to a more common-sense way of managing their affairs long ago. At all events, this policy was in the direction of causing Canadians to help themselves, instead of looking to others to do work for them that they were in duty bound to do for themselves. This tariff was the first step towards carrying out the great scheme of Confederation. Was it not intended to identify the interests of all sections, encourage inter-provincial trade, mutually beneficial, and enrich the country by promoting its industries? He thought that they should look at the matter in that way. He would read a short extract from the speech of one who helped greatly to bring about Confederation, made at that time. What did he bring forward to induce them to form Confederation—what benefits did he show would result from it, pointing to the efforts of their neighbours, the United States, who had benefitted by union?

“I go heartily for the Union because it will throw down the barriers of trade, and give us the control of a market of four millions of people. (Hear, hear.) What one thing has contributed so much to the wondrous material progress of the United States as the free passage of their products from one State to another? What has tended so much to the rapid advance of all branches of their industry, as the vast extent of their home market, creating an unlimited demand for the commodities of daily use, and stimulating the energy and ingenuity of producers?”

That was what would be the result of the present policy of the Government. They would be able to increase the railroad communication between the Provinces, and in this way they could develop the resources of the country, and exchange the commodities produced in the different Provinces. This policy was calculated to have the same beneficial effect on this country as a similar policy had had in the country of our neighbours south of us. We were not so different in point of capabilities as com-

pared with the United States. Canada had, within herself, vast resources, and all they wanted was development. Under this tariff they would be able to give to their respective industries that protection and stimulus which they had asked, and he hoped that the country would attain a degree of prosperity which had not been ours for the past few years. He was glad to know that, at last, the agricultural community of this country had received some consideration. For many years they had sought for Protection without avail. In 1872 he himself had moved the following resolution :—

"1. That it is highly desirable that the several classes or branches of the industrial pursuits in this country should, as far as possible, be placed on an equality.

"2. That the agricultural classes are not so placed while grain of all kinds remains on the free list.

"3. That in order to remedy that inequality, and to remove an injustice, the following articles imported into this country be made subject to a duty, viz. : Barley, oats, and Indian corn, per bushel—cents.; coal, per ton, —cents."

It would be observed he omitted wheat in that resolution, and he did so for various reasons. He was not particularly favourable to a duty on wheat today. When he introduced that resolution he was laughed at by both sides of the House. He was glad to know that the ideas he then entertained had taken root, and that they had been introduced in this tariff. It had been contended by his hon. friend from North Norfolk that this policy was calculated to create ill-feeling in the United States. He could only say in reference to this that it was for them to decide whether they were a free people, free to do what they pleased. He was opposed to always consulting the Americans as to what was best for ourselves. He believed the policy was a sound one, and would increase the general prosperity of the country. But he must admit there was something manifestly unfair in the way England was treated in this tariff. England treated us fairly in opening her ports to us; but they must admit that, whilst she was generous to Canada, she was equally generous to other countries. She did nothing more for Canada than for our American neighbours. He would be perfectly willing

to admit English goods into this country at a less duty than any other country, if she would secure a market for our goods and products. If England chose to open her markets to all peoples, and treat us no better than others, we had to do the best we could for ourselves, consequently, Canada must adopt such a fiscal policy as commended itself to their own sense of judgment, and which was in the interest of the people. Unless they did this they must fail to accomplish what was expected from them as a free and progressive people. If England would place a duty on foreign products, and treat Canada as a part and parcel of herself, it would be greatly in the interests of England and her Colonies. This country was capable of supplying England, under a proper fiscal system in that country, with all the cereals she required. Unless England changed her policy, he feared the interests of Canada and of England would so conflict that it was questionable whether they would long continue one and united. He regarded it as important that we should always continue under the old flag, but he believed seriously and honestly that in order to do so, different trade relations would have to subsist between Canada and England. He could quite understand that, if they put a high price upon English goods coming into this country, it would only go to weaken the tie between Canada and England. He believed the only way in which the matter could be settled was by making a representation from this country and the other Colonies to England, desiring her to determine a plan that would be satisfactory to all her people. He was afraid that, unless there was a change made in the lavish manner in which money had been expended in the Dominion during the last few years, that additional taxation would be required. Under Confederation they took a very long step. The understanding was that, under Confederation, we were to get the four Provinces united, to build the Intercolonial Railway, and acquire the North-West Territories. In his opinion, they would have been much better off if they had contented themselves with that. But they ran away with the idea that they must extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He said in 1872 or 1871, that a great

mistake was being made, and that they were not financially in a position to bring British Columbia into the Union. It was quite impossible, considering the financial condition of the country, to construct the Pacific Railway without increasing the burdens of the people. He would ask was it possible that any hon. gentleman could come to the conclusion that they could go on with that work without increasing the taxation of the people? He did not know whether they were really bound to go on with the work or not.

MR. BUNSTER : Oh, yes, you are.

MR. ROSS (Dundas) said his hon. friend from Vancouver said he was willing to throw up the matter. He thought that, if the matter were properly represented to England, she would advance all the money requisite to build the railway to British Columbia sooner than allow this union to be broken. He was of opinion that, if they again sent home their Finance Minister to create a further increase of the national debt, for the purpose of building this road, which his hon. friend had said would not pay running expenses for a long time to come, they would get into difficulties from which it would take a very long time to recover. Whilst it was not possible for them to go to the Mother Country for a loan, for the purpose of paying the running expenses of the road that was purely for their own benefit, it could be properly represented that this road would be valuable as a military road, in enabling England to keep her colonial possessions together, and if England, as she undoubtedly did, desired to retain her Colonies, he thought that she would be willing to assist in the building of the road; and he thought it was their bounden duty to do so. A few years ago, before the change of Government took place, after the Conservative party had been in office some time, the Liberal party said the Government had been a little careless and extravagant respecting this matter, and those gentlemen promised that, if they got into power, a purer state of things would succeed; that this country would prosper; that a strict system of economy would be pursued. He was sure that the pres-

MR. ROSS.

ent leader of the Opposition when he was called upon to carry on the Government, had no excuse for not fulfilling his promises when in Opposition. He had the whole Reform party at his back, and a fair portion of Conservatives. But what had the hon. gentleman done? In the very first place, he made a very great mistake. He had, in 1871, he (Mr. Ross) thought, opposed the Government of the day in building the Pacific Railway as a Government work; he would place no such work in the power of any Government to construct; but, when he attained the reins of Government, he adopted the very same course that he had before so strongly opposed. He had every opportunity then to have gone into that work, with a well-defined plan, in strict accordance with sound commercial principle; and if he wanted to carry out that great scheme, he had no better scheme before him than in the proposition of the previous Government to give the road to a private company to build, and thereby keep the hands of the Government free from it. In 1871, he (Mr. Ross) had taken objection to the scheme that was then introduced, and had voted against it. He had objected to the construction of a work so gigantic as that by any Government. They might be the best and purest men in the world, and still not be able to carry out such a great work without it being, to a certain extent, managed so as to favour private or commercial interests. The hon. gentlemen had an example before them which they could very properly have followed without violating any pledge, or any understanding they formerly had with regard to this work. The people of this country were a reading people; they watched the finances of the Dominion, and there was no man who could stand under the load of having it charged against him that he had increased the public debt from year to year as those gentlemen had done. When they looked at the promise of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) and the course pursued by him, what did they find? They found that, taking the three years following 1873-'4, as compared with the three years previous,—for that was a sort of partnership year and disputed one—the national debt had been increased

\$19,000,000, and if they referred to what was called the controllable expenditure, they found that the controllable expenditure of those years was increased nearly \$2,000,000 a year in excess.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. ROSS said yes, he understood that to be the case. As he had the proof of this extravagance, he would assume that the hon. gentleman's denial was incorrect. These hon. gentlemen had so administered the affairs of this country that there had been a deficit from year to year, and if the same ratio of increase were followed, it would result in financial ruin to this country. But he was sure the National Policy now proposed would prevent that result. He believed this policy was a move in the right direction, and that the Government deserved the confidence of the House. It was the duty of every hon. gentleman, on an occasion like the present, not to throw obstacles in the way of the Government in their honest endeavour to improve the condition of the country, but to do all in their power to help to perfect any measure having for its object so laudable a result, and the Opposition would find it vastly to their benefit to adopt that course, and thereby raise themselves in the estimation of the people of this country. It was the duty of the representatives of the people in this House, at any rate he (Mr. Ross) felt strongly it was his duty, to do all in their power to place the people of this country in a more prosperous position. In conclusion, he hoped this policy would work well. If it did not, of course it must be remedied. It was not likely that they could have a perfect measure all at once. He thought the working of this policy would satisfy everyone that it was a step in the right direction.

MR. HESSON said he would endeavour to occupy as short a time as the great importance of the question under the consideration of this House would permit. He would first notice a remarkable passage in the speech of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) the other evening, who, in a most excited manner, charged hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House with having gone from one end of the Dominion to the other with false

promises and pledges, which it was never intended to carry out, telling in each county and Province a different tale. He, for one, denied the charge with the same vigour with which it was made; and repudiated the right of the hon. gentleman to make such a charge against hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House. The same hon. gentleman made another singular declaration at the same time, which was, that it was not possible for this or any other Government to protect the farmers of Canada. He would allow this hon. gentleman to answer this singular proposition in his own words. Before he got through with his speech he stated: "I will allow that Protection may be obtained by a duty of 2½, 5, 10, 20, 100, 1,000 per cent." Now, here was a paradox which he must leave the hon. gentleman to explain to the farmers and the others interested in this tariff. The hon. gentleman was honest enough to admit the inability of gentlemen on his side of the House to provide a remedy for the prevailing distress in the country, having stated that they could not, by any system of legislation, bring about a period of prosperity. The electors of the Dominion thought differently, though hon. gentlemen opposite might call them ignorant and easily gulled by the promises of gentlemen on the Government side of the House. He was pleased to see that the tariff now brought down was in keeping with the expectations held out and the promises made to the electors of Canada, prior to and during the last elections. Then they had the loyalty cry, the charge that we were dealing unfairly with Great Britain. He would investigate this charge for a few moments, for he felt it to be a serious charge, if true. He would take the evidence of the Trade and Navigation Returns, as furnished this House by hon. gentlemen opposite during a period of five years, and what did he find. Our imports from Great Britain, for the following years, were:

| | <i>Dutiable.</i> | <i>Free.</i> |
|-----------|------------------|--------------|
| 1874 | \$63,076,437 | \$15,287,217 |
| 1875 | 60,347,067 | 11,107,948 |
| 1876 | 40,734,260 | 8,348,778 |
| 1877 | 39,572,239 | 6,655,463 |
| 1878 | 37,431,180 | 5,291,397 |
| | \$241,161,183 | \$46,990,801 |

Of which sum \$194,170,382 paid a duty of 15, 16 $\frac{2}{3}$, and 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. How stood the imports from the United States during the same period of years? Did the imports from that country decline in the same rapid ratio? He was sorry to say that they did not, as the following table would show:—

| | <i>Dutiable.</i> | <i>Free.</i> |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|
| 1874 | \$54,283,172 | \$33,179,716 |
| 1875 | 50,805,829 | 28,782,185 |
| 1876 | 46,070,033 | 24,735,420 |
| 1877 | 51,312,669 | 27,801,823 |
| 1878 | 48,631,739 | 25,163,656 |
| | \$251,103,442 | \$139,662,800 |

That was a sufficient answer to the charge of disloyalty, because we desired to shut out the American goods which were permitted to such a large extent to enter free, greatly to our injury. Hon. gentlemen would observe that our free list of imports from the United States showed \$139,662,800, against \$46,990,801 from Great Britain, a difference in favour of the former of \$92,671,999. But that was not all. If we contrasted our export trade with both countries, it would be seen that, though we bought less from Great Britain than from the United States, the Mother Country consumed the largest portion of our exports, which she admitted entirely free of duty, thus proving that, under the policy of the late Government, our trade showed most disloyal tendencies. Our exports were:

| | <i>To G. Britain.</i> | <i>To the U. States.</i> |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1874 | \$45,003,882 | \$36,244,311 |
| 1875 | 40,032,902 | 29,911,983 |
| 1876 | 40,723,477 | 31,933,459 |
| 1877 | 41,567,469 | 25,775,245 |
| 1878 | 45,941,539 | 25,244,898 |
| | \$213,269,269 | \$149,109,896 |

He would ask these hon. gentlemen how much longer they would require to remain in power in order that the trade with England should have fallen off altogether? If they took the ratio at which it had declined during the time they were in power as an index, he would venture to make the statement that, in less than five years more, we would have ceased to import a dollar's worth from Great Britain at all, and our whole import trade would be with the United States. He was glad to see the Finance Minister had the courage to come down

with a Budget which would remedy this; which would reverse these unfair anomalies. Take, for instance, the article of breadstuffs, of which we imported from the United States \$13,350,777, and from Great Britain only \$21,884. This was taxed about 15 per cent., which was a step in the right direction, bearing heavily upon the United States, and but slightly affecting Great Britain. But the cry was raised that the poor man would suffer, that we were unfairly burdening our own people with taxation. He would ask those hon. gentlemen in what way they would propose raising the revenue, if they did not levy additional taxes? In what other way could they provide for the large deficits which occurred during their *régime*, and which necessitated the collection of an additional amount of \$2,102,500 from the people? Hence this cry of taxation fell to the ground, and the people were aware that our only safety lay in levying the duties in such a manner that, while providing the requisite amount of revenue, they would develop our resources and manufacturing industries, and thus benefit the people by being the means of giving them additional employment and avenues for their skill and industry. Great complaint had been made because the Minister of Finance had been favoured with the experience of manufacturers and other experienced business men to aid him in framing his tariff. If hon. gentlemen opposite were sincere in their desire to see the country prosper, they would join with the Finance Minister in endeavouring to procure some remedy for our troubles, instead of approaching this question in a fault-finding spirit, and with loud declamations. Gentlemen seemed to have forgotten the lesson of the 17th September, that the people had asked for Protection and that it was the duty of this Government to give it to them. He desired to say a few words with reference to the question of taxation. He knew that it was not a popular question, and that the gentlemen opposite had been afraid to go to the country on that question. He thought it was a remarkable thing, indeed, that the Conservative party, who had boldly grappled with that question, had met with such great success in the last election. The Government had a right to

the approbation of the country for having endeavoured to meet the necessities of the revenue in the manner they had. What would hon. gentlemen opposite have said if the hon. the Minister of Finance had failed to bring down these resolutions? They would have said that the Government had deceived the people, and they would have had real cause for blaming the Government for not introducing the legislation required by the country. But now they had no right to come here and charge them with breaking faith with the people. In undertaking this difficult task, the hon. the Minister of Finance had assumed an enormous intellectual burden, and, instead of finding fault with him, they should do everything in their power to sustain him. They had heard a great deal about the poor man's interest. On this point, he would quote from hon. gentlemen opposite to show how hollow were their professions of regard for the interest of the working classes. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright) had said, the other day, that the manufacturers were signing their death-warrant in asking for these resolutions, as the increase in home competition would bring down prices to a ruinous point; but the *Globe* newspaper, on the other hand, declared that this tariff was constructed in the interests of the manufacturers, who would all grow rich under its operation. Evidently one of these authorities was egregiously mistaken, because the two statements were directly opposed to each other. He would continue to quote from the hon. gentlemen opposite against each other. One of their beautiful statements was that the Government had surrendered to the manufacturers, their interests alone being considered, while those of the vast body of consumers were entirely lost sight of. On the other hand, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) declared that the Government had utterly failed to keep their promises to the manufacturers, who were justly indignant at their shameful betrayal. It was only necessary to listen to those hon. gentlemen in their speeches, and take notes as they went along, and every man of them could be tripped. Here was another statement from one of the gentlemen opposite: "The bread of the poor will be taxed for the benefit of the greedy

millers, and already sufficiently wealthy farmers." But another gentleman opposite made this directly opposite statement: "The protection on breadstuffs is a hollow mockery, and will be absolutely of no benefit to farmers and millers, but, on the contrary, as it will close the doors of other nations against us, the prices of breadstuffs will be ruinously lowered." Then they made a great outcry about putting a tax on the people's coal. Said one of them: "The people of Ontario will have to pay the tax on coal for the benefit of the Nova Scotians, while the duty on breadstuffs will not benefit Ontario." Another gentleman said: "The duty on coal will never benefit Nova Scotia, while the tax on breadstuffs, for the benefit of Ontario, will press with insupportable severity on the people of Nova Scotia, and will, in time, lead to the disruption of the Union." "The prices of manufactured goods," said another, "will be so enormously advanced, that the consumers will be utterly ruined." Then came this directly opposite statement from another hon. gentleman on the same side: "Ruinous home competition among manufacturers will so cut down prices, that successful manufacturing will be an impossibility." He could go on almost *ad infinitum* quoting hon. gentlemen opposite against themselves. Another of their grievances was the bearing of the tariff on our intercourse with Great Britain and the United States. One hon. gentleman said: "The tariff being hostile to the United States, it will provoke hostility with the Republic, and the Yankees will retaliate." Another of them said: "The tariff is hostile to Great Britain, and unduly favours the States; it is, therefore, at once disloyal and annexationist." This was a sample of the stuff the House had been obliged to listen to during the last few evenings. He desired to say a few words on a question of equal national importance with the one embraced in the resolutions now before the House—he referred to our monetary and financial institutions. No one would deny their great importance, and he desired to press upon the Government who were now charged with the legislation for this country the absolute necessity of changing the entire fiscal system so long pursued in this country. So long as our Canadian Min-

ister of Finance was compelled to go year after year to Great Britain, and there advertise and sell our national bonds, whether at a discount or premium—and he was sorry to say it was most generally at a discount—going on borrowing at the rate of from two to fifteen millions per year, so long would our national debt and our national interest go on increasing most alarmingly. Take, for instance, the very last loan of \$15,000,000, placed, no doubt, as well, and he thought he was justified in saying better than any other man in this Dominion could have placed it at such a trying time, in the financial crisis passing like a wave more or less over every land. Take that loan, and it was but a single instance of the many loans placed year after year, and what did they find? They found, saying nothing of the shrinkage on the face of our bonds, saying nothing of the percentage paid to our financial agents for floating the loan, saying nothing about a sinking fund, the enormous charge upon the revenue of this country, even at the apparently low rate of interest of 4 per cent. annually, might he not say forever, of \$600,000, over and above the astounding sum of \$7,002,515.69 on our other national indebtedness. He maintained the whole system of borrowing was wrong from beginning to end, and, so long as we pursued that course, so long would this young country be unfairly weighted, and its people impoverished and burdened with a heavy load of taxation. This objection was all the stronger because the interest was not being paid to our moneyed men or our moneyed institutions, but the circulation passed away out of our country and into the hands and pockets of a people who carried none of our burdens. It might fairly be asked what remedy could be provided to stop this drain of the very life blood of our country, and, at the same time, complete our great national railways, our colonization roads, our canals and other public works so necessary to the prosperity of this young Dominion. His answer was, by the adoption of another National Policy—a policy which he held to be quite as important to the welfare and the prosperity of this country as the one now being debated, and they must all confess the great importance of the resolutions now

MR. HESSON.

before the House, and the influence their adoption might have either for weal or woe to Canada. He was not in accord with the gentlemen on the other side of the House who said that no Act of Parliament could make a people rich or prosperous. From his earliest years he had been taught to believe that, in these matters, at least, a Parliament was all-powerful, and from the way hon. gentlemen opposite attacked these resolutions and the hon. the Minister of Finance, whose duty it was to bring down this tariff, they were apprehensive that an act of this House would have some effect on the interest of this young nation. He proposed a national issue of paper currency by the Government of this country, for the purpose of continuing and completing our great public work, and that such issue should be, at least, to the extent of the money voted by this House to be expended annually on public works in the Dominion, and to be paid out by the Public Treasury, from time to time, to the Government contractors engaged in the completion of our public works; such issue of paper money to be made a legal tender, as our Dominion notes were now for all payments in this country. He should not stop to discuss here whether or not such a national currency should be made redeemable in 20, 30, or 50 years, or whether it would not be best to make it an irredeemable currency. He knew it might be urged by many, whose faith in values was centred and bound up in a gold or specie circulation, as against a paper circulation, that the value of such a paper issue would, some time in the distant future, decline in value. Were they to be told that the security was not good that this great Dominion had to offer, that our limitless prairie lands, our boundless mineral resources, our vast tracts of valuable forest and timber lands, our teeming fisheries in the east, west, and everywhere, our great public works, and our other valuable resources of revenue were not ample and sufficient securities to the holders of such a currency? Were they to be told, who professed such hopes for the future of Canada, that their own people would look with distrust or doubt upon such magnificent security? What right had they to expect that their national

bonds would sell at par in any foreign country, if Canadians had no faith in them at home? Let them prove to all the nations around that they had an abiding faith in the great future in store for Canada. He knew he was venturing a bold statement, and yet he did not hesitate to say that a specie currency was a lifeless currency, a dead currency, that yielded no annual profit to our people, that in a few years it eat itself up in interest, while locked away in some secure place. In the first place, it was obtained by much toil and labour, and, in many cases, by digging deep down into the bowels of the earth; then, if a man had at last been successful in obtaining the much coveted dust, it was coined in a mint and locked away carefully and securely in some great vault to rust, where it remained as lifeless and useless for all practicable purposes of every-day trade, as it was originally deep down in the fissures and crevices of the rock where nature first placed it. Then, upon this security, this dead and lifeless carcase buried away in our vaults, enterprising bankers who knew the value of a circulating paper currency came to the Government of the country and obtained a charter authorising them to issue a live paper currency, which went into circulation in the proportion of three, five and often more, paper dollars, to the one in specie. The gold earned no more in the vault than it did in its original graveyard, and the great toil and labour expended in seeking it would have gone far in building and completing some of our great public works, which would be a lasting monument of the enterprise of our people, and which could have been paid for by an issue of a national paper currency which would have cost the Government the labour of printing, and for which all Canada's great resources would stand pledged as security. He had said nothing of the profit that would result to the Government from the wear and tear of such a circulation; it was safe to place it at 5 per cent. per annum, and to that was to be added the 4 per cent. interest we were now promising to pay foreign capitalists upon the loans we were yearly placing abroad. He was not of the opinion, as expressed by the hon. member from North Oxford (Mr.

Oliver), the other evening in this House, who said it was no evidence of a nation's prosperity to be able to pay their national debt. The Americans were now doing that rapidly under a national protective policy and a national paper currency, whilst we were rapidly increasing ours, and were annually paying a tribute of interest to another people than our own. If we must be in debt, let us change our system, and let us be in debt to our own people, and let us in the future prevent in this way the large annual flow of interest which now went out of our country, representing as it did much, if not all, of the profits arising out of the hard earnings of our people. He desired to say a few words in regard to the unreasonableness of hon. gentlemen opposite—an unreasonableness exhibited to a shameful extent by the press of hon. gentlemen opposite demanding day after day in this House and in the country, where was the prosperity promised to Canada upon the advent to power of the hon. gentleman who now led this House? Did they desire this House or this country to believe that all the distress and want and financial ruin that fell upon this country fell suddenly and upon a single day, and that day the one upon which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), and those who followed him came into power? He thought not? But he did not hesitate to say that the distress we were in and had been passing through grew upon Canada from that time forward, gradually but surely, under their Government. But it took years to accumulate the misfortunes we had suffered since then. So, too, it would take time to restore the ruined hope and fortunes of our fellow-countrymen, and bring about the general prosperity that once prevailed. Gentlemen opposite must have learned ere this that it was much easier to pull down a structure than to build one up; much easier to destroy our trade than to restore it; and yet these reasonable gentlemen had asked for all this to be done suddenly, even in a single day. He had strong faith that we were now taking a step in the right direction. He had a firm belief that a national system of Protection to all our interests and industries would in due time restore our national prosperity. There might be details in the tariff he

should have preferred to see different, but he had not one doubt that they were all considered in the best interests not of individuals, not of Provinces alone, but in the greater interests of our whole Dominion. He supported most heartily these resolutions.

MR. SNOWBALL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes before
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 2nd April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 70) To remove doubts as to the true intent and meaning of certain provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(Mr. McCuaig.)

DREDGING OF NEW CHANNEL INTO PRESQU'ISLE BAY.

QUESTION.

MR. KEELER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates this year for completing the dredging of the new channel into Presqu'Isle Bay, Lake Ontario.

MR. TUPPER: I am afraid the Government will not be able to do so.

MURRAY CANAL CONSTRUCTION.

QUESTION.

MR. KEELER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to make an appropriation for constructing the Murray Canal, in the East Riding of North-

MR. HESSON.

umberland, Ontario, for which purpose some 6,000 acres of land were set apart in the year 1796.

MR. TUPPER: I will be obliged to give my hon. friend the same answer.

ST. ANACLET POST OFFICE.

QUESTION.

MR. FISET enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Postmaster-General to instruct the postmaster of St. Anaclet to remove his office to a more central locality, as he has done with respect to the postmasters of Matane, Montalembert and St. Fabien.

MR. LANGEVIN: In answer to the hon. member, I may say that my Department has received no request to change the location of that post-office. I have received some information in relation thereto, which the hon. gentleman will excuse me if I cannot, at this moment, make public.

RIVER TRENT CANAL WORKS.

MR. KEELER moved that a Select Committee be appointed, to take into consideration the return to an Address of the 24th February last, relating to the River Trent and Newcastle District Navigation and Canals Works, and the papers brought down therewith; with power to send for persons and papers, and to report thereon; said Committee to be composed of Messrs. Keeler, Brown, Burk, Burnham, Cameron (North Victoria), Cockburn (West Northumberland), Hilliard, Thompson (Haldimand), and Williams.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) said he seconded the motion from the conviction that the matter was one of great public importance, as well as specially important to the section of country he represented, and of the country intervening between the North Riding of Victoria and Lake Ontario, six or seven constituencies. The subject was one of public importance from a constitutional point of view. The value of this property was very great. The actual cost of the works, according to a return

laid on the table of the House, was \$670,000. If to that was added the cost of repairs and maintenance, the actual value of the works, that had been handed over in the manner shown by the return before the House, would exceed \$1,000,000. When they were in the last days of their existence, the late Government thought fit, on the 8th of October, two days before their resignation, to hand over a million dollars' worth of property belonging to the Dominion to one of the Provinces, doing an act for which there was no immediate urgency, and which was not in accordance with the settled policy of the country as established by Parliament. One could not help thinking that, at any rate, the late Government were assuming a power which it would have been much more becoming if they had left to their successors to exercise. But a defunct Government had assumed to itself the right of giving away, without consideration and without condition, \$1,000,000 worth of property belonging to the people of this Dominion. The return laid on the table of the House showed that there were comprised in these works and affected by them 116 miles of lake navigation, together with 98 miles of river navigation, making altogether 200 miles of navigation of a very important character, and very extensively used, not only for the purpose of the transmission of lumber and timber, but for the purpose of navigation. One portion of this water communication was navigated by nine steamers, another portion by eight, and another portion by twenty-four, all in daily use during the season of navigation, and many of them of large size. There were also important works in the shape of mills along this navigation, and persons who had built these mills held leases from the Dominion with rights which were enforceable at law; consequently large interests were involved in this question. Another circumstance should be considered. Between 30,000 and 40,000 acres of land, much of it of a valuable character, had been acquired and paid for by the late Province of Canada or by the Dominion for the purpose of utilising the navigation. All that land was immediately saleable for a large sum of money, and this was also handed over to the Ontario Government

without consideration. When one came to look at the facts of this transfer, one naturally inquired what was the reason that it was so hurriedly carried out? He saw by the return that it was assumed to be in pursuance of negotiations under an Order in Council passed in 1870. If the Government in power in 1870 opened negotiations with the Provincial Government, why were they not carried to completion, if thought to be in the interests of the Dominion? An examination of the full return would show that the Ontario Government at that time declined to assume these works for certain reasons that were then satisfactory, and the matter remained in abeyance until 1878, when this sudden transfer was made. In reference to the validity of the transfer, he would call the attention of the House to the only authority under which it could take place. That authority was the Public Works Act of 1867, the 54th section of which he read. The authority given by that clause included only roads, harbours and rivers, whereas a large portion of the works in question consisted of canals. The return showed that there were nearly two miles of canal which were of absolute necessity to make this navigation possible. This was the canal at the head of the River Trent, which made Rice Lake navigable to a much greater extent than before. This was built some forty years ago, and since then Rice Lake and the River Otonabee had been extensively navigated by steamers. There was another canal at Buckhorn, and another at Bobcaygeon—the latter rendering Sturgeon Lake navigable. He did not think these canals came within the meaning of the Act. The words "rivers or river improvements," meant simply those rivers upon which improvements had been made for the purpose of bringing down timber and saw logs, and in some few instances, partial navigation. It was never intended by this clause to cover the transfer of such works as those of the Trent navigation. If it could not legally be done under that clause of the Act, the 54th section, the whole thing was void, and for that transfer there was no authority. In the other provisions of the Act there were circumstances worthy of attention. The Order in Council never was published in the *Gazette*, and it publica-

tion was essential to its validity, it remained a dead letter to this moment. The Governor in Council was authorised to reserve the power to resume possession of the works if any of the conditions of transfer were violated. It was evident, from the law, that the sole purpose for which the transfer could be legally made, was the maintenance of the works—that was the essential condition. What was the purpose for which this transfer was sought to be made? The Order in Council of the Province of Ontario showed it was not their maintenance, but the destruction of a great part of them. The Ontario Government was found declaring that they would only take the works without conditions as to maintenance, whilst the Statute said that the Dominion Government should have power to transfer them only on condition of maintenance, and yet that Government gave them away unconditionally. That was an express violation of the terms of the Statute, or at any rate of its spirit. It must have been done with some improper motive. It was alleged to have been done with political objects by a dying Government—the late one—which handed over those works to their political friends, who still held—but probably not for long—power in Ontario. Finding that power was slipping out of their hands, they wanted to place the control of those very extensive works, with all their patronage, in the hands of the Local Government, more particularly in view of the approach of the local elections. He had been informed by letters from the neighbourhood of those works, that the fact of their transfer was now being used extensively by candidates in the interest of the present Ontario Government. Candidates of that Government in East Northumberland, and East Peterborough, were going about boasting that they had now got control of the Trent Navigation Works, including some 30,000 acres of land, that would, probably, be sold to the owners of adjoining properties, and that they would be able to take care of the interests of their friends. The House could readily see what a mighty engine of corruption might be given to the candidates of whatever Government held control of those large and important works. If the dams were taken down, 30,000 acres of

valuable land might be reclaimed, and offered for sale, worth \$30 to \$40 an acre. Was it right that this property should be handed over by the Dominion Government to the Government of Ontario, apart altogether from the question as to whether the gift was made to influence the approaching local election. The late Federal Government was guilty of a gross violation of their functions in making that transfer on the eve of their death. Negotiations for the transfer were commenced in 1870, but had been allowed to remain in abeyance because the Local Government refused to accept the works on the legal condition. When they found that, in the last week of the late Government's life, this subject was suddenly taken up, and this valuable property handed over to the Local Government, the conclusion as to a political object was irresistible. They should have left to their successors the disposal of that property. Under those circumstances they could not find it strange if hon. gentlemen on that side of the House charged them with thus committing this act to gain political influence for their friends in Ontario, having found that they could no longer use them for their own benefit.

MR. BURNHAM said the late Government acted improperly in disposing of those works a few days before quitting office. There was no authority for their action. Their motive must have been outside their legal and official duties. The first intimation the public had of the transfer was the question asked in the Ontario Legislature. Mr. Ferris had asked whether the Government were going to make provision for removing a portion of the dams; the answer was that the matter was under consideration. The Government brought down their ordinary Estimates, but there was no reference in them to those works. In the Supplementary Estimates \$3,000 was placed, not for the repair, but for the removal of a portion of those works. The Public Accounts of last year showed that the amount expended on them was \$5,834, of which \$2,366 was for salaries. Though there were lock-masters at each of the locks, no provision was made to keep them in repair. Those works were

originally constructed to open a system of navigation from Lake Ontario to Georgian Bay, and the number of vessels using the locks was large indeed. If they were not kept in repair, it would hurt that region very materially. No public works did so much at an early day to promote the prosperity of the region interested as the present, they affording, formerly, the only communication for a large district. He had found no reference to the transfer of these works in the Report of the Public Works Department of that year, so the whole thing was done in secrecy. When he knew that the transfer was used as a means of acquiring votes in the districts affected, he thought it was clear its whole object was political. The *Globe* of the 19th stated that those works had produced no revenue, and that it was a question if they were of any benefit to the Province. But there were a number of public works, though local, kept up for other purposes than revenue. Why were works on the Gatineau and elsewhere maintained? If works, local in their nature, were not to be kept up by the Dominion Government, they might as well be handed over to the Local Government as the Trent works. It would appear from the report that they were only used for the descent of timber, and should be removed; but timber and saw-logs were still brought down by the Trent works. He did not see why they should not be maintained as well as similar works in other places. It was also asserted that land belonging to the Province was flooded by the dams on the works, but the quantity was small indeed. He knew that the flooding of these Provincial lands was given as the reasons for the transfer of those works to the Local Government. He believed the transfer was made in the interest of political supporters in the Ontario Legislature, that the owners adjacent might be benefitted. He thought that this matter should be taken under the consideration of the Government. If the transfer was illegal, the Order in Council was void. He hoped that the Government would allow this Committee. He knew that the leader of the present Government had proposed to the Sandfield Macdonald Ontario Government, the transfer of those works, on condition of their main-

tenance; but the ground of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald's refusal to accept them was made the very ground of their transfer by the late Federal to the Ontario Government.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said he desired to add his word of regret that this valuable property was disposed of by an Order in Council of the late Government. It was well known to many hon. members that this was the interior line of navigation, called the Trent Valley navigation, which had been for a long period a favourite idea with many parties, that it should and would, at some time, be made available as a very speedy route from the far West to the seaboard. In 1874, an Act was passed by this Parliament which incorporated a company with \$5,000,000 for the purpose of taking up all those properties, little links of public works, connecting the different natural chains of navigation, with the object of establishing a speedy route from the West to the ocean. It was calculated, then, that by it there would be a saving in distance between Chicago and Montreal of upwards of 200 miles. Not only was the Act passed, but it was agreed on the part of the Dominion Government that those public works should be handed over to the company when formed, and when a certain amount of stock was subscribed. In consequence of the financial difficulties which had prevented enterprises of this kind being carried on everywhere, this particular scheme was laid aside for the present. But there was no intention whatever to abandon it. It had still remained a favourite scheme in that part of the country that this line of navigation should be completed by private enterprise through this particular company that was incorporated with all the rights and powers and privileges of a chartered company. It was thought that, if the Government of the Dominion could not see its way to take up this as a public work, it should, at all events, be undertaken by private enterprise. It was well understood that a very large amount was ready to be subscribed by our neighbours on the other side. Indeed, the merchants of Chicago had taken so much interest in the scheme that they had agreed to take up a very large share

of the capital stock of the company, as it was found that it would shorten the route to the extent of 200 miles from Chicago to Montreal. Now they found that, without notice to the members of that company, this Order in Council had been passed, sweeping away any chance of renewing it. They had always been led to believe that no grant of public moneys or public properties should be made without the sanction of Parliament, yet his hon. friend, in the last days of his Government, had transferred the properties in question to the Government of Ontario. On what pretence that could be done, he was at a loss to know. He did know that there were many of those rights thus transferred, that were, either directly or impliedly, obligations upon the Government of the day. He ventured to say that a serious course of litigation might arise out of this transfer, in which the question would arise, how far the Crown might transfer these obligations by Order in Council, and how far the obligation still rested upon the Dominion Government? He would mention one case which would give the House an idea of the injustice arising out of the transfer. There was a company, whose management was in the town of Cobourg, established by the old Parliament of Canada. It had a railroad to Rice Lake, and, by a grant from the Legislature, the right of navigation through the waters of Rice Lake, through the canal at Hastings, and through the waters of the River Trent, to a certain point where it had another line of railway leading to its mines, where it had been carrying on a large iron and mining business in that section of the country, and it had an invested capital of over \$1,000,000. That expenditure would be all lost if the interior line of navigation was destroyed. As he understood it, the power was given to the Government of Ontario to maintain the works necessary for this navigation or not, just as they please. If the work at Hastings was not maintained, the whole of this valuable property would be lost. He maintained that the Government should permit nothing to be done which would result in the destruction of that property; and the Government were unquestionably morally, if not legally, responsible for any loss that might be thus sustained.

MR. COCKBURN.

There were eight members of the constituencies comprising the old Newcastle district present on the floor of this House, and not one amongst them knew anything of this action of the Government until the House was called together. He would ask his hon. friend, the member for West Hastings, if he knew of this action of the Government. This was a question which ought to have been submitted to the House. It was a question affecting navigation, and valuable properties belonging to the Dominion, which were passed over to one of Provinces by a stroke of the pen, without consulting the Parliament of the Dominion. He trusted that the motion would be granted, so that there would be a further searching enquiry into the matter.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentlemen who had spoken on this subject had evidently spoken simply with a view to the local advantages derived from the expenditure of public money on this work. His hon. friend who spoke last gave a glowing picture of the hopes entertained in regard to the canal, and the Trent navigation works projected before the union of Upper and Lower Canada. This, work, however, was long ago given up as one utterly impracticable, and every practical man knew that there was not the slightest intention to build a canal, or a possibility of it being made through to the Georgian Bay. The project had been given up by every engineering authority, and by the Provincial and Dominion authorities. It had literally become a source of expense to the Dominion ever since Confederation, and it threatened to become a matter of very serious expense if this Government had resolved upon the maintenance of these works. He mentioned, two years ago, in this House, in connection with the Estimates for river improvements, slides and booms, the desirability of giving up the work altogether, as one that imposed a heavy burden on the taxpayers of the Dominion, and yielded no corresponding advantage whatever. The hon. gentleman from North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) saw in this, as he saw in everything else, some political reason. He (Mr. Mackenzie) could only say that he never heard of any political advantage to be

gained by him or political disadvantage to be suffered by his opponents by this transfer. He looked upon the works as being a great disadvantage to the Government. The Dundas Canal, for instance, was given to the Dundas Town Council, and he contended that it was in the interest of the Government to get rid of such works as were not only not profitable now, but which showed no prospect of ever becoming profitable in any way whatever. As the hon. the Postmaster-General, then Minister of Public Works, said, the matter was purely one of Provincial concern. It was not one of the great lines of navigation; it had utterly ceased to have any character of that kind for many years, and if it were to be maintained, it would be in the position the Rideau Canal was at present. That was a work the maintenance of which, he thought, should be given up. It was one which had been almost utterly useless since it had been surrounded by railways, and the traffic had been reduced to an infinitesimal amount. The annual expenditure for maintenance of this canal was between \$50,000 and \$60,000, while the entire revenue was only about \$8,000. The hon. member for Northumberland admitted that this was a source of constant expense to the Government when he said there were other works which were unprofitable, and he instanced the navigation works on the Gatineau River. He quite agreed that these works should be given up. He also thought the Dominion should get rid of everything of that kind that was not properly within their province in connection with the great lines of intercommunication. He expressed his opinion about these Ottawa works on several occasions in the House. The works on the Ottawa tributaries were not, however, altogether unprofitable, as the member for Peterborough supposed; they cost up to 1874 or 1875, he was not sure which, \$1,258,780, the revenue to the close of 1875 was \$1,426,788.51, showing a surplus of revenue over expenditure of nearly \$200,000 upon the works of that river. The expenditure on the St. Maurice slides and booms up to the same period was \$514,641; revenue \$133,105. The expenditure on the Saguenay works was \$58,586; revenue, \$20,331. He was of opinion that all these Provincial

works he had mentioned ought to be given to the Provincial authorities in order that they might make them profitable. These were properly within their domain, and other parts of the Dominion ought not to be compelled to pay for the maintenance of public works belonging to the old Province of Canada, either in Quebec or Ontario. That was the view the late Government took of these works, that they were only a source of expense, while the revenue was almost nothing. With regard to the legal argument of his hon. friend from West Northumberland, he ventured to say that the hon. gentleman was not serious in making such a statement, and he was quite sure, if he asked the hon. gentleman's opinion as a lawyer, he would not say anything of the kind. Their sole motive in transferring these works was to save an expenditure utterly useless to the Dominion at large, and instead of being a subject of censure for this, he thought they were entitled to credit for having cut off the expenditure on these works from the annual taxation. The expenditure on these works last year was somewhere between \$5,000 and \$6,000, the entire revenue, he believed, was \$40. He spoke from memory, subject to correction, but that was his recollection. He and his colleagues had several interviews with members of the Ontario Government about this matter. He mentioned to the House the intention of the late Administration to cede these works to Ontario if they would accept them. He recollected very well the present Prime Minister made some remarks about it, advising caution, or something of that sort, but there was no strong, adverse opinion expressed at all in reference to it. It was a course they believed to be right, one for which they had legal sanction, and one which would, undoubtedly, be beneficial to the Dominion. He would be glad to support the present Administration in getting rid of those of a similar character.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): Was that question ever submitted to the law officers of the Crown?

MR. MACKENZIE: I have no doubt that it was.

MR. BROWN said his hon. friend from West Northumberland had men-

tioned his name in the matter, and it was a matter in which he was very much interested. He thought it was a matter of indifference whether these works belonged to the Dominion or the Local Government, provided they assumed the responsibility that these works should be proceeded with. There were several mills upon this dam, and several attempts had been made to destroy them, under the supposition that the 20,000 acres of land flooded, and which had been made over, could be redeemed. He thought the Local Government should now assume the responsibility of keeping up these works. He supposed that the idea of shortening the distance to Chicago was, to a certain extent, exploded; but there was a good deal of valuable property connected with these works which would be rendered valueless should they be abandoned. These works should be maintained, not only in the interests of the steamboat proprietors, but also of the lumbermen, who floated large quantities of lumber down this river, and had organised a company themselves to maintain some portions of the work which were not properly looked after by the agent of the Dominion Government. He trusted these works would be maintained by the Local Government. He did not see why they should not assume the responsibility from the Dominion Government.

MR. McCALLUM said he was not acquainted with this work, but he rose to explain the contradictory course followed by hon. gentlemen opposite. When they were in power they held on to all local works, but when in Opposition they wanted the Government to get rid of them all. Last year they urged that the Government should spend money on local works, and a large expenditure was voted for Morpeth harbour and Pickering, both local works belonging to private companies, the excuse given for the expenditure being that they did not pay a dividend to their stockholders. The hon. gentlemen opposite might have had, certainly, the modesty to leave this matter to the incoming Government to settle as they thought proper; but, before leaving power, they hurriedly transferred this work to their friends. A large section of the country would derive great

MR. BROWN.

accommodation from the maintenance of this work, and it ought to be seriously considered. He only rose to show that it was the same old story with hon. gentlemen opposite. Whenever they changed sides they went back on their record. Last year they argued in favour of local works; this year they wanted none at all. In any case, they might have left the matter to be settled by the incoming Government, as, even were it necessary to deliver this work over to the Local Government, a delay of three or four days could not have made any difference.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said he hoped that, whatever decision might be arrived at in reference to this particular question, which was wholly within one of the Provinces, the opinion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) would not be entertained by this Government with reference to works on the Ottawa River itself, the revenue derived from which gave a fair interest on the cost of construction. Besides that, by a Statute of this House, passed in 1870, the navigation of the Ottawa was declared to be within the exclusive control and jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. Whatever might be done with local works of this character, when within the different Provinces, works of a similar character upon the Ottawa River might not be treated in the manner described by the hon. member for Lambton.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said that he had lived a great many years in the neighbourhood of these works, and had received several letters in relation to this particular transfer to the Ontario Government; and, so far as he could judge, there was a very strong feeling among the people that the transfer had not been made in the interests of the country, but purely for political objects. He had not the local knowledge to enable him to say whether this feeling was well grounded, but it was certainly a natural one. It was not unfair to draw the inference that there must have been some reason, other than the public good, to induce the late Government, after having retained these works in their possession during the five years they were in power, to transfer them on the eve of their resignation, after they had

been defeated, to the Province of Ontario. This feeling was aggravated by the fact that no provision for the maintenance of these works had been made in the transfer. He was sure the view of the hon. member for West Hastings, that it was a matter of small consequence whether the works were in the hands of the Dominion or the Ontario Government, provided they were maintained in the state of efficiency in which they were at present, would be concurred in; especially as there were public interests which had been built up in connection with these works, and which depended on them for their maintenance. He was somewhat astonished to hear the hon. member for Lambton compare these works with the canal at Dundas. There was no possible analogy between the two classes of works. The one was a long series of works, through which an enormous trade passed, where there was navigation for a very considerable distance, where slides, booms and dams had been constructed, where water privileges existed, all largely dependent on the proper maintenance of these particular works now given over to the Ontario Government. He sincerely hoped the Committee asked for would be granted, and a most searching investigation be made. The hon. member for Lambton said he was not aware whether the law officers of the Crown had been consulted with reference to this transfer or not. The papers brought down contained no report from the Department of Justice to show that the opinion of that Department was taken in relation to it. The whole thing seemed to have been done with a view to affect the Ontario elections coming on this summer, so that the works in the hands of friends of that Government might be used with very great advantage in influencing the people who had special interest in them, from one end of the old Newcastle district to the other. It was most unfortunate that the late Government of the country, just on the eve of their resignation, should have given reasonable cause for such imputation.

Mr. CURRIER said he joined with the hon. member for North Renfrew in protesting against the principle acted on

by the late Government in this matter being carried out with reference to the works on the Ottawa river and its tributaries. That was quite a different question from the one now under consideration, because the interests of lumbermen lay on both sides of the River Ottawa. The improvements on the tributaries were situated in both Provinces, while the lumber from each would have to pass through the works on the main river, and, therefore, it would be almost impossible that these works should be transferred to the two Provinces. The charges on lumber coming down the tributaries were Provincial, but when the lumber came to the works on the main river they were used by both Provinces in common. These works had, besides, always paid a fair interest on the outlay; therefore, the lumber interest felt under no obligation to the Dominion Government for maintaining these works.

Mr. BOWELL said he fully concurred with the hon. member for West Hastings on this question, when he said it mattered little who kept these works in repair. Representing a constituency somewhat interested in the disposition of these works, he desired to say that the transfer was unknown to the sections of country more affected, until the Supplementary Estimates, in the Ontario Parliament, were laid before the House, containing an item of \$3,000 for the demolition of these dams. It was somewhat strange that the Government should have waited until the day before its resignation to consummate this Act. If the late Government believed that the maintenance of these dams was necessary, why did they not stipulate with the Ontario Government when making the transfer, that the latter should maintain them, and prevent the destruction of slides on that river, and consequently the navigation. For the last ten or fifteen years there had been speculators endeavouring to get possession of all the land which belonged to the Government, in order to adopt the policy which it was evident the Ontario Government intended to pursue, that was, to move the dams, drain the lands, and allow speculators to put the money realised from their sale into their pockets. If it were not in the interests of the Province or the locality

that these works should be maintained, then it was the duty of the Government of the day to have spent two or three thousand dollars, and do that which the Ontario Government now proposed to do, and then sell the land. There was scarcely an acre of these 20,000 or 30,000 acres of land, now under water, formerly purchased by the Board of Works of Old Canada, that would not sell to-morrow, if drained, for \$20 to \$30 an acre, including the land along the whole line. Portions of the land would sell for much more. It was the most valuable farming land in that section of the country. Why should that land, which would realise an immense amount of money, be handed over to Ontario, if it were not done to place it in the hands of the one or two speculators who were now using the advantage they had secured to influence the local election and aid the Ontario Government? The hon. member for Lambton told the House he was in favour of giving away all these local works. It was a strange doctrine to lay down now when, for the last five years, the hon. gentleman had been recommending this House to vote large sums to aid private companies who owned private harbours, the dues from which went into their own pockets. It was true the public generally would benefit by the improvement of these harbours, but the pecuniary results went directly into the pockets of the hon. gentleman's political supporters. The matter looked like a second edition of the Order in Council transferring the land and building property on the Intercolonial, in the Metapedia Valley, to some friends of the late Government, for a few hundred dollars, which were worth thousands, and that, too, on the very day that they surrendered power. He hoped the Committee to be appointed would not only investigate the matter, but that if, as the hon. member for North Victoria had pointed out, this transfer was illegal, steps would be taken to annul it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there were two points which the discussion of this case had evolved, upon which he would say a few words. The first was whether the late Government had power to do what they did, and the second was whether, if they had that power,

MR. BOWELL.

they were wise in using it. After listening to the argument of his hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), he must say that his first impression was that it seemed quite clear the Government had no right to pass this Order in Council, that there had been no legal transfer of this property by the Dominion Government to the Ontario Government, and that, at this moment, that property belonged to the Dominion Government. It seemed to him that was quite clear, from a fair reading of the Statute. Moreover, as the Order in Council had not yet been published, it had no legal existence, and this alone was sufficient to avoid the transfer, even supposing it had been valid otherwise. The 57th clause of the Public Works Act seemed clearly to state that: "One of the conditions of every such lease or transfer of any bridge, road or public work, shall be that such work shall be kept in thorough repair." This was an indispensable condition provided in that very portion of the Act which gave the Dominion Government the power of handing over these properties to the Local Government, that such works should be kept in thorough repair. In 1870, the then Minister of Public Works was authorised to enter into negotiations, but nothing more, with the Local Government, and the latter refused to take the works on any condition, and the negotiations ended. It was disingenuous, it was uncandid, to base this Order in Council of the 8th October last on the action of the Government and an Order in Council passed in 1870, which latter order was dead to all intents and purposes. The negotiations had been commenced by his hon. friend the present Postmaster-General, the offer was refused, and the negotiations came to an end. There could be no excuse for the transfer. He did not believe the late Ministry had made a mistake, nor that they really supposed they were carrying out the Act. They could not have supposed it, because the Ontario Government had already said they would not take the property; they would not touch it with a pair of tongs unless they got it absolutely and without condition, and with the view, as his hon. friend from North Victoria had said, not of maintaining the works, but of destroy-

ing them. Notwithstanding that the late Government knew all this, and were told by the Ontario Government they would not accept the works except unconditionally, the former passed this Order in Council on the 8th of October. He had no doubt the conveyance would be found illegal, and, if so, the Minister of Public Works would be guilty of a dereliction of duty if he did not immediately get possession of this property, and have any one who made resistance punished as trespassers. But, supposing the Dominion Government had had power to transfer this property, was it wise, was it just? He was going to say, was it constitutional? Because these hon. gentlemen were no longer responsible to the country for their acts. They went out of office the next day, but before resigning they passed this Order in Council in order to prevent their successors from dealing with this property. The property was one of immense value, so far as the expenditure on it was concerned. Previous to 1870 the expenditure was \$1,670,403, besides all the expenditure between that year and 1878. If there had been an absolute necessity for the transfer, or if had been an everyday transaction, they still might have waited until their successors were appointed; but instead of that they passed the Order in Council when they knew their existence was to be measured, not by days, but by hours. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) knew that he clung to office for some days in order to carry this and other like resolutions through the Council. They had passed this order when their existence could be counted by hours, for the purpose of preventing responsible men, who were to come after them, from dealing with this great property, and in order, moreover, to prevent their successors from considering the liabilities assumed by the Government when these works were constructed. But, without regard to these liabilities and responsibilities of the Dominion Government, they had made this absolute and unconditional transfer. It was unjust, it was wrong, it was unconstitutional. He would say to the hon. gentlemen opposite, it was one of the most inexcusable acts that he ever knew perpetrated—that was the word—by any Government. There were

a great number of vested interests along the whole line of these works. Properties had been bought and sold by the Dominion Government, and every man who had a lease from the Government had a claim against it. Did the hon. gentleman opposite mean to say that these men were obliged to look to the Ontario Government? There were no relations between the Local Government and these men; there was no contract between them. The contract was made with the old Province of Canada, and the Dominion Government assumed all the responsibilities and all the obligations, and would be obliged to carry them out. If those parties who had vested interests along the whole line of the Trent improvements should claim damages from the Dominion Government for any injuries they might sustain in their vested rights, this Government would be responsible and liable therefor. But, if they should apply to the Ontario Government, that Government would say to them: We do not know anything about you; we made no contract with you; this property has been handed over to us free from all obligations or conditions whatever. We are the grantees; you must look to the grantors who handed over this property to us. If they have broken faith with you in consequence of that transfer, you must look to them. If the Ontario Government should make this answer, it would be legally and equitably correct. It seemed to him that there could not be the shadow of a justification for the course taken by the late Government in passing this Order in Council on the 8th of October. He thought the hon. the Minister of Public Works had a right to take possession of those works. It would be well for a Committee to be struck for the purpose of enquiring into the disastrous consequences to the country caused by the transfer of this property. He hoped the Committee would address themselves with all speed to this question, for he thought a more unjustifiable, a more improper, a more unwise—he was almost going to say a more wicked act—could not have been committed than the transfer of this property the day before the hon. gentlemen ceased to administer the Government.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he should not go into the merits of this transaction, but he desired to speak a word as to a matter of fact. He recollected distinctly that the question of the surrender of these works was discussed two or three times at least in the late Parliament, and that his hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) expressed precisely the same opinion he had expressed to-day, without meeting with any violent dissent, as to the desirability of handing these works over. As to the Trent River works, they had always been used chiefly for the accommodation of the lumber interest, which was entirely under the control of the Ontario Government. He thought it would be found, when this Committee came to examine into the matter, that negotiations or correspondence with the Ontario Government had been going on for a considerable time on the part of his hon. friend. How far they were verbal or otherwise, between himself and the members of the Ontario Government, he did not know, but he did recollect this matter was frequently discussed. He thought it was neither unconstitutional nor a serious infringement on the prerogative of an incoming Government, if these negotiations had been pushed almost to completion, as he understood they had, that they should have been completed before the late Government went out. He would take this opportunity of observing that, so far from the late Government having clung unfairly to power, it was wholly and entirely within their power, had they so seen fit, to have waited until Parliament had been called together, and then to have resigned their trust. That would have been strictly constitutional. Had they desired to hold office and to remain in power, they might well have done so for two or three months longer without laying themselves open to the accusation of having violated constitutional usage or British precedent.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was quite true, as the hon. gentleman had just said, that the late Ministry might have remained in until Parliament, by a formal vote, declared want of confidence in them, but a little bird said that was the intention of the Government; and the little bird also said the reason that intention was not carried

out was that the hon. gentlemen found that, if they ran to the last moment, the credit of the country would be lost in their hands, because the hon. gentlemen could not go home as a discredited Finance Minister to negotiate a new loan. That was what compelled the Government to reverse their original decision, which was to remain in until Parliament met, because they found they would have no money, and the country would be declared insolvent unless the hon. gentlemen made way for better men.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the House would remember that the hon. gentleman had, on another occasion, announced the receipt of knowledge from a little bird, of something that had passed in the Privy Council; the hon. gentleman's little bird was destitute of the truth on that occasion, as destitute as this one was now. The hon. gentleman ought to know better than to make these assertions a second time. The hon. gentleman would learn in time, he presumed, not to put much dependence on this little bird of his. But not only was it their right to remain in power until they met Parliament, but it was their duty to do so. There were only two examples in the political history of England to justify them in taking the course they did—a course they decided upon immediately the result of the elections was known—to finish all their business as rapidly as possible and resign. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) was without a particle of justification for his assertion at the present moment, and he (Mr. Mackenzie) defied him to produce a particle of evidence in support of his assertion—let him produce his little bird if he could. The hon. gentleman was a high legal authority; he (Mr. Mackenzie) ventured to say a little higher than the hon. gentleman who sat behind him (Mr. McDonald, Pictou), and on this occasion he had taken the legal matter out of the hand of the hon. the Minister of Justice. He had given an *ex parte* opinion here to the effect that people who pretended to have claims, in consequence of this transfer, might bring them against the Dominion Government. But the late Minister of Justice, one of the highest legal authorities in Canada, had approved

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

of the transfer. The hon. gentleman had not looked at one of these leases, and he ventured to say, did not know the terms of these agreements, and yet he told the House that the holders of these leases had a claim against the Government of the Dominion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I said any claims they might have legally would come against the Dominion Government, and not against the Ontario Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said that he understood the hon. gentleman to state that they had vested interests. Not being a lawyer, he knew nothing of the value of legal opinion upon a matter of that sort, but he ventured to say that the hon. gentleman would find that all the leases granted by the Government under such conditions were liable to resumption at any time.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would venture anything against what the hon. gentleman had just stated about these leases, because no man in his senses would take a lease of land, and build mills and dams, if there could be resumption without compensation.

MR. MACKENZIE said he knew that those conditions were in the journals, and that they would only be liable, in that case, to abstain from the collection of dues or rents from such leases—that was his impression at present. Now the Province of Ontario only consented to accept it on the 4th October.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria). The Order in Council is dated the 3rd, yet it appears to be transmitted in a letter dated the 4th October.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was within a few days at all events. He had had frequent conversations with Ontario Ministers in relation to the matter, and that was the first intimation that the Federal Government had that they would accept the transfer. The General Government looked on the works as a burden, and on the expenditure on them as entirely lost. The hon. gentlemen opposite spoke of the great value of those works, saying \$600,000 or \$700,000 had been spent on them. They

were worth less than nothing, and they had obtained by the bargain \$100,000, if the amount spent annually on them were capitalised. They would not have to spend \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year to maintain those works. He believed they had acted in the public interest in the matter, and according to the law—constitutionally and properly.

MR. BOWELL : Was there any correspondence between the Ontario Government and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) on the subject ?

MR. MACKENZIE : Whatever there was must be now in the office. We had several interviews.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) : Were there any interviews with members of the Ontario Government, and with Mr. Ferris, of the Local Legislature, on this subject ?

MR. MACKENZIE : I have no recollection of any formal interviews with Mr. Ferris, but I had some with members of the Ontario Government.

MR. GUTHRIE said he desired to call attention to the extraordinary statement of law by the leader of the Government. The most ordinary lawyer knew that a person taking a transfer or deed of land, subject to a lease, took it with all the obligations to the lessee which would be a claim against it. The right hon. gentleman said that the lessees had no right against the Ontario Government under the covenant of their leases ; they had the ordinary right of the lessee in regard to covenants running with the land. He (Mr. Guthrie) should be ashamed of a common law student who would lay down any doctrine contrary to that ; and yet they were told by the Premier that these lessees, under such covenants, had no right to look to the new landlords. He could only say that, if his law in regard to the construction of the Public Works Act was as hopelessly bad as in regard to the rights of the lessees, he was sure that the hon. member for Lambton had nothing to fear with respect to the transaction he entered into. It was stated that the Government in 1870 was desirous of getting rid of this immensely valuable property for

nothing. It was right in 1870 to try to transfer it to the Ontario Government, but utterly wrong in 1878; that was the position of the matter. Out of the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite came the justification of the action of the late Federal Government.

MR. BOWELL: That was not the fact.

MR. GUTHRIE said it was, so far as he understood it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is the opinion of an ordinary lawyer.

MR. GUTHRIE: Well, he is a most extraordinary lawyer who says it is not good law.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) stated that a person accepting a transfer of land, with liabilities, must satisfy them. The member for Victoria, B.C., (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not say that was not the case, but, if the member for Wellington would look at the papers, he would find that in this case the transfer was made on condition that the recipient should not be subjected to the performance of any covenant. The Ontario Government was not made liable, but the Dominion Government was.

MR. GUTHRIE said the lessee could look to the landlord.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is quite true, but it is not the point.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MESSRS.
MURRAY AND COMPANY'S
CONTRACT.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. MACKENZIE moved for copies of all papers relating to the disputed claims of Messrs. Murray & Co., contractors on the Intercolonial Railway, embracing a statement of such claims; the estimates of materials removed or placed and works performed, as made by the Government Engineer and showing the amount of contract and the payments thereon; also copies of all papers and Orders in Coun-

MR. GUTHRIE,

cil relating to or authorising the submission of such claims to arbitration, and the decision of Mr Samuel Keefer, the sole arbitrator thereon. He said he had seen in the newspapers a statement to the effect that the claim of this firm, which was being prosecuted before the Exchequer Court, under the Petition of Right Act, had been withdrawn from the Court, and that the Government had allowed a reference to arbitration by a single person, who had given a verdict for \$99,000 to this firm. He had, as Minister of Public Works, frequent interviews with some of those gentlemen, whose allegation, so far as he (Mr. Mackenzie) could recollect, was that the measurements were wrong; that engineers were prejudiced against them, and that deviations from the line were made, and that measurements upon such works were inexact. He then suggested to the gentleman who had waited upon him that, if his own engineer would make up a statement showing how he had arrived at the measurements claimed, he (Mr. Mackenzie) would submit it to the Chief Engineer, to discuss the matters fairly, and that if there was any wrong done he was quite willing to consider how it could be rectified, but that the contract must be adhered to—that was the primary principle. He also informed him that powers were given to the Supreme Court, that would enable it to adjudicate upon all claims. He did not know to what length their proceedings had gone when this proceeding took place; but one thing was perfectly clear, that a different course was adopted towards this firm from that respecting others. He had felt it his duty to leave every question of this kind to the Court expressly created to deal with such claims. He had to call attention to the extraordinary circumstance of submitting a claim of such magnitude to the adjudication of one sole arbitrator, and he would not believe, till the hon. the Minister of Public Works said so, that such was really the case. He would not say anything about the person selected as arbitrator, further than that there were reasons of a departmental kind why he should not have been appointed sole arbitrator, or an arbitrator at all.

MR. TUPPER said that the hon. gentleman was under an entire misappre-

hension as to the position of this question. It would be seen from the papers that this was a case entirely different from the others to which he had made allusion. This was a case in which contractors for the Intercolonial Railway claimed payment for work which they asserted they had not been paid for. Being unable to agree with the late Government, they applied for a petition of right to have their claim tried before the Exchequer Court. This case differed from others in this particular: that, whereas, in the other cases, the Government obtained judgment in their favour, in this case it was the contractors who gained the judgment. Instead of the Government taking this matter out of the hands of the Court, and carrying it to a sole arbitrator, all they did was to carry out the decision of Judge Fournier, which was, that the evidence should be taken before the Registrar of the Court for the purpose of ascertaining to what extent the work had been increased or diminished, in order that an award might be made of the amount due. The solicitor of the claimants appealed to the late Minister of Public Works.

MR. MACKENZIE: Who is he?

MR. TUPPER said he was Mr. O'Dougherty.

MR. MACKENZIE: He is a partner of Mr. O'Connor.

MR. TUPPER said the parties stated that the judgment was obtained in June last, and the hon. gentleman did not appeal from it; but, on the contrary, the solicitor of the parties stated to him (Mr. Tupper) that, having obtained judgment against the Crown, and Judge Fournier having considered that fixing the amount was not a matter for him to decide, that they had appealed to his predecessor, and that he had assured them he was prepared to consider the most expeditious means of arriving at the conclusion the Judge had decided on, in order to determine the amount. His hon. friend the Minister of Justice having been engaged in this case, he referred the matter to Mr. Lash, who he need not tell hon. gentlemen opposite was a gentleman of very high legal attainments. Every step taken had been taken with the advice

and direction of Mr. Lash. Judge Fournier directed that the Registrar should take the testimony. It was felt that there was very good reason to think that it would be better to have a person who had professional knowledge, as well as general information, in order to arrive at the object in view, of being able to get an arbitrator as to the extent of the claim. Under these circumstances application was made for the appointment of a civil engineer to take this testimony, which the Judge had directed should be taken by the Registrar, for the two objects of saving time, and of having a party qualified to judge as to the character of the testimony, and arrive at a correct conclusion. That matter was also referred to the Deputy Minister (Mr. Lash), and, in conformity with his advice, he (Mr. Tupper) submitted to Council the appointment of a civil engineer for this purpose. The Deputy Minister of Justice said the matter was entirely within the competence of the Government; the parties interested nominated one or more civil engineers, men of some considerable standing and position. They were not accepted. He submitted the name of Mr. Starke, a civil engineer in Montreal, a man of standing and character in the profession, who he thought would be well qualified to receive this testimony. One of the contractors objected to Mr. Starke, on the ground that one of the parties connected with the contract had come in collision with him in connection with this or some other public work. He then submitted the name of Mr. Walter Shanly, and he was appointed. Mr. Shanly afterwards stated that it would be impossible for him to take the position in view of his other engagements. Under these circumstances, Mr. Samuel Keefer, a gentleman high in the estimation of the Government, was appointed; then all that remained, therefore, was for the testimony to be taken, and the decision to be arrived at as to the question of the amount. The same able counsel that were employed by the late Government to advocate their case against the contractors were employed to conduct the case before Mr. Keefer, and to see that no testimony was admitted except that which could be legally admitted. Everything was done in the

public interest, and he had no doubt these gentlemen discharged the duty with ability and fidelity. The papers, when brought down, would show hon. gentlemen that this was not a parallel case to those cases in which judgment was in favour of the Government against the contractors. The case was decided in conformity with the decision of Judge Fournier, who directed the Registrar to take testimony, and decide upon the amount.

MR. MACKENZIE asked the hon. gentleman if Judge Fournier remitted to this arbitrator the power of deciding on the amount.

MR. TUPPER: Yes; that is practically what he did.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could only say that he entirely misunderstood the gentleman. He did not consider that the case had been taken out of the hands of the Court and transferred to the hands of Mr. Samuel Keefer. Of course, he was discussing the matter without having the judgment before him, and, therefore, he would be very careful what he said. But there was one thing that was very clear to his mind from his recollection, that the case was to come before the Court again, and that this was only an interlocutory proceeding.

MR. TUPPER said he did exactly what the hon. gentleman himself would have done. He submitted every question in relation to it to the Deputy Minister of Justice, and acted upon his advice.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH asked whether this Mr. Keefer was substituted in place of the Court, or whether his judgment should have been confirmed by the Court. The question was whether the matter had been taken out of the Court, or whether this evidence, taken before Mr. Keefer, should have been confirmed by the Judge.

MR. TUPPER said the decision of the Judge was that he decided by evidence to be taken before the Registrar. The evidence was taken and a practical decision arrived at, and under that award an agreement had been prepared by the Deputy Minister of Justice, with refer-

MR. TUPPER.

ence to the question of costs, obliging the parties to abide by the decision whenever it should be arrived at under the testimony taken before Mr. Keefer.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Without reference to the Judge.

MR. TUPPER: Yes.

MR. HUNTINGTON said that if this had simply been an order for this evidence to be taken, then the Government in entirely settling the matter had taken it out of the hands of the Court. If the case was at present in adjudication the evidence should be adjudicated upon by the Court. He was of opinion that Judge Fournier did not render a judgment, but only gave an order on which judgment could be rendered further on.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken as to the character of Judge Fournier's decision. He gave his decision against the Government, and left it to the Registrar to take the testimony as to the question of amount; therefore his judgment had all the character of a final settlement.

MR. CARTWRIGHT asked if the money had been paid, or whether the hon. gentleman proposed to take a vote for it in the Estimates.

MR. TUPPER said no money had been paid or would be paid until it was voted by the House.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF SPRING HILL STATION AGENT.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. DOMVILLE moved for copies of all papers and correspondence, in respect to the dismissal, or resignation of Mr. E. O. Stark, Station Agent at Spring Hill Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, in the Province of Nova Scotia. He said, in asking for these papers, he had no desire to embarrass the Government, or find unnecessary fault with it, but Mr. Stark, or his friends, claimed that he had suffered by losing his position, and should be reinstated in his former position. He thought this might be a proper occasion to call attention of the Govern-

ment to the removals of officials on the Intercolonial Railway. He was very glad to see the energy displayed by the hon. the Minister of Public Works in taking hold of that railway, and endeavouring to put it on a better footing. The country felt sure that he would do all in his power to make it a financial success, and at the same time commercially beneficial. He trusted that the freight rates would be so arranged that they would not have one freight for those shipping down to the Lower Provinces, and another up for the New Brunswicker. He trusted, as it was not right to charge one Province more than another, as had been done, that the line would be worked in the interest of all. In reference to the general reduction that had been made, he said it was very hard for the officials and workmen to be thrown out of employment at this inclement season of the year, and with such depression existing. He trusted that, if it was in the interest of the public that a reduction of the tariff had to be made, it would be done irrespective of political opinions, and he would suggest that where it was possible, when a removal took place, worthy officers should be found some other employment, or at least retained until they could get some other situation. It was hard, even in the public interest, to throw men out of employment.

Mr. TUPPER said he thought his hon. friend behind him had selected a rather unfortunate basis for his motion, on which to discuss the question of the reductions on the Intercolonial Railway, and the fact of its becoming necessary. It had been a very painful duty on his part to dismiss these servants, but he felt himself compelled to do it in the interest of the public service. He thought that, if his hon. friend were to read the correspondence on the subject, he would find that the attack upon him came from his political friends, who had thought their claims had been overlooked. With regard to the particular case under consideration—that of Mr. Stark—he did not dispense with his services. He was, unfortunately, connected with a very serious accident on the Intercolonial Railway, which resulted in the death of one individual. At the conclusion of the

coroner's inquest, Mr. Stark resigned his office, without having been dismissed. He could only say that, if he had not resigned his office, he would have been promptly dismissed.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

Mr. VALIN moved for a statement of all moneys paid over by the official assignees of the Province of Quebec, under the provisions of the Act 38 Victoria, chapter 16, section 42, showing whether the said assignees furnished the Receiver-General with a statement of all moneys belonging to estates then in their hands, not required for any purpose authorised by that Act, or by any Act thereby repealed, as the case may be, with sworn statements and accounts of such moneys, declaring that such moneys are all that they have in their hands.

Motion agreed to.

PRESQUISLE BAY LIGHTHOUSE.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. KEELER moved for copies of all letters, instructions, tenders, plans, specifications, contracts and agreements relating to the building and selecting site of the lighthouse erected during the past summer in Presqu'Isle Bay, in the East Riding of Northumberland, Ontario. He said that this was a case in which the public money had been expended for the furtherance of political ends. This lighthouse was no more required where it was erected, in the judgment of mariners frequenting that coast, than in a back kitchen yard in the city of Ottawa. He understood that the erection of that lighthouse cost \$3,000; if so, a large amount of money was thrown away in a most reprehensible manner.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH said he thought the hon. gentleman must have had a very keenly contested election, for he seemed to think that everything was made subservient to his expulsion from Parliament. The correspondence would show that a strong application had been

made for the erection of this lighthouse ; the correspondence would further show that Mr. Simpson, the lighthouse keeper, had located the site ; Mr. Tomlinson had also agreed with Mr. Simpson on the site selected. He was satisfied that the correspondence would show that the lighthouse was in the interest of the navigation of that part of the country.

MR. WHEELER said he was given to understand that the light instead of being an advantage to the navigation of that part of the country was an absolute obstruction.

SIR A. J. SMITH : Would not Mr. Simpson be a suitable person to select the site.

MR. WHEELER said he thought Mr. Simpson was an interested party, and that the site should have been selected by a civil engineer, and not a lighthouse keeper.

Motion agreed to.

WESTERN DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING EXTENSION.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell), in the absence of Mr. WILLIAMS, moved for a statement showing the total expenditure in detail, upon the addition made to the Western Departmental Building ; also, for a copy of all contracts in connection with the same.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERY OVERSEER IN KAMOURASKA.

MOTION FOR COPIES OF COMPLAINTS.

MR. LANDRY moved for copies of the complaint made last autumn, by Mr. Clement Rouleau, of St. Anne de la Pocatière, in the county of Kamouraska, against Mr. Clovis Caron, Fishery Overseer, asking for an enquiry into the conduct of the said Clovis Caron ; also, of the minutes of a certain enquiry said to have been commenced or held by Mr. Gauvreau, Fishery Overseer for Témiscouata, into the matter of a dispute in which Clovis Caron, Clement Rouleau and Prudent Martin were concerned.

Motion agreed to.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

DISMISSAL OF MOLESWORTH POST-MASTER.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved for copies of all papers and correspondence relative to the dismissal of Samuel Lough-
eed, from the office of postmaster at Molesworth.

Motion agreed to.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT REFUND.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. TROW moved for a detailed statement of all sums of money refunded by the Department of Inland Revenue, and to whom paid, during the years 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872 and 1873 ; and copies of all papers and correspondence in connection with the same.

Motion agreed to.

CAPT. LAVOIE, OF THE *RIMOUSKI*.

MOTION FOR ORDERS.

MR. Fiset moved for a statement showing the orders given to Captain Pierre Lavoie, during the whole time he had charge of the steamer *Rimouski*, by whom such orders were given, and those which were disobeyed by him, and which caused his dismissal, as stated to the House by the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. TUPPER said there was a serious objection to the passage of this motion, because it apparently affirmed as a fact that which was not a fact. It asked for the reasons which caused this man's dismissal. Upon enquiry from the Department he had learned that Captain Lavoie was employed by the season, and, at the close of the season, he was paid off. He had no claim whatever to re-employment, and the reason he had not been re-employed was because he had not given satisfaction. He was instructed that everything purchased for the steamer must be purchased by requisition. He disregarded these instructions and purchased direct. Consequently, he was not re-employed. Had he been engaged for a term of years it would have been

different. But, being engaged by the season, he was simply told that it was not the intention of the Government to re-employ him.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

YARMOUTH DYKING COMPANY INCORPORATION BILL.—[BILL 46.]

(*Mr. Killam.*)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for the House to go into Committee of the Whole, *read.*

MR. TUPPER suggested that the Bill should stand till the Minister of Justice was in his seat.

MR. DREW said the Minister of Justice appeared to be satisfied that the Bill should go through.

MR. TUPPER said this was a proposal to incorporate a single gentleman without giving the names of those parties whom he proposed to associate with himself, and the object of the Bill was to dyke a quantity of land by shutting out the tide. On the other hand, the House had a petition, signed by 50 or 60 respectable inhabitants, who claimed that they were interested, and that they would be damaged if this Bill should pass. He thought, therefore, a strong case should be shown for the passage of the Bill. The objection to the measure on the face of it was that it was interfering with tidal navigation. How deep the water might be he did not know, but he was told that the place which it was proposed to shut out was, a few years ago, navigable by vessels of considerable size. The parties claimed that their facilities for navigation were to be cut off, and they would lose the benefits they now enjoyed.

MR. KILLAM said the only reason for coming to this Parliament was that there was some doubt whether the Local Legislature had power to dyke a navigable river. He believed, in fact, that it was admitted that they could not. The Local Act provided that, when two-thirds of the proprietors of any marsh land, etc., wished to construct a public work of the kind, they had liberty to

carry it on under supervision of officers appointed by Government. The present Bill provided that three-fourths of the proprietors should give their consent before the work was commenced. He knew the locality; he knew almost every man who signed the petition, and he would be the last to do anything to injure them. This Bill, however, gave the owners of the land the improvement which they needed without any payment at all, unless they saw fit to make it. The promoter of the Bill had been before the Committee and had given satisfactory explanations. An independent gentleman had also given explanations, and the Bill was passed by the Committee, and he believed there were no clauses in it that could be considered objectionable that were not in a stronger form objectionable in the Nova Scotia Act, under which dyking works had been done. The general objection was that the owners thought it would cost them something; but here, where the object was to reclaim a lot of useless land, it was not right that the few gentlemen who had petitioned, and many of them had no interest in them at all, should prevent the carrying out of the work. Mr. Clements was very enterprising.

MR. TUPPER: It looks enterprising.

MR. KILLAM said the measure was so framed that Mr. Clements could not do anything without the consent of three-fourths of the proprietors, and any one could have arbitration before the work could go on. The public interest was perfectly protected in the Bill.

MR. DREW asked if it was proposed to settle with those whose land was taken for this improvement. As he understood the Bill, these parties must take stock in payment for their land. It was also provided that the consent of three-fourths of the marsh land proprietors must be obtained. How about those whose land was not marsh land?

MR. KILLAM said the eighth clause provided for that. These people were to be paid. In any case, details could be amended in Committee.

MR. PLUMB said he objected to the principle of this Bill, which created one

single person a corporation. He might associate others with him, and might select a Board of Directors. He thought Parliament might well be invoked to protect the persons interested against this enterprising gentleman. They were told that the laws of Nova Scotia would give this power, but that in this matter there was some little doubt. He knew nothing of the local legislation of Nova Scotia, but he thought that any such legislation brought in here ought to be challenged in its inception. This would be cited as a precedent, if allowed to pass here. He thought all such matters should be dealt with by the Local Legislatures.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said the Bill had been examined by the Private Bills Committee and amended by them, and the House should have sufficient confidence in that Committee to allow the Bill to pass. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Drew) had stated that the Minister of Justice saw no objection to the Bill. If that were so, why should the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Drew), or the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), take such objection to it? He saw nothing unreasonable in the provisions of the Bill, and thought the rights of private persons were sufficiently protected.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) said this Bill had been discussed before the Private Bills Committee. Evidence had been given that there was no timber on that river within 30 or 40 miles. The navigation privileges which were alleged to be destroyed by this Bill were of no value whatever. One of the witnesses examined before the Committee had stated that some of the petitioners were not proprietors at all, while others were eight miles away from the river. If the petition against the Bill had been expected, hundreds of ratepayers would have signed in favour of it.

MR. VALLÉE said the House had no right to pass the Bill, because the object was of a Provincial character. He also objected to one man obtaining a Bill, against which a great number of people had petitioned.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he agreed with his hon. friend (Mr.

MR. PLUMB.

Vallée), that this Bill was not within the province of this Parliament at all. It was a Local Bill in every way. It was a matter that ought to be passed by the Legislature of Nova Scotia. It was a Bill to incorporate Mr. Clements to make a dyke across the mouth of two rivers in Nova Scotia, and was so completely a Provincial Bill that the last clause provided that the consent of the marsh owners should be deposited in the Provincial office of Nova Scotia. They had the power in this Parliament to pass laws in relation to shipping and navigation, but they had none to pass an Act of incorporation of this kind for Provincial objects. Again, it was a novelty in Dominion legislation that any one man could apply for a charter as a corporation with any people who he might get to join him. Such a thing had never been known in the world. There must be a body of corporators, but here was a man who simply made a speculation, and said he would get up a company by-and-bye.

MR. KILLAM said that, if the First Minister would state that the Local Legislature had the right to dyke a navigable river, he would withdraw the Bill. The Minister of Justice, however, had agreed that they had not.

MR. MILLS said that, before the Private Bills Committee, it had been held that, in any matter affecting a navigable stream, the parties had to come here for incorporation. On several occasions the parties had come here for incorporation in order to build a bridge over a navigable river, and this House had said, We cannot control the granting of land, but we can give the permission to build a bridge over a river. The Local Legislature could not obstruct navigation. A corporation was a person in law, and it was recognised that any person had only the power which the law gave him. It was not in the power of the Local Legislature to give any powers which it did not possess. As the Local Legislatures could not give to a private corporation the right to interfere with a navigable stream, the only way in which such a corporation could get such power was by coming here.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said his hon. friend (Mr. Mills) was taking a

line directly contrary to all he had ever advocated since he had been in Parliament as to the powers of Local Legislatures. The object of this Bill was to get possession of certain property which could be only dealt with by the Local Legislature. The whole object of the Bill was to reclaim certain lands, and make the promoters proprietors of the lands so reclaimed. He had no doubt that this Parliament had no power to convey these lands, reclaimed or otherwise, and that the true plan was to apply to the Nova Scotia Legislature for incorporation. If, after incorporation, they required other powers, they might come here. He denied that the Local Legislature had no power to deal with navigable rivers. The Legislature of each Province had full right to deal with a navigable river, and this Parliament had no specific right given it by the British North America Act to deal with navigable rivers. It had a right to deal with navigation or shipping. It could pass general laws in relation to obstructions.

MR. MACKENZIE : It is an obstruction to put a dam across a river.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was no general law passed that no one should have power to obstruct navigable rivers, and all these matters, relating to the incorporation or to the giving to the company land which was reclaimed from the waters, distinctly related to property and civil rights, which should be dealt with by the Local Legislature. The true plan would be to get the Act of incorporation in the Province, and, if necessary, to come here for additional powers ; but this House could not incorporate the company or give them the power to acquire these lands.

MR. McDONALD (Picton) said this was not a Bill to reclaim lands from a river, but to take in what had been harbours in Nova Scotia. The waters of the Bay of Fundy rose some 20ft. or 30ft. ; the lands proposed to be reclaimed by this Bill were bare at low tide, but formed harbours at high tide, and the extent proposed to be reclaimed was some eight or nine miles, embracing an area not owned by anyone of about 20,000 acres. With all deference to his right hon. friend (Sir John A. Mac-

donald), he did not see how the Legislature of Nova Scotia could incorporate a body of this kind, and he could not see the objection to passing this Bill here. If this was land covered by the Provincial jurisdiction, the parties would have to apply to the Local Legislature for incorporation ; but, as this was to be reclaimed from the sea, he was under the impression that this House was the body from which the authority ought to be derived. He thought the Bill provided sufficient protection for the proprietors, and he did not see that it would do any harm. The object of the Bill was a very laudable one, as it proposed to reclaim a large territory from the sea and turn it into cultivated land. If it were not for the opinion which had been expressed by his right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald), he should have had no doubt that this was the proper place to invoke authority, but, after the expression of opinion from the leader of the Government, he presumed his hon. friend (Mr. Killam) would not press the Bill.

MR. KILLAM said that by chap. 97 of the Statutes of 1875, power was given to build a toll-bridge over the River L'Assomption in the Province of Quebec. That was a purely local river, but, because some parties claimed that they took rafts by the spot, the Bill was allowed, after a long discussion, to pass this House. The hon. the Premier stood in the position of preventing one of the most important public works in that section of the country from being carried out. He would consent to withdraw the Bill, but would ask the leader of the Government to consent to return the fees.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had no doubt at all that this House alone was competent to give power to build dams across rivers. He suggested that the House should go into Committee and eliminate the clauses which would be within the limits of the Local jurisdiction. It was hardly fair to thrust out a Bill because some parts of it were, as he believed they were, within the Local jurisdiction.

MR. LANGEVIN said he thought the Local Legislature should incorporate the company, and then, when they wanted to

build a bridge over a navigable river, they could come here as a corporate body, and ask for the power. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) wanted to begin at the wrong end.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, if a company, incorporated by the Local Legislature, could apply here, a company incorporated here could as well apply to the Local Legislature.

MR. MILLS said he recollected several measures coming before the Private Bills Committee, to some of the provisions of which he had been opposed, but the present leader of the Government had supported their obtaining the incorporation sought. When Mr. Dorion was Minister of Justice, he (Mr. Mills) had brought this matter carefully to his attention. If a company was incorporated here they could go to the Local Legislature for power to acquire the lands. This Parliament could not give them the power to acquire them, but it could give them the power to hold them.

MR. BOULTBEE said the promoter of this Bill had given his word to the Private Bills Committee that it was not opposed by persons in the locality. The Bill was very peculiar. It asked power to dam up a navigable river, and to acquire property for the one man who was promoting it. The Private Bills Committee had been led to believe that there was no objection to it, but he was informed there was a petition against it.

MR. DOMVILLE said a petition must have three names attached to it, and, if a single man was asking for incorporation, how could he get his Bill before the Committee?

MR. MCKAY said that in the original Bill there was a clause which empowered the company to compel owners of marshes to pay for improvements. That was considered very objectionable, and was believed to be the principal reason why the Bill was petitioned against.

Order *discharged*, and Bill *withdrawn*.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time, and passed:—

MR. LANGEVIN.

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Act incorporating the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Act of incorporation of the Confederation Life Association.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Acts respecting the Isolated Risk and Farmers' Fire Insurance Company of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the "Sovereign Fire Insurance Company of Canada."—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 52) Respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(Mr. Colby.)

INLAND BILLS OF EXCHANGE BILL.—

[BILL 16.]

(Mr. Doull.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading *read*.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said he thought the hon. gentleman ought to explain to the House what he proposed to accomplish by this Bill, and that the Minister of Justice also should, before the Bill received its second reading, explain to the House whether or not it had his sanction. It appeared to him extraordinary that such a Bill as this, applying, as it did, to promissory notes and bills of exchange, should be restricted in its operation to the Province of Nova Scotia alone. If it were a proper Bill, and its provisions were acceptable, it should not be confined to Nova Scotia. It provided for notes and bills made and payable in the Province of Nova Scotia, and not elsewhere; but he (Mr. Cameron) thought that, if it were a proper Bill for the Province of Nova Scotia, it ought to be extended to the whole Dominion. It was unwise and injudicious that, in dealing with promissory notes, there should be one law applicable to that Province and another applicable to the other Provinces. The Bill provided, further, that these notes or bills might be protested by a Justice of the Peace in the absence of a notary. What did his hon. friend's Bill mean by that? Did it mean absence from the place where the note was presented, or absence from a township, parish or the Province? It appeared to him that the Minister of

Justice should not allow a Bill with such absurd clauses to even receive a second reading, without pointing out to the mover of the Bill the inconsistencies and defects it contained. As he understood the observations of the mover and the Minister of Justice, it was intended by this Bill that the protest of a Justice of the Peace would have as much force as if the bill were protested by a notary public, and that such a protest would be accepted as proof sufficient that the note or bill had been properly protested. If the Bill passed in its present shape, the production of a protest of a Justice of the Peace would not even be *primâ facie* evidence of the presentation of protest and dishonour of a note under the peculiar wording of this Bill. He had very decided objections to allowing Justices of the Peace to protest bills of exchange, which sometimes involved thousands of dollars, and he thought it would be a dangerous experiment to leave this power in the hands of some of the country magistrates—the hon. gentleman knew of what kind of material some of them were made. It was different in regard to the notaries public, who were generally selected from the professional class, and they knew the proper mode in which to present or protest a promissory note.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said his hon. friend who had just sat down misunderstood, to some extent, the object of the Bill. The sole object was to prevent difficulties as to proof of presentation and protesting of inland bills of exchange. Another object of the Bill was to place notes of hand, or inland bills, on the same footing in reference to proof of presentation for payment as foreign bills. So far as his (Mr. McDonald's) experience went, he could not see any objection to allowing Justices of the Peace to protest these Bills. However, he was not wedded to that section of the Bill, and he had no doubt his hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Doull) would have no objection to the Bill being amended in that respect in Committee. He was of opinion that legislation in this respect pertained to this Parliament under the 91st clause of the British North America Act. He did not know why his hon. friend con-

fined the Bill to Nova Scotia. He supposed that was the particular Province he had in view at the time. A friend had just put into his hands the Statutes of Lower Canada, in which the same law prevailed, under a Statute passed before Confederation.

MR. GUTHRIE said in Ontario no such difficulty occurred as had been mentioned by the hon. the Minister of Justice. There the practice was that when a note was presented it was protested at once, not to trust to any memorandum or giving of notice, but to draw the same day or the day following.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said he did not know the practice in Ontario, but in Nova Scotia the practice would be valueless because the protest would not be received in a Court of Justice as evidence.

MR. GUTHRIE said that in Ontario the protest was *primâ facie* evidence of the presentation, and of the giving of notice, so that there was no necessity for this Bill in Ontario. But if it was required in Nova Scotia, and the hon. gentlemen from that Province were satisfied with it, he supposed there could be no objection. He thought, however, the objection taken by his hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. Cameron) to the wording of the Bill was well taken, as to the absence of a notary, which was so loose that there would always be a difficulty in proving whether he was present or not. He was only to have a conditional power to protest, the condition being the absence of a notary. But how was that to be proved? There certainly might be a more complete provision than this Bill made.

MR. DOULL said the reason why he asked for this Bill was because they believed the same law was in force in the other Provinces of the Dominion—at least in Quebec and Ontario—and, therefore, they asked to have it apply to Nova Scotia. If there was no objection to the wording of the Bill, he could not object to any alteration that might meet the views of hon. gentlemen. With respect to the words, "in the absence of such notary," he would suggest that it be proved by a notary public or a Justice

of the Peace, and leave out these objectional words altogether. He could not see why gentlemen from Ontario or Quebec, where they had the same law in existence, should object to giving it to Nova Scotia. If he had not been informed that the law was in existence in Ontario and Quebec, he should have applied for a general law for the whole Dominion.

MR. DOMVILLE said there were other things they must look at if they were going into details at this stage of the Bill. His hon. friends, the lawyers, had taken exceptions to legal points; he took exception to the money point. If every farmer that got a note protested for \$20 had to pay \$1, he should object to it.

Bill read the second time.

MR. MACKENZIE said the Bill ought to go to a Select Committee. The Minister of Justice showed, a moment ago, that the legislation on this matter in the Province of Quebec was other than the legislation common to this country since Confederation. He understood that in the Province of Quebec it was wholly a matter of procedure.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): Perhaps the hon. gentleman would prefer having this Bill sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

MR. HOLTON: That Committee is rather too large to discuss it.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was exceedingly undesirable to have any sectional commercial law. If it was a matter relating to the collection of promissory notes and inland bills of exchange, he thought it rested with the Local authorities. He had no doubt the Nova Scotia Legislature had power to legislate in this direction as far as this Bill went. If so, and if the other Provinces had legislated on the same matter, it would be far better to leave it to the Local Government. But, if this House decided differently, then action should be uniform, extending over the whole Dominion. He thought it would be well for a small Committee of professional gentlemen to look at the legislation of the sev-

MR. DOULL.

eral Provinces in regard to this matter. He was, however, very strongly opposed to the Bill as a whole.

MR. MILLS said it was not always easy to draw a line where substantive legislation ended, and where procedure began; but he thought, according to the general rules which prevailed in Courts, it should be treated rather as a matter of procedure than anything else. According to the practice recognised in Courts, the law of evidence was all embraced in the law of procedure. This was rather a matter relating to processes, by which a party who had a claim against another on a promissory note, or a bill of exchange could collect from the parties who were liable, than legislation with regard to the nature of bills of exchange and promissory notes.

MR. MACDOUGALL said the Committee on Banking and Commerce was the proper one to deal with this question. He agreed in the opinion that it was desirable to have uniform procedure with reference to matters under the control of the General Parliament, wherever that was possible. It would be a dangerous principle to establish, were they to legislate on matters not under the control of this Parliament. He did not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), who had stated that this was a question of procedure. If he would look at the Dominion Act, he would see that it had reference to procedure in Courts. This Parliament had jurisdiction and control over the whole subject of bills of exchange, promissory notes, currency, and all that class of subjects.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that a precedent had been established in 1874, when this House enacted a Statute having reference to notices of protest and bills of exchange, thereby showing clearly what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) then thought as to the jurisdiction of this House in this matter.

MR. MACKENZIE: That was foreign bills.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that foreign bills and inland bills were all the same practically. As far as protests were concerned, there was no difference between them. He quite agreed with the

hon. gentleman, that they should, as far as possible, make the laws throughout the Dominion uniform. He understood the object of this Bill was to make the law in Nova Scotia the same as it was in the other Provinces, and, therefore, he was in favour of the Bill.

MR. DOULL moved that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 19.]

(*Mr. Casey.*)

SECOND READING PROPOSED.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Casey's motion, that the Bill (No. 19) To amend the Act respecting the election of members of the House of Commons (37 Victoria, Chapter 9), be now read the second time; and the motion of Mr. Arkell in amendment thereto, that the said Bill be read the second time this day six months.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) said he wished to draw the attention of the House to the extraordinary provision in the first clause, which he understood to mean that, if any person chose to announce that he was desirous of becoming a candidate, or was a candidate, for the representation of any electoral division, say for six months before the writ of election was issued, or before the election came off, and he happened to be one of those whole-souled, good-natured, generous fellows, and followed out the practice he had been accustomed to follow, of treating his neighbours socially, then his election must be avoided for that reason. It was a general practice in this country that, whenever a man met his neighbours at a hotel, he would call them up to have a drink. All this was prohibited by the first section of the Bill the moment a man became a candidate, or announced his desire of becoming one.

MR. CASEY called attention to the fact that general treating was defined in the second section.

MR. ROBERTSON said, as he understood it, within a week after the writ

of election was issued, before the nomination took place, before a man might have had the intention of becoming a candidate, if he was in the habit of treating, the act of treating would revert back to the date of the writ of the election. That was wrong in principle, and should not become law. He was in favour of having the law strictly carried out, of having the franchise pure and incorruptible, but this clause would act as a trap to catch men who had no desire whatever to break the law. It would be an improvement if the Bill provided that it should be a "corrupt practice" for the candidate to solicit votes from house to house; it was practically an infraction of the ballot system to ask a man to disclose to you how he intended to vote, and ought to be prevented. No one had a right to know how a man was going to mark his ballot. Candidates should have the privilege of addressing public meetings as much as they pleased, but it was contrary to the spirit of the Election Law that they should go to the elector and ask him to promise to vote for them. He was also in favour of compulsory voting, and he hoped that before the next general election came off, the Statute-book would be graced with such a law. He contended that it was a duty that every enfranchised person owed to the State to cast his vote in favour of a candidate.

MR. STRANGE said he took exception to this Bill, because he believed the present law was too stringent. It hemmed the candidate in with so many restrictions, and made his responsibility for the actions of his supporters so wide as to make it almost impossible for him to escape a protest. It was impossible for a man of a generous nature, who had been in the habit of treating his friends, to throw off the habit in one moment, simply because he became a candidate for Parliamentary honours. This Bill should be thrown out, and he had great pleasure in endorsing everything which his hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Arkell) had said concerning it.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said there was no use in introducing amendments to the present Election Law, which was sufficiently stringent. He had never had personal experience of the law as

regarded controverted elections. In his constituency there was no opportunity of bribing men, or of bringing men forward in any way to controvert the elections, or in any way to act before the public otherwise than to go forward and say that they voted for the man they believed should represent them. Had these questions been brought up against him, he might have been put to a great deal of trouble and expense in contesting them. He was in favor of abrogating this absurd ballot law altogether, because he believed in men coming forward and saying in the light of heaven for whom they voted. Had anyone contested his election, the Dominion Government would have been put to an expense of about \$4,000 through the absurdities of this Ballot Act. He thought the Government should allow him \$2,000 or \$3,000 for having never put them to the expense of a contested election.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) said there was one section in this Act he knew something about, the 8th section, which said that no act of a deputy returning officer or poll clerk should disfranchise the voter. In East Hastings during last September, the leading Reformers left an impression on the electors at different polling booths that the ballots would be numbered, and that it would be known how they voted. He was very glad to see they had been caught in their own trap and had been defeated. It had been charged unjustly that he (Mr. White) had something to say with Mr. Rathburn, previous to the last election in the East Riding. That statement was not correct, the *Globe* to the contrary notwithstanding. To say that a gentleman in the County Council, who had kept that position six or seven years, and was now Reeve of Thurslow, could go to the polling booth where he resided, and tell the electors, in the presence of the deputy returning officer and poll clerk, that ballots must be numbered, and that this act of acquiescence of the deputy returning officer should not be punished, was asking too much. The law as it now stood was the proper way to disfranchise the voter. As far as treating was concerned, he believed, with Judge Armour, that men

who had votes to sell, did not sell them for a glass of whiskey. They understood how to sell them as they did how to sell a bushel of corn or any other article. There was too much said about treating and drinking. Those parties who cried out against drinking generally drank the most. There were Reformers in the East Riding of Hastings who were Christians in their own estimation, who would not drink a glass of whiskey, but who, whenever they got a candidate's money, would spend it and drink freely. They should not be too hard on the hotel keepers. They took their money to make improvements, they encouraged them to sell whiskey, and when there was a little chance for them to make a little money, those men who claimed to be Reformers would crush them, although they were the quickest to use money when it came from other hands than their own. If the Government thought the present law was in need of amendment—and he believed with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Strange) that it was too stringent—let them bring in a measure. They were preaching economy, and here were members getting Bills printed and circulated at the expense of the country in order to get their name in the *Hansard* and before the country. The hon. member for Elgin was promoting a Bill to amend the Election Law. Who paid for the printing of it? If members were compelled to pay for the printing of those Bills which did not become law, less time would be wasted in useless discussions. It would be an injustice to the electors to enact a law which would relieve the returning officer or any officer of the Government from the punishment due to interference with the ballots. If there was an election tomorrow, and that was the law, there would not be an elector in the whole riding that the candidate would not know how he voted, because every ballot would be numbered and marked and tampered with. In a certain part of his constituency, if the ballot was not marked to suit them, they cried out corruption; then they did not want the ballot. Nor did he, for he wished they were back again to the old system of voting by open votes; they would have less deception and more honesty; and he hoped the day was not far distant when

they would have open voting again. If the Grits were true to what they professed, in the name of common sense, why did they abuse the people when they took advantage of the ballot to vote according to their convictions in Mill Point? The *Globe* lately abused a gentleman about some matters concerning the town of Belleville which were untrue, and the Reform party that stated that Mr. Rathburn had said aught to him in his own interest was not just or truthful. Mr. Rathburn acted honourably towards the Reform party at the general and last election, and made the very best speech the night before the election that had been made in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite from the commencement of the canvass until the close of the election. But, those gentlemen would compel people to go with them, even against their own will and inclinations; if one opposed them he was called a turncoat. He believed that this Bill should not be allowed to go to a Committee. If it should, why did its promoters desire another Committee than that considering the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)? He thought that it would not be reported this Session, and that neither of them was necessary. Why would the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) prohibit an elector from taking a glass of beer during an election more than at any other time? This Bill was too restrictive. No elector could be bought for whiskey. The Bill was uncalled for, and should be thrown out.

MR. ORTON said, as reference had been made to the election for Centre Wellington, he would explain the causes of the delay experienced in that constituency, and make a suggestion as to the provisions that should be introduced—not to increase the amount of litigation, but to simplify the Election Law, and diminish litigation. The difficulty in connection with the recount in Centre Wellington arose from the fact that the deputy returning officers did not perform their duties properly. Only one ballot-box was properly sealed, and some returned unlocked. Some had been exposed in hotel stables for hours, where they could have been tampered with;

and on that account, but more particularly because it was generally believed the ballot-boxes had been tampered with, his counsel objected to the recount, in consequence of finding one ballot-box in a very informal condition. He thought that the present law did allow every opportunity for fraud, even after the election; and they all knew there were strong partisans, neither ashamed nor afraid to tamper with the ballot-box, as they saw in the Jacques Cartier election recently. The Act might be very much simplified, while retaining the recount. If the law provided that there should be a recount only of those ballots rejected or disputed by the scrutineers, and that the rejected ballots be put into one envelope, and the disputed into another, marked with the signature of the scrutineers and the deputy returning officer, the possibility of tampering with ballots would be prevented. A statement should also be signed by the scrutineers and deputy returning officer, which should be taken by the Judges as conclusive evidence of the number of sound, rejected, and disputed ballots. In reference to other portions of the Act, he fully agreed with the hon. gentlemen who spoke before him, that it was a very arbitrary piece of legislation. He did not think that treating ever influenced a vote. Besides, all knew that there were other influences that were used to influence votes and yet evade the law. He had known millers supply wheat, flour, and seed grain to poor voters, take their notes for them, and then canvass such electors. Such men could exert a vast influence in elections. Instead of trying to hamper the candidate, and encourage litigation and expense, he thought that all the amendments to this Act ought to go in the direction of simplifying the law, rather than in making it more difficult, and increasing litigation.

MR. PLUMB said, in the year 1873, an Election Law was passed by his right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald), which had been loudly called for by hon. gentlemen opposite, and others. But he chose to wait till the experiment had been fairly tried in England, of referring election trials to the Judges, and he adopted that course. In 1874 it

seemed good to the hon. gentlemen, some of whom now remained in the House and sat on the Opposition benches, to bring in an entirely new Act, which was in no respect an improvement on that already on the Statute-book, except the ballot should be considered an improvement, with all its objectionable machinery, now proved to be a means of the grossest fraud. That Act had been amended in 1875, also in 1876, and again in 1878. The greater part, if not all, of those amendments had been made by the Minister of Justice, the responsible law officer of the party that held power for the last five years. They had been accepted by the hon. gentlemen opposite without question. He did not remember the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) ever proposing any amendment to those Acts brought in by the leaders of the party which he zealously supported. Now, however, he proposed to add his mite of legislation in respect of election matters. In every case in which the Election Law had been tampered with by those hon. gentlemen, they had made some loop-hole favouring delay in the law, or shielding some corrupt practice. There was some amendment, if it could be called an amendment, by which no prosecution could be commenced during a Session against a man who had bought his way into the House, and by which it was possible for such a man to sit, and during the last Session of a Parliament, till its prorogation, and then escape many of the consequences. They added a clause by which the Judges were stopped from trying such cases during term, and all the expenses were increased by that Act. His own (Mr. Plumb's) case was adjourned for forty days. The respondent had been disqualified before the adjournment, but he (Mr. Plumb) could not take his seat until the Court again met and gave judgment. Now, what did they find here? The hon. member for West Elgin, not satisfied with his leader's Election Law, had brought in his small Bill, which he presented to the House with an air of profound satisfaction. He was not content to have it referred to the Committee considering another Bill—a Bill of some consequence in regard to election matters. He refused the Premier's suggestion so to refer it. Every clause in the

MR. PLUMB.

hon. gentleman's Bill could be very easily disposed of by anyone who knew anything of the Election Law, or of the English decisions upon which all decisions in Canada were based. This Bill defined in one section who should be considered a candidate. Why, according to the decisions of the Judges in election cases in England, every man was a candidate the instant he contemplated candidature, and they went back to his acts for a year—for any period during which, to use an English expression, he had cultivated his constituency; the day of his formal nomination was not regarded as the day of the commencement of his candidature, because he was a candidate already, and did the hon. mover of this Bill set up his authority against this practice and the decisions upon it in the Courts here? There were cases constantly cited as precedents in respect to the candidature, which were intended to prevent a man from employing corrupt influences, and attempting to evade the consequences by not having accepted a formal nomination. Yet the hon. gentleman said that a man should be considered a candidate and held responsible, because some persons might put his name in the newspapers or name him as a candidate without his consent or knowledge. Under this provision it was clear that anybody could make anybody else a candidate, and, if the unauthorised nominating party was in the habit of treating his friends, such treating would disqualify his nominee. He (Mr. Plumb) could hardly believe that his young friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) could be in earnest when he brought forward such a Bill. If it had been introduced on the 1st of April, he should have supposed the hon. gentleman intended the whole thing as a huge joke. Why, the entire gist of the Bill was to define what should be considered as treating. At a late election trial. Vice-Chancellor Blake of Ontario had given a decision on treating. It so happened that in the riding where the trial took place, that next to that represented by the hon. gentleman, there was a person who had the habit of treating—a Mr. Day—who treated nearly everybody he met who would drink with him, and Day supported the gentleman who was successful in the East Riding of Elgin,

and whose election happened to condemn a colleague of the hon. gentleman from West Elgin, during the floods that broke over the land last 17th September, to stay at home; and the sitting member for East Elgin was specially aimed at in this Bill. The House was, therefore, asked to pass an Act to punish such acts as Mr. Day's, which were decided by a Judge not to be corrupt. Corrupt treating was what the law condemned—treating with corrupt intent. In a trial where he (Mr. Plumb) could have proved a charge of corrupt treating—where the respondent had never met the constituents before, but declared himself a candidate and treated the electors,—but the Judge refused to hear the charge of treating, saying it was not worth while to take such cases up. And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) proposed to make a candidate responsible for treating, whether corrupt or otherwise, habitual or otherwise, and would go back to the time when some habitual treater might have been a canvasser without the evidence of any corrupt treating, in order to vitiate an election. The thing was preposterous. It was contrary to the spirit of any law. The offence of treating was defined in the Act, and the Vice-Chancellor refused to receive doubtful evidence; undoubtedly there was nothing in the decisions of the English Courts to have set aside an election, and to have unseated a candidate on such grounds. The next feature of the Bill was that those found guilty of general treating should be fined \$200. It would apply to any person who happened to live in a constituency, whether he was a canvasser or not?

MR. CASEY: To any candidate or agent.

MR. PLUMB said they knew how wide the law of agency was; that any man under the Election Law was an agent who canvassed, but this Bill went far beyond that. There was great latitude as to the definition of agency, the person appointed to pay the election expenses of the candidate and receive his certificate was the only agent whose exact position was defined by the Statute. The gist of the clause in the present Act was that the offender, if found guilty of corrupt practices,

must be prosecuted. The hon. member for West Elgin could not have read the Act of 1876, which provided, in the most stringent manner, that, when a Judge had reason to suppose, or when ever it appeared a person had been guilty of corrupt practices, he must report him to the authorities in the Province in which the Act had occurred. He must report him to the Governor-General and the Attorney-General of the Dominion, who must act as prosecutor, and he must be summarily tried by the Judge or his substitute. The hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) was not satisfied to have his Bill referred to the Committee to which the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was referred, but insisted on a Special Committee of his own naming. He did not agree with his hon. friend for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) that there was nothing new in the provisions of the Act that had been introduced by the member for North Simcoe. He (Mr. Plumb) thought there were very valuable, and necessarily new, provisions, in it, and that it was a Bill well worthy the attention of the House. In this wonderful Bill there was a strange provision with respect to ballots. They knew of a case where the ballots were not found in the ballot-boxes. This was a most wonderful piece of legislation, and, if adopted, would leave the ballot system open to a thousand frauds. They had evidence of the ingenuity that could be practised in this direction, even under the auspices and at the election of a late Minister of Justice. He was sure that no other hon. gentleman on the other side would have ventured to provoke discussion upon the informality or irregularity of voting by ballot, and the abuses which could be practised in ballot-stuffing—side-board dodges for instance. He wished to deal with this Bill exactly as he found it. He found in the last section of the proposed Bill that, "if it appeared to the Judge upon a recount, proper so to do, after hearing the evidence, he should hold good all ballots appearing to have been cast in the election, notwithstanding any informality, neglect, error or omission on the part of any officials," particularly if a deputy returning officer had a cramp in his stomach about four

o'clock in the afternoon of polling day, as at St. Anne's, "and whether such ballots be found in any packet or ballot box, as provided by law, or not." He might add further, whether under a side-board or not, or in a cellar or not, they must be counted, according to the Bill under discussion. He was astonished that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) had the temerity to ask for a Special Committee upon this miserable attempt at weakening the Election Law. He (Mr. Plumb) had never been particularly in favour of the ballot, but, when he saw how it worked in England upon its introduction there, he thought it would do the Conservative party in Canada no harm. He was quite willing that this Bill should go to as many Committees as the hon. gentleman liked, but he thought it was trifling with the House to attempt this childish legislation in the face of the decisions that had been made by Judges, and the precedents afforded by previous election trials.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex) said that he was surprised that the Bill of his hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), which the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) had characterised as funny legislation, should have received so much attention at the hands of so distinguished a gentleman. It appeared to him (Mr. Ross) that, if the Bill were so trifling and feeble as the hon. gentleman said, he had exhausted an amount of intellectual power that was altogether unnecessary. He had gone to Jacques Cartier to find an illustration in condemnation of this legislation, and had, furthermore, taken his hon. friend to task for introducing the Bill at all. He (Mr. Ross) would ask if it was necessary for a member on the Opposition side of the House to introduce a Bill in this House without first asking leave of the hon. member for Niagara. His hon. friend from West Elgin was endeavouring to perfect an Election Law which was necessary as a safeguard to public morality. He (Mr. Ross) noticed that the proposed restriction of general treating at elections seemed to be very obnoxious on the other side of the House. It had begun with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Arkell), who must have had a

lively recollection of the effect of treating, and his sentiments had been re-echoed by his hon. friend from Cariboo (Mr. Thompson), and the hue and cry had been joined in by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), and these hon. gentlemen said that whiskey never influenced a vote. He (Mr. Ross) felt very strongly on this question. It was one of the weaknesses of their electoral contests that people who were disposed could have perfect freedom in influencing electors by the corrupt practice of treating. He had been waiting to hear his hon. friend the Minister of Finance on this question. If that hon. gentleman and himself had to contest elections with gentlemen who were disposed to use liquor very freely, they were at a disadvantage, inasmuch as they had to act on the principle that it was improper to give intoxicating liquor. Looking at the tariff resolutions that had been brought down, it would be seen that an immense bonus was offered to every man engaged in the liquor business. They had given a bonus of \$204,000 to the brewers, and now, by opposing this legislation, they would be enabled to distribute it amongst the electorate. He protested against that species of legislation. He knew of nothing that had so demoralising an effect upon the great body of the electorate in the Dominion of Canada as the corrupt practice of treating. He had very great pleasure in supporting this clause. He had not examined the other clauses, but this was the one against which the opposition of the hon. gentleman was particularly directed, and he was glad to find that any opposition which would be given to a Bill to prevent intoxicating liquor being used as a bribe to the electorate, would come from the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) said the hon. gentleman who had just sat down might be looked upon in this country as the special advocate of temperance, but he (Mr. White), sitting in the gallery above and looking down at this House during the last five years—or rather for many years—had had an opportunity of judging the value of that hon. gentleman's temperance principles. What stand did that hon. gentleman take when a motion was

Mr. PLUMB.

made in this House in favour of prohibition. He moved an amendment, which declared it was inexpedient to deal with the question. For five years, when in Opposition, hon. gentlemen had traded upon this question; but, when in office, with the responsibility of office upon their shoulders, they had not a word to say in practical promotion of the prohibition movement. And now, when they were again in Opposition, free from the responsibilities of office, they again brought that question up against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. He (Mr. White) was a teetotaller himself, and had hearty sympathy with any effort having for its object the lessening of intemperance. But, when he compared the conduct of the hon. the Finance Minister with the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite who reviled him, when he remembered that that hon. gentleman had always maintained his temperance principles in private life as in official life, that he had stood as one of the exceptional few among the champions of temperance who had remained sincere in his convictions and steadfast in his practice, he felt that it came ill from hon. gentlemen, whose temperance principles were, in the case of most of them, merely political clap-trap, to sneer at the hon. the Minister of Finance. What had been the history of this temperance movement? When the hon. gentlemen opposite were sitting upon this side of the House, not a word, locking to practical results, was uttered in connection with temperance by them, excepting, perhaps, a statement by the then First Minister that he was very anxious to secure prohibition in Canada, but that the public sentiment was, unfortunately, against it. While they were in Opposition they did not recognise this sentiment. Petition after petition, signed by hundreds and thousands in favour of prohibition had been presented to the House, prompted by hon. gentlemen opposite for no other purpose than that they might appear as the champions of that principle, so that when they went to the polls they might use it for election purposes; but, when they changed sides in the House, the petitions decreased, until finally, not a single petition came in; the whole movement dropped, and they would not have heard any more of

it, in so far as Parliamentary action in the direction of prohibition was concerned, had not the hon. gentlemen found themselves in Opposition, and again desired to raised a little cheap clap-trap in the country by falling back on their old temperance hobby. With regard to this particular Bill, he thought it was very much to be regretted that the hon. member for West Elgin had not accepted the suggestion made by the First Minister, to let this Bill go before the Committee that had already been appointed.

MR. CASEY: It is not on the same subject at all.

MR. WHITE said it was on the subject of the Election Law, and might very well go to the same Committee; but the hon. gentleman insisted on having a Special Committee, and he thus forced upon the House the consideration of a Bill, in order to ascertain whether the Bill, as it stood, contained such provisions as ought to be adopted by the House. He (Mr. White) had gone through an election contest or two before the Courts, as well as before the electors, and he knew that the law on the Statute-book was quite sufficient for all practical purposes in relation to this matter of treating. He could give an illustration that occurred in his own contest in the city of Montreal before the Courts. A gentleman who was engaged in connection with the corporation as foreman of one of the departments, who took no part whatever in the election, went up early in the morning on the day of the election and voted. He went back to work, and in the afternoon, as he was returning to the city, a couple of men asked him for a lift, as they were going to vote. He consented, and after the men had voted he brought them to a tavern close by and treated them, and sent them home in a sleigh. When this case was brought before the Judge, it was held that the treating would have voided the election, but for the fact that the man who had treated had not only taken no part in the election, but had, on account of personal engagements, declined to do so. Surely this was a severe enough law. The hon. gentleman proposed to declare, in the first place, that a candidate meant any person who might have been named, talked of, written about, or canvassed

for as a possible candidate at a coming election. Under such an Act, every possible candidate would be an actual candidate. For instance, the friends of the gentleman who opposed the hon. member at the last election and was defeated, might make up their minds that they would have him as their candidate at the next election. If he did not protest to every man that he would not be a candidate, he would be the candidate for the elections five years later, and were he in the habit of treating, and should he treat any person in the mean time, it would be considered, under this Bill, corrupt treating, and, should he run, it would be sufficient to disqualify him.

MR. CASEY : That is not the law.

MR. WHITE said he would read the clause. It was clumsily drawn, but no other inference could be deducted from it. It read as follows :—

“In this Act ‘Candidate’ means any person who has been nominated as a candidate for the representation of any Electoral Division in the House of Commons, at any election, by any person or persons, in any public manner, or who has announced himself as such, or allowed himself to be announced as such, or on whose behalf support at an election has been asked; and any person who is actually nominated according to the provisions of the Election Law, on nomination-day at any election, shall be deemed, for the purposes of this Act, to have been a candidate from the time of the issue of the writ for such election.”

Treating, according to the second section, meant, “the frequent or habitual treating of individuals or assemblies of individuals.” Treating one individual would come under the head of “individuals.” Why else should he say “individuals, or assemblies of individuals?” Three individuals constituted an assembly of individuals under a fair interpretation of that Act. If a man who was mentioned as a candidate, without protest on his part, should enter a tavern and ask any of those present to join with him in a glass of grog, as was too often, and to his (Mr. White’s) view, improperly done, but not according to the view of a vast number of people, he was to be considered as having been guilty of corrupt treating, and should he be induced to allow himself to be nominated, and were he elected, he would be disqualified. A

MR. WHITE.

Statute of that kind could not be worked. He was in Hamilton when a decision was given by Chief Justice Draper, in the case of the North Wentworth local election, disqualifying the returned candidate, a penalty which appeared so terrible to the Local Government that they passed a white-washing Bill in order to save some of their friends in Ontario, and to relieve the disqualified candidate from the effects of the disqualification. He remembered the remarks of Chief Justice Draper, who took the ground that it was impossible the act of the candidate was corrupt treating, but that, unfortunately, the law was a cast-iron one, and he was compelled to inflict a penalty for the offence utterly beyond what it merited. If they put an Act of that kind on the Statute-book, they would make that practical injustice very much greater. There was an hon. gentleman in this House who had been disqualified for the Local Legislature of Quebec, because at nine o’clock, after the polling was over, when no possible influence could be exercised, his brother-in-law took it into his head to treat the persons present, who were waiting for the returns from the outlying districts. Previous to doing so, the law was looked up, and they considered that treating them could not be considered a corrupt act, and in a fit of hospitable generosity a five or ten gallon keg of beer was sent for, and its contents partaken of by all present. The law being a cast-iron one, the Judge had no option but to disqualify the candidate elected. The law was unjustly severe, but the Conservative party in Quebec did not do as the Liberal party in Ontario had done. They did not first pass a stringent law, and then pass a whitewashing Act to relieve themselves from its effects. No; they respected the law they had themselves made, and refused to pass an Act to relieve those who suffered penalties under it. The question of corrupt treating should be left to the decision of the Judge in the case, who, hearing the evidence and knowing all the circumstances, could determine whether an act of treating was a corrupt act or not. The Judiciary of this country could be trusted with that amount of discretion. Another clause of this Bill related to mistakes by returning officers, deputy returning offi-

cers or other officials. The singular feature in this Bill was that special penalties and stringent rules were imposed in relation to treating, while a man might commit any amount of frauds in connection with the ballots and no penalty whatever was prescribed. He (Mr. White) had been deprived of a seat in this House, in consequence of errors of the deputy returning officers. In the first election he ran for Montreal, he had a majority of fourteen votes, but through the acts of the deputy returning officers, his opponent was declared elected, and sat in this House for a Session. He would be sorry to see any law introduced which would tend to make more lax the practice in regard to the ballot. He had not been a believer in the ballot in the past, but believed in it now. He believed that 50,000 of the Reformers of Ontario, relieved from the terrorism of their local party influence, voted at the last elections according to their convictions in favour of the policy of the right hon. the Premier, who, if the system of open voting had been adhered to, would not have dared to record their convictions. One of the results of the ballot system would be that no Government could in future depend so much on party backing as in the past, but would depend upon the convictions of electors that they were properly administering the affairs of the country, for their retention of office. That was a result which the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would not regret. If the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill had been willing to allow it to go to the Committee to deal with the whole question of elections, it could have gone through, but if it was to be dealt with as a separate measure, the best thing to be done with it was to adopt the resolution of the hon. member for West Elgin, and give it a six months' hoist.

Mr. CASEY said he had expected to hear something from the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches with reference to this Bill, but, if they were not going to make any reference to it, he would notice a few points made in the discussion. The remarks of his hon. friend from West Middlesex appeared to him to contain the pith of the whole of the objections to the Bill from the other side

of the House. The hon. member for Hastings said it would be a shame to deprive the poor man of getting a glass of beer during the elections. Give the poor man a chance to get a glass of beer out of the candidates. The Conservatives in England carried the elections at one time on a somewhat similar cry, "Bibles and beer," and the Conservative party, worthily led on this question by the hon. member for Hastings, decided to adopt the same policy here. He hoped his leaders on the front benches would say "no" to that policy, or they would find it a fatal one to go to the country on. The hon. member for Centre Wellington seemed to have carried away the impression that he (Mr. Casey) had insinuated that there had been a perversion of justice in his return. He had not insinuated anything of the kind. He did not think there had been any injustice perpetrated in carrying out the Statute. What he pointed out was that the Statute under which his return was made possible was wrong, and allowed electors to be disfranchised by the acts of officials. He did not intend to say there was any dishonesty in connection with his return. His venerable friend from Niagara had charged him with inconsistency in having supported the law now in force, when it passed through the House, and now wishing to change it. The defects in the law only appeared after full experience. He thought it was good legislation then. The hon. member for Niagara thought, then, it was bad. He considered now that it worked badly. The hon. member now insisted that it needed no change. Which was the more consistent? The hon. gentleman had gone on to say that this Bill was aimed at the hon. member for East Elgin and his agent. It would not need any legislation of this House to attend to those gentlemen, and it would be beneath his own dignity, and that of the House, to introduce a Bill aimed at one candidate or his agent. He had noticed the case of East Elgin simply as an instance of the evils permitted by the present law, and he was going again to refer to the judgment delivered in that case. He was bound to do so, because his hon. friend from Niagara, and his hon. friend from Cardwell had both taken the same line, namely, that the Act of 1874,

provided for the case which he tried to provide for in his Bill. Against the authority of these gentlemen he would set the judgment delivered by Chief Justice Richards, late of the Supreme Court. On the Kingston election case he said:

“Experience has proved that the provisions contained in the laws now in force in the Dominion and in the Province of Ontario, do not effectually put an end to corrupt practices in elections.”

Vice-Chancellor Blake in the East Elgin case decided to the effect that treating an elector while canvassing him for his vote should be a corrupt practice, but was not so by law, and pointed out, also, the evils permitted by this laxity. He had simply, in this Bill, carried out the suggestions of Vice-Chancellor Blake in making treating, while canvassing a voter, a corrupt practice. He had ventured, with great timidity, to put these two puny critics of the present Election Law against the overwhelming intellects of the hon. gentlemen who had adopted the opposite view, and left it to the House to decide whether they would hold with the hon. members for Niagara and Cardwell, or with Chief Justice Richards and Vice-Chancellor Blake. He maintained strongly that the law did not provide sufficient safeguards against corrupt practices in elections, especially with regard to treating. His hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb) said that under the Bill any person who was guilty of general treating would be punished therefor. He forgot that no person could be guilty of “general treating” under this Act, except the candidate or his agent, and therefore no other person could be punished for it. He felt he must refer to an unprovoked attack by the hon. member for Cardwell upon his hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). That hon. gentleman had been so far carried away by his spleen against the hon. gentleman from West Middlesex that he had forgotten some of the most prominent facts of our political history. He said he had sat in the gallery and watched the troubled existence of the member for West Middlesex, whom he accused of being a traitor to temperance, and whose principles he characterised as political clap-trap. He

MR. CASEY.

said that he had watched that gentleman bringing in petitions for prohibition while the Conservative party was in power, but keeping silence when his own party was in power. He (Mr. Casey) was sure that hon. gentlemen knew such was not the fact. His hon. friend from West Middlesex frequently lifted up his voice in favour of temperance while his own friends were in power. He had presented hundreds of petitions in favour of temperance legislation. The hon. member for Cardwell knew very well that the hon. member for West Middlesex, and the temperance organisations with which he was connected, had formulated a Bill which embodied their desires, and his hon. friend had prevailed on the Government to introduce that Bill, and to carry it through Parliament. The Government passed exactly the Bill that the temperance people in the country thought best adapted to our circumstances. He (Mr. Casey) desired to give the most emphatic contradiction to the assertion of the hon. member for Cardwell, that his hon. friend had not stirred in the matter. If this Act was not found sufficient for the interests of temperance in the country, the hon. member for St. John, N.B., (Mr. Tilley), that “bright and shining light in the cause of temperance, who was loved and respected by every temperance man in Canada” would, no doubt, take hold of the matter, and make a better law to remedy any defects in the present one. Coming back to the subject of the Bill under discussion, several hon. gentlemen had complained that the law of elections was in such a condition that a candidate might be held responsible for anything done on his behalf, and for any treating that was ostensibly done on his account, and that in this way his adversaries, even, by pretending to act in his favour, might secure the invalidation of his election. He believed it had been held by the Courts that, when anything of that sort took place, candidates could not be held responsible. But his Bill had nothing to do with the law of agency in elections; it left it exactly where it was before. Many hon. members seemed to be under the impression that, when he defined treating in the first section, he meant corrupt treating, and that that would be held to be criminal under his

Bill. That was a mistake. The word treating, as used in this Bill, meant the giving or procuring of drinks or refreshments, etc., as defined. Then the Bill went on to explain what sort of treating constituted corrupt treating.

MR. BOWELL: Would the hon. member explain what constitutes habitual treating?

MR. CASEY said this was a matter which was to be left to the discretion of the Judge who tried the case, as a great many other indefinite questions in law were equally left to a Judge's discretion. It must necessarily be left to the Judge to say what amount of treating shall be considered habitual or frequent. He would give as an example the North Middlesex election (1875) for the Local House. A candidate was shown to have treated everybody he met, and to have kept that up during the whole time he canvassed. That would be considered a case of habitual treating. He thought, if the hon. gentleman was on the Bench, he would have no difficulty in discriminating between "frequent or habitual treating," and merely occasional treating. His hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) had indulged in one of his numerous flights of imagination when he stated that this Bill proposed a penalty on the man who treated. Now this was not true, unless the individual treated in the manner defined in the Bill. The hon. gentleman had complained, again, that the Bill allowed the deputy returning officer, who dealt improperly with the ballots, to go scot free. He had pointed out the incorrectness of this statement, but his hon. friend had still persisted in his assertion. The Bill did not let the deputy returning officer who committed irregularities get off free; but it left him exactly where he was before, and subject to the penalties imposed by the existing law. This Bill was intended simply to put the law back where it was, and make it again what it was intended to be in 1874—to put it back in the position from which it had been removed by conflicting decisions of Judges. The decisions of the Judges had permitted a latitude in regard to treating which the country could not approve. With regard to the irregularities of returning officers he had not expected that there would be any

objection to the provisions of the Bill. He had not thought there was one hon. gentleman in the House who would stand up and say that the improper acts of returning officers should involve anybody else in their consequences, yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) seemed to think it was quite proper that, when the returning officer in the East Hastings election numbered the ballots, the consequences of that irregularity should fall upon the electors, and that the voters should be punished for the irregularity of the returning officer. Why? "So that the people of the country might have an idea of the gravity of the offence committed by the returning officer." That was one statement of the hon. gentleman which he hoped the House would not endorse. The Bill did not offer any greater opportunities for fraud than existed before. Hon. gentlemen had pointed out that, if ballots, which had been improperly dealt with, were counted, it would afford an opportunity for fraud. The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) had pointed out that in his own case the ballot-box was supposed to have been tampered with. The Bill provided that in case the Judge had reason to believe that fraud had been committed, he should leave out any ballots he might think were affected by that fraud. He might count all or none of the ballots. As the law stood now, a Judge had no power to count ballots in connection with which there was any irregularity. The hon. gentleman from Cardwell had stated that instead of allowing this Bill to go quietly to a particular Committee, he (Mr. Casey) had insisted in having a discussion on it. He did not refuse to send it to that Committee if he could not do better. If the Bill went to a Committee it should go to one that had no other business before it. He wished just to remind the House that, in voting for the second reading of this Bill, it would merely affirm the principle that it was expedient to provide further against the evils that had arisen from the use of strong drinks in elections, and that the elector should be sheltered in the exercise of his franchise from the operations of returning officers. He was not inclined to stand on matters of detail in Committee. He thought,

however, the House might, without any sacrifice of principle, allow it to go to a second reading. The hon. leader of the Government had informed him that he would consider about letting it go to a Select Committee, and he was sorry the hon. gentleman was not at this moment present to state how he would like to dispose of the Bill. Under the circumstances, he (Mr. Casey) thought he should have to let the matter go to a vote.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex)^a moved that the debate be adjourned. He said he would take this occasion to answer the grave charges made against himself by the hon. gentleman from Cardwell. The first was that he (Mr. Ross) had made a violent attack on the hon. the Finance Minister. He was sorry that hon. gentleman was not at this moment in his place, in order that he (Mr. Ross) might set himself right with him, if that hon. gentleman considered that he had spoken disrespectfully of him. If his hon. friend from Cardwell had construed his remarks into an attack on the hon. the Finance Minister, he had misconstrued them. He had not intended to attack that hon. gentleman. He was as hearty in his appreciation of that hon. gentleman's usefulness in the temperance cause, and of his high character, as the hon. member for Cardwell could be. But the hon. gentleman did not confine himself to this attack—he must, forsooth, drag into this debate the whole temperance question. It would seem that, notwithstanding the lofty altitude in the gallery from which that hon. gentleman had listened to the debates in this House, he had not been able to follow the course of legislation on the floor of the House. He had stated that, while he (Mr. Ross) was in Opposition he was exceedingly anxious for temperance legislation, but that when he was on the Government side he had nothing to say. That was a great mistake. While he sat on the Opposition side of the House he had raised his voice but once in favour of temperance, during the whole of that Parliament, and that was in 1873, when he seconded a motion by Mr. Bodwell to refer to a Select Committee the petition for a Prohibitory Liquor Law. He regretted now that he had not

spoken more frequently during that period. But what was his record while sitting on the Government side of the House? During the first Session he had the honour to sit on that side of the House, he had moved for the appointment of a Commission to visit the United States to collect evidence with regard to the results of prohibition. In the next Session, he formulated a motion on the report of the Commission, and during every Session, from 1875 to 1878, he brought the question of prohibition in some way before the House. And yet that hon. gentleman, who never raised his voice or wrote for the press, except to disparage and underrate the efforts of temperance men, chose now to impugn the sincerity and honesty of a life-long temperance advocate. He had charged him with having voted against prohibition. Evidently, he knew nothing of the position he had occupied with regard to temperance legislation. Did he not know that he (Mr. Ross) particularly represented the Dominion Alliance, who specially instructed him to oppose the resolution moved by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Schultz), and to say that the time had not arrived at which they, as a temperance organisation, were prepared to assert that they must have prohibition pure and simple? Was he to go in opposition to the temperance organisations? But, if his hon. friend was so sincere in his advocacy of prohibition, let him go back to that resolution which his friends on the Ministerial side of the House supported at that time. Let him reintroduce it, and see to what extent even the gentlemen who voted for it in 1877 would say that it was the duty of the Government to interfere to stop intemperance. His amendment to Mr. Schultz's motion was not a motion against prohibition or its principle; they merely reaffirmed their previous expressions of opinion on this question, and were waiting—

MR. BOWELL: I simply want to ask a question—Whether the hon. gentleman ever gave an expression of opinion on that question?

MR. ROSS said he had.

MR. BOWELL: Not on prohibition.

MR. CASEY.

MR. ROSS said yes; the vote referred to was not against prohibition, but, inasmuch as the question then was on its way to the Supreme Court, where it was to be decided whether or not Parliament had the power to deal with the whole question, his temperance friends outside instructed him not to embarrass the Government on the matter at that time.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROSS said hon. gentlemen opposite might cheer, but they ought to know that a speech did not consist in cries of "hear, hear." He would repeat, the temperance men considered it unwise to embarrass the Government, and unwise to embarrass themselves in connection with prohibition, until it was determined what course they could take in law. That was the only honest course they could take. What right had they to insist on a Prohibitory Liquor Law, when there was a great difference of opinion as to whether it could really be passed by the House, particularly in face of the fact that the matter was in the way of settlement by the Supreme Court, where only the question of jurisdiction could be finally decided? To show that they were sincere in the course they took, immediately after the matter was settled, what was done the following Session? There was placed on the Statute-book the Temperance Act of 1878, which was satisfactory to the temperance men of the Dominion, and which made it practicable for any municipality to pass for itself a Prohibitory Liquor Law. In face of that fact, was he to be charged with inconsistency or trading in temperance principles? Did he trade in those principles for the purpose of gain, or did the hon. gentleman accuse him (Mr. Ross) of trading in them for political support or otherwise? Did he mean to impugn the whole acts of the temperance men, from one end of the Dominion to the other, instructing him to take the course he had done? The language of the hon. gentleman was certainly uncalled for, being that of a man who had formerly acted prominently in connection with temperance associations, but who had since, no doubt, disregarded the pledge of which he formerly was so proud. He (Mr. Ross) was not here to

take a certificate of character from that hon. member. He was willing to stand by the gentlemen who stood by him in the Legislature, and to pass the Temperance Act now on the Statute-book. Even the hon. the Finance Minister, who enjoyed such a reputation and influence in connection with the temperance cause, never, during the five years which he sat on the Treasury benches, allowed the word temperance to escape his lips, and never made an effort to give the slightest assistance to the cause. Yet he was to be held up as an example, while his (Mr. Ross's) character was to be impugned undeservedly; that hon. gentleman was to be extolled as a model of consistency, and he was to be denounced as trifling and tampering with the cause to which he had given his best energies. He was willing to have his record put to the test, and his friends were willing it should be tried in the light of past experience, and by the Act passed by the late Government which the country would appreciate.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) said the hon. member for Middlesex stated that he had made no attack on the Finance Minister. Then what was the relevancy of that passage in his speech in regard to the tariff resolutions? What was the meaning of the various references of that hon. gentleman and others on his side of the House, and of their friends in the press, with respect to the Finance Minister and his tariff in connection with the temperance question? The hon. member for Middlesex said he had made no attack, but he was one of those who could

"Damn with faint praise,
Assent with civil leer;
And, without sneering,
Lead the rest to sneer."

That was the style of the hon. gentleman when he attacked the hon. the Finance Minister whose temperance record was superior to his own. He had stated that during the last five years the hon. member for West Middlesex had done nothing practical to promote prohibition, and in answer they had the statement that it was doubtful if this Parliament had the power to deal with this question. If that was so, whence came those petitions from every part

of Ontario especially, in favour of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, when the Conservatives were formerly in office? Why the motion of the hon. gentleman in the early part of the last Parliament, to send a Commission to the State of Maine, and elsewhere, to ascertain the working of the Prohibitory Liquor Law? What was the meaning of all those proceedings of the temperance people, if, as the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had asserted, Parliament could do nothing in relation to the question? He (Mr. White) had reason to believe in the existence of political temperance men, and in their efforts in behalf of the hon. gentleman's party. The facts he stated he was prepared to justify. He knew the hon. gentleman had got from the Dominion Alliance instructions to act as he did, and not to embarrass the Government of the day; and he knew also that those same party temperance men had, when the Conservatives were in office five years before, done everything they could to embarrass the Government, by raising the temperance feeling against it all through the Dominion, on the ground that it was an immoral party, and should be resisted by the moral sentiment of the people. The member for West Middlesex got the assent of the Dominion Alliance to the course he had adopted. He (Mr. White) referred to the convention in Montreal, specially organised not to promote prohibition, but to relieve the Government of all embarrassments. That convention was the result of a meeting held in one of the ante-rooms of this building; practically a political meeting, at which, out of sixty gentlemen assembled, there were not more than eight or nine teetotallers among them. They were quite willing to raise the cry to injure the Conservative party. What he said before he stood by now—that as soon as they found the question embarrassing to the Government of the day they ceased their agitation, but promptly renewed it when they found it injurious to the Conservative party. During the last three years of the late Government, the country heard little on the subject from them. Now, as on former occasions, there had been a disposition to raise the latent temperance sentiment, in order to embarrass and injure a Conservative Government. The future would

MR. WHITE.

tell whether he was right or wrong in predicting that, before this Government had lasted five years, they would have petitions pouring in again for entire prohibition, as the only proper means of terminating the use of intoxicating liquors; and that the cry used in the past against the Conservative party would be employed again when it suited the hon. gentlemen opposite. He regretted that this discussion, which was to a certain extent out of order, should have been provoked; but it was provoked by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross), who, in that sneering manner familiar to him, posed himself as the only temperance man in this country entitled to respect, while denying any respect in relation to that question to the Finance Minister, or to any hon. gentleman on the Ministerial side of the House.

MR. ANGLIN said he believed that it was his duty to correct some of the statements of the hon. member for Cardwell on this question. If he understood him, he stated that, during the five or six years that the hon. gentlemen now in office formerly sat on the Treasury benches, the political agitators for prohibition deluged this House with petitions for prohibition, but that, during the five years of the late Government, a different course was pursued. His (Mr. Anglin's) recollection was entirely different from that. The petitions for prohibition in the early years of the Parliament were few, and the agitation not urgent. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) seemed to think that the demand for prohibition was afterwards virtually abandoned; but, during those years of the late Government, if his memory served him, their table groaned with petitions for prohibitory legislation, and the Government of which he (Mr. White) stated the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) was so subservient a supporter, and which he would not press, had to pass an Act which he (Mr. Anglin) had said would work most injuriously to the country at large, were any serious attempt made to enforce it, and work mischief to the party that introduced it. He believed the Government then assumed a serious responsibility, but they proved their sincerity in the cause. Those who professed to be advocates of total abstin-

ence stated that, while they wished to see prohibitory legislation adopted, they felt that it would, in the interest of the temperance cause itself, be the worst possible course to anticipate the progress of public opinion, and attempt to force legislation of that character prematurely on the country. That was the position taken by the hon. gentlemen then in office, and by the member for Middlesex on various occasions, and particularly when the resolution was moved by the hon. member for Lisgar—a resolution which he (Mr. Anglin) thought was not made seriously in the hope of carrying it, but to embarrass the Government. That was his recollection of the facts, and it differed very much from that of the member for Cardwell. Instead of placing the member for Middlesex in the position of a mere trickster and trafficker in temperance principles, he thought it placed him in the position of a consistent, persevering, prudent advocate of temperance principles and prohibitory legislation. He was entirely opposed to prohibition, but thought this statement was due to that hon. gentleman. He was not prepared to say he would vote for the present Bill in its present shape; but there was very much in it that required serious consideration. The decision of Vice-Chancellor Blake, which he regarded as one of a series of very extraordinary decisions, had placed the question of corrupt treating in a new light. If he understood the judgment, it was this: That, if a man, not in the habit of treating, ventured to treat a few electors at the time of an election, he rendered it void, were he a successful candidate or his agent; but that an agent who was in the habit of treating crowds of people at other times, might treat at election times with impunity and be legally employed as agent, because he had the capacity of drinking enormous quantities, and the habit of treating everywhere. He (Mr. Anglin) regarded that as a very extraordinary view of the law. It was pronounced, however, by a Judge of high standing. The question for their consideration now was whether they should allow that to be the law. He did not think hon. members on the other side could be seriously of opinion that it should be open to anyone who was fortunate enough at election times to

to secure the services of men of this extraordinary capacity and habits to obtain an advantage over an opponent. The question was a serious one. His own experience led him to believe that it was best for the candidate running a fair and honest election that the law should be as strict as possible, and that there should be no doubt whatever as to the legal effect of any corrupt treating, or treating of any kind. If treating were indulged in at all, it was very difficult to define the point to which it should be allowed to go. In his opinion, a necessity existed for a change of the law in this respect, as now interpreted. No one anticipated a change in the law this Session, but it was desirable that the Bill should be taken into consideration in Committee, so as to prepare for such amendments as it might be found desirable to make next Session.

MR. CASEY said that the hon. the leader of the Government proposed to him the last time the Bill was before the House that it should go to the same Committee as the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe. He (Mr. Casey) had expressed his preference for a smaller Committee. The right hon. gentleman promised to consider whether he would allow the Bill to go to a separate Committee or not. In any case, he had no doubt the right hon. gentleman would allow the Bill to go to the Committee he had formerly suggested. Nothing had transpired to change the state of the case since he made the proposal, except the motion of one of his supporters to give the Bill a three months' hoist. He thought the question was one deserving of further consideration, and, for that reason, he would ask an adjournment until such time as the hon. the leader of the House should be in his place.

MR. TUPPER said he did not see any practical result could arise from this Bill going to a Committee. According to the statement just made by the hon. member for Gloucester, it was not expected that anything would grow out of it during the present Session.

MR. ANGLIN said he thought the hon. gentleman misapprehended him; what he intended to say was that he did not expect any legislation would grow

out of the matter this Session, but that valuable work might be done in the way of preparing the measure for next Session, and obtaining such information as would be valuable in the consideration of a Bill next year.

MR. TUPPER said he understood the hon. the leader of the Government made an offer to the hon. mover of this Bill to send it to a certain Committee, but the offer was declined.

MR. CASEY : No.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman took his own course, and the result had been a discussion, which had brought hon. gentleman on both sides of the House to the conclusion that no immediate benefits would arise from its further consideration. He trusted the House would reject the motion to adjourn the debate, and that the motion to read the Bill a second time this day six months would be carried.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron) said the hon. gentleman was mistaken as to the course taken by his hon. friend the First Minister. It was suggested by the hon. the Premier that all Bills having relation to controverted elections should be referred to the same Committee as the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). His hon. friend did not refuse to have it referred to that Committee, but preferred to have it referred to a smaller Committee, as this Bill dealt with a different branch of the Election Law. Because the Bill would not be made law this Session, it was no reason why it should not be referred to a Committee. The hon. the First Minister had declared that he would not allow the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe to become law this Session, and yet he referred it to a Special Committee on the ground that valuable information would be obtained in Committee which would facilitate ultimate legislation. If that measure were referred to a Committee, there was quite as much reason for referring this measure to a Committee. There was another Bill on the subject introduced by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. He had no doubt the hon. gentleman

MR. ANGLIN.

who had just resumed his seat would say that that Bill ought to go to a Committee, though it was as objectionable in many respects as that of his hon. friend (Mr. Casey). He was entirely opposed to some of the provisions of his hon. friend's Bill. He thought the Election Law as it stood in many respects was too stringent, but there were many points deserving careful consideration in Committee, which he thought might be made into law. There were points upon which the opinions of Judges were diametrically opposed to each other, and he thought that, if they could remedy some of these difficulties by referring the Bill to a Committee, no opposition should be given to that course. He thought that hon. gentlemen opposite should deal the same justice to gentlemen sitting on the Opposition side of the House as to hon. gentlemen on the Government side, if they wanted the House and the country to think they were actuated by fair motives.

MR. MILLS said he thought that, when the House considered this question, they would see that if his hon. friend from West Elgin had objected to the proposition of the hon. the First Minister, he would not have been unreasonable in that objection. The measure of the hon. member for North Simcoe dealt with a particular branch of the subject. What the member for North Simcoe proposed was a complete consolidation of the law relating to controverted elections. The Bill of his hon. friend from West Elgin did not touch that subject at all, and, consequently, it was desirable that it should be referred to a different Committee. There were anomalies in the law which ought to be dealt with one way or another. Different views were entertained in regard to the stringency of the Election Law. At present its stringency depended upon the individual opinions of the Judge who sat in the case. The question as to whether ballots marked by a deputy returning officer ought to be rejected or not was an important matter, and it was absolutely necessary that the Legislature should deal with the law in some way. It should not be left for a Judge to say that certain ballots which were sufficient to elect a candidate in one constituency

should be counted, while ballots of the same kind were rejected by another Judge in an adjoining constituency. There was another feature in the law which required amending, that was the provision relating to general treating at elections. He desired to call the attention of the House to the fact that two candidates might be running at one election, and, one having an agent in the habit of treating, it would be perfectly legitimate for him to do precisely the same thing which would unseat his opponent. Would hon. gentlemen say that this was a satisfactory condition of the law? It was perfectly obvious that the law ought to be amended, and this defect remedied, so that men seeking the suffrages of the people should stand on a footing of perfect equality, which, it was obvious, they did not now. If the hon. gentlemen would not allow his hon. friend's Bill to go to a Committee, with a view of obtaining a solution of these inequalities, these anomalies, these defects, it would be as clear as noonday to every member of the House, and to the whole country, that they were actuated by feelings of the most partisan character.

MR. HESSON said, when he first looked at this Bill, it had his sympathies, but he had since looked at the existing Act under which members were elected to the House, and he found it contained all the provisions necessary to a pure election or a fair trial. Gentlemen opposite boasted that they gave the country that Bill, and now they seemed to be the first to find fault with it, because under it they had not been able to bring back to Parliament a large majority. If the Bill had worked against them, it spoke so much the more for good government. He considered the existing Statute quite stringent enough. Under its provisions he had been afraid during the election to give refreshments to his friends even in his own house. During his election he guided himself by that Act, and he considered it dangerous even to treat himself, let alone his friends. He had taken the opinion on this subject of a legal gentleman, who could teach many on the other side of the House. He referred to Mr. Robert Smith, of the town of Stratford, a gentleman of high standing amongst the legal fraternity.

He thought the Bill now on the Statute-book was strong enough. There appeared to be too much desire on the part of gentlemen in this House to distinguish themselves by the introduction of new Bills, or the alteration of old ones, putting the country to much useless expense, and often leaving the law worse than at first. So much was this the case, that eminent legal gentlemen differed widely as to what the law really was. He would support the six months' hoist as moved by the hon. member for East Elgin.

MR. MACDOUGALL said the Bill of the hon. member for West Elgin was not quite adapted to the circumstances of the country, which, so soon after a general election, was hardly prepared to form very conclusive opinions respecting the working of the present Election Law. Whilst he was not of opinion the present law was anything like perfect, he thought that if the Bill before the House were adopted in its present form, it would render it very difficult for a candidate to present himself at an election. He thought that his hon. friend (Mr. Casey), having presented his views to the House and the country, should allow the question to drop for the present, and when it was brought up again in another form, the House, perhaps, would be in a better position to deal with it than they were at present.

Motion to adjourn the debate, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

Amendment (Mr. Arkell) agreed to on a division; Bill to be read the second time this day six months.

House adjourned at

Thirty minutes past

Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 3rd April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PACIFIC RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

REMARKS.

MR. MACKENZIE said he desired to call the attention of the Minister of

Public Works to the fact that the papers relating to the contracts recently let did not contain the report of the engineer, nor the Order in Council giving the reasons for passing over the lowest tender. He presumed they would be laid before the House, as they were necessary to an intelligent discussion of the matter.

MR. TUPPER said there was no lowest tenders passed over. The principle of the lowest tender was adopted throughout, and there was really no action taken, except that of awarding the contract to the lowest tender, until they reached the contracts as they now stood. He had understood the hon. gentleman himself to say that it was not usual to give the reports of the engineers, and he did not believe they were submitted by his predecessor; but if it was the practice, he had no objection to having it followed.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentlemen would find that the engineer's report in regard to section 15 was brought down. When the report was an open one, dealing with several contracts, he thought it should be brought down, but he quite admitted that it might be of such a character that it was intended more for the confidential eye of the Minister, and in that case he would not ask for it. But if it was a report giving reasons why some tenders should not be accepted—reasons of a general character—the House should know the views of the engineer. In regard to the lowest tender, he could only say there must be some mistake, because there was a lower tender than that accepted, and there was a combination of others which would be still lower. There was no statement made as to whether these tenderers had withdrawn or not.

MR. TUPPER said the tenders were awarded strictly on the principle of not passing over the lowest tender in any case.

MR. MACKENZIE said he found one tender for \$5,699,000, while the two accepted were very much more than that; and he found no reason given for passing over that tender.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman would find that the parties whose

MR. MACKENZIE.

tender was lowest for the whole amount, were unable to furnish the security required for a part of the tender, and that, after a long period had been allowed them for the purpose of obtaining assistance from outside to strengthen their hands, they were utterly unable to deal with the contract at all.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is an answer as far as it goes.

THE CASE OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR LETELLIER.

STATEMENT.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a statement to the House. With reference to the resolution come to by the Senate, last Session, and by this House some little time ago, with regard to the conduct of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, I have to state that I waited on His Excellency the Governor-General, and informed him that, after the resolution of the Senate of the last Session of Parliament, and the resolution of the House of Commons during the present Session, it was the opinion of His Excellency's advisers that the usefulness of Mr. Letellier, the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, was gone, and that it was, in the public interest, deemed to be expedient that he should be removed. His Excellency was thereupon pleased to state that, as the federal system introduced by the Constitutional Act of 1867 was, until then, unknown in Great Britain or her Colonies, there were no precedents to guide him to a decision in the present case, and, as the decision in this case would settle for the future the relations between the Dominion and Provincial Governments, so far as the office of the Lieutenant-Governor was concerned, he therefore deemed it expedient to submit the advice offered him, and the whole case, and the attendant circumstances, to Her Majesty's Government for their consideration and instructions.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion to agree

to resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th).

MR. SNOWBALL said he admitted the the task before him was a serious one, and one he would willingly have avoided if possible. No person had had a higher respect for the present Finance Minister than he had. No one had more pleasure than he in seeing that gentleman as he had ascended step by step till he reached the pinnacle of power in his native Province. Referring to the tariff, he said if an enemy had done this, they might have borne it, but for a friend—one in whom they trusted—to come and sow their field with tares, was beyond endurance, and must be resented. He would notice the remarks of some of the previous speakers on this subject. He was surprised the other evening at the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Wellington, with regard to cheap money. He fell into the mistake of eulogising everything that belonged to our American neighbours, and rather depreciating what belonged to Canada. He was surprised to hear him state that cheap money was a sign of the great prosperity that existed in the Republic at present; that in New York they were now investing in their own bonds, and that money could be had on demand at 4 per cent. But cheap money was always not a sign of prosperity, but the reverse. When trade was prosperous, men engaged in commercial pursuits, and the demand for money was greater, and when trade got depressed, the money-lender became distrustful of all operations, and began to withdraw his money from business, and invest in consols, and what appeared to him undoubted securities, but which bore low interest. Then consols would rise in value, and the rate of interest would fall for want of proper investments. In all cases when Britain had been prosperous, money maintained a uniform value of about 5 per cent, showing a general trust and confidence in mercantile transactions, capitalists were willing to lend, and business flowed smoothly. But in times of depression like the present, in the great money-lending centres like London, money brought only 2½ per cent., while in Can-

ada the supply of money was so limited that its owners could demand rates that suited them, though higher than those of the world generally. One point touched upon by the hon. member for Maskinongé related to a statement as to a discrepancy in the remarks of members of the late Administration, in reference to the value of flour in different localities, in the event of the adoption of such a tariff as the present. As that subject interested the portion of New Brunswick that he (Mr. Snowball) came from, he would refer to it. He could see no discrepancy in the statements made by these gentlemen. In the western section, where grain was raised, and a surplus existed, the duty would not really enhance the value of flour, but in the Eastern Provinces, that had to depend on the others, it would be enhanced without any benefit to the Western farmer, who was to benefit so much by the tariff. They in the eastern part of New Brunswick enjoyed water communication, and got freights at such extremely low rates as to secure a reduction of those of the Intercolonial. Where he (Mr. Snowball) lived, he had to pay \$80. to \$85 a car load for flour from the West, when the same could be taken 180 miles further, to St. John, or 260 or 270 to Halifax at \$20 less. What was the cause? Clearly in St. John and Halifax, having to compete with such close proximity to the United States. The hon. member had told them that in the Lower Provinces, previous to Confederation, they were not educated to taxation. He was perfectly right. They were, however, apparently going to be taxed enough now. The Finance Minister had staked his reputation that they would not be taxed under Confederation above \$2.75 per head; to-day it was up to \$6.14 in New Brunswick, and, after the tariff got into force, would be up to \$9. He was surprised at the hon. gentleman making those changes, since his constituency would be so greatly affected by them. Hon. gentlemen opposite had observed that he had excelled himself in this his last great effort. He (Mr. Snowball) endorsed every word of that statement. Representing, as he did, a constituency almost entirely engaged in lumbering, fishing and ship-building, he had excelled himself in producing a tariff that would create wide-

spread distress and woe not only in his own constituency, but the Province generally. Hon. gentlemen had stated in their speeches that Canada was in such a very deplorable condition. He would ask, was it worse than any other portion of the world? Was our trade utterly ruined! Had we not one advantage to offer seeking immigrants as an inducement to come to our country? Was the population of our country totally destitute? This, certainly, was what we had come to, judging from many of the speeches we had heard. He maintained that Canada was not in a worse, but rather in a better condition than many other countries, but would not say how long it would continue so if this obnoxious tariff was to be forced upon it. While admitting it was suffering with all the world in the present financial depression, it had not that pauperism that was seen in other and older countries. It certainly was in a better condition than the United States. It had not been troubled with the great army of tramps with which our neighbours had been afflicted. Last fall that country was infested with these marauders, and the result had been a state of things that had never existed in Canada. The Dominion had been blessed in the past year with an abundant harvest. Living had been cheap; what we produced was produced at a cheap rate, and our exporters had held their own, if they did not make money. For this we had great cause to be thankful. Several speakers, in the course of the debate, had blamed the Grit Government for the depression that had existed in Canada. Was that Government to blame for the depression that had existed in the United States, or any other part of the world? In Norway and Sweden, which, like the Maritime Provinces, were particularly interested in the lumber, shipping and fishing trades, a condition of depression existed such as had never been known in that country during his experience of business. Hon. gentlemen might as well blame the Grit party for the plague in Russia as for the depression in Canada. Hon. gentlemen, in their zeal, appeared to decry everything pertaining to British trade, and eulogise everything pertaining to our neighbours in the South. Where did our neighbours go for money when

MR. SNOWBALL.

they wanted it but to England? When they got in a tight place, and were compelled to realise on their products, they then had also to go to Great Britain. It was not a sign of the prosperity of the United States that they had had a large export trade during the past year. It rather showed that, owing to their depressed condition, they had been compelled to sacrifice their products in European markets to meet their pressing wants. Figures had been brought forward by hon. gentlemen for the purpose of showing the relative positions of the United States and England. He desired to refer to these arguments, and he would take the figures which had been quoted by hon. gentlemen. They were told that the total exports from the United States were \$694,884,000. They were largely raw materials, and when these materials were shipped to Europe the tendency of parties owning the goods was to over-value them. They invoiced them at prices above what they actually expected to receive, and above what they actually did receive. A reduction of 25 per cent. might be safely made upon the total amount of the exports, to bring them down anything near the value actually realised, but taking off 20 per cent. the exports of the United States would be reduced to \$555,907,000. They had imported during the same period \$437,000,000 worth of goods. They knew that, in view of the tariff of the United States, the tendency in importing goods was to undervalue them. Large American importers had their own agents in the European markets who re-invoiced their shipments at a reduced rate, perfectly understood by the house on this side of the Atlantic. Proof of this tendency had lately been afforded in the proceedings against an extensive American house which had imported a large line of gloves, which were seized, and found to have been invoiced about 25 per cent. below their real value. They might safely add 20 per cent. to their imports to allow for this undervaluation. Then they had to take into consideration the amount paid for carrying. It was estimated that the United States paid \$130,000,000 to foreign bottoms for carrying their goods annually. To this, also, was to be added the interest they paid to foreigners on

their national debt, and then they would find a balance of trade of \$126,500,000 against the United States. The result was really much larger than that. Now look at the other side. The exports of Great Britain were £355,000,000 sterling, and the imports £272,000,000; and here the same thing occurred which occurred in the United States, and the same system of calculation would show that the balance of trade in favour of England was £122,000,000 annually. In her receipts from the carrying trade, and the tribute she received from the rest of the world as interest on their loans, was to be found the secret of her extraordinary wealth and power. An attempt had been made to show that the commercial greatness of England was waning, and that, while the exports were decreasing, the imports were increasing. In the figures before him he found that the gross exports of Great Britain in 1872 amounted to £314,588,000; the export trade of 1877, the last year for which we had returns, was £252,346,000 sterling, which showed a falling off of about £60,000,000. They had, however, to look to the value of the goods in the different periods. They knew that there had been a material falling off in the value of all goods in their market. In iron, for instance, there had been a reduction in the price of over one half, and coal, which, in 1872, sold at from 20s. to 30s. per ton, could be bought in 1877 for 4s. 6d. to 6s. 6d. per ton. In view of this reduction in value, they might safely take 25 per cent. from the imports of 1872 for shrinkage in value, which would bring the amount down to £235,941,000, as against £252,346,000, the value of the exports in 1877, leaving a balance in favour of England, at the present time, of £16,000,000 sterling. Whilst he admitted that England was suffering, he claimed that she was in a better condition, proportionately, than most other countries. She had shipped a greater bulk of goods in 1877 than in any previous year. The statement that England was getting tired of her Free-trade policy was without foundation. He remembered, a few years ago, that fears were entertained that Germany was going to deprive England of her small-ware trade. It was of very short duration, however, and was

not sustained. Then Belgium was going to take away her iron trade, but that fear was found to be not well grounded. Next came the cry that France was going to control the sugar refining, but that also proved to be a fallacy. The statement that America was going to supersede England in the cotton trade had even been made on the floor of the House. He knew that, a few years since, a large quantity of American piece goods were sent into the English market. The American papers made a great cry about it, and this, acting as an advertisement, naturally attracted attention. He knew that a large quantity of these goods, after lying in Manchester and other parts of England for many years, were found utterly unable to compete with goods of English manufacture, and they were actually shipped back to the United States. He could assure them that England was holding her own, and was in quite as good a condition as any other country in the world. The present complaint in England arose from stock farmers. They complained that Canada and the United States were taking the fresh meat trade out of their hands, which complaint found additional weight in view of the present tariff. We four millions of people, scattered over a vast extent of territory, could do but little to improve the trade of the world, and without the trade of the world improving, we could not improve. Employment must first be found for our ships, and a market abroad for our lumber, grain, fish and other exports, without which the trade of Canada would not improve. From the debate, he inferred that the party who had been most imposed upon during the elections was the farmers. The tendency of the present surplus population of our towns and cities was to go on farms and supply themselves with food to eat, at least. The policy of Canada was to encourage the immigration of a farming population to settle our great North-West, which we had been informed could produce wheat and cattle sufficient to supply the whole world. When that was done, and this supply came in in addition to the present abundant supply, it would bring the prices of these commodities down to a point never before dreamt of. That was Canada's present policy towards our

farming population. If we must have Protection, he would like to get it in small doses, so as only to nauseate, but not kill. He would cite a few figures given by the Finance Minister a few evenings ago. Carriages were imported annually into this country to the extent of \$86,000. A high duty might naturally be put on these, without sacrificing the labouring or farming population. We had all the wood and iron and raw material used in this manufacture, and could employ in that industry more people than in the sugar refinery and other things talked of. He would tolerate a duty of 100 per cent., or a heavy specific duty on carriages, that would keep the foreign article out of the country. Then came the article of clocks, of which \$65,000 worth were imported. Those could be taxed to any amount, so as to keep the manufacture entirely within ourselves. Of furniture, \$399,000, worth were imported annually. The importation consisted of the better classes of furnitures, as that for the working classes was already manufactured in this country. This item could bear a heavy tax to keep it out of the market, as the tax would in any case fall on the rich. On sewing-machines and tubing, which were grouped together, for what reason he could not tell, of which the hon. gentleman said \$518,000 worth were imported, he would be willing to have a tax, as we had manufactories of these machines in this country. Pianos and organs were entered to the extent of \$469,000. A tax on these would not weigh seriously on the poorer classes. Billiard-tables, importation \$11,000. He did not care how much they were taxed. Brooms and brushes \$45,000, and farming implements \$141,000. The latter he was very doubtful about, but, looking at the creditable show made at the Exhibitions in Paris and Philadelphia, he considered that even farming implements might be taxed if Manitoba were exempted. These items combined amounted to about \$2,000,000, which might be protected. To return to his own Province, what did he find? New Brunswick at the time of Confederation, paid into the Treasury of the Dominion \$386,586, while the amount paid last year was \$1,731,960, a very large increase which did not at all correspond

MR. SNOWBALL.

with the statement that they would not be required to exceed \$2.75, the amount laid down by his hon. friend.

MR. TILLEY: What is the average of the year before? There was \$400,000 the result of the five last years, of which our predecessors had the benefit.

MR. SNOWBALL said the amount paid in, notwithstanding, had steadily increased since Confederation. Ontario paid \$7,561,000, but claimed in addition that a large portion of the duties collected in Montreal were paid by her. This showed that Ontario paid into the Treasury of the Dominion \$4 24 per head, or allowing \$2,000,000 for the duties paid by her in Montreal, it brought the average to \$5.36. New Brunswick imported largely from Montreal, Toronto, and other Western cities, particularly in the Excise line, which would increase her amount. Nova Scotia paid \$1,471,000, or \$3.45 per head last year. For New Brunswick, it they added the amount of excise paid in Montreal, and other cities, it would make the average \$6.14 per head. If that amount were equalised throughout the Dominion, the revenue, including that derived from public works, would amount to over \$29,000,000. What had been done for shipbuilding under the new tariff? It was stated that, though the amount of taxation was increased, that this was going to be returned in the shape of a drawback. In looking over this list he found there was a tax of from five to thirty per cent. on many materials used in shipbuilding. How were shipbuilders going to get those taxes back; a shipbuilder wanting a few tons of iron might get it at the Londonderry mines, or from a dealer in our cities. What did he know about the amount of duty paid on these goods? He bought hinges, cordage, etc., and small wares from dealers, and, when his ship was ready, asked for a drawback on the materials. From his (Mr. Snowball's) experience, it was very difficult to get drawbacks, one of the conditions being that the applicant must swear that he actually paid duty on those goods. It was impossible for that man to make a statement which would enable him to recover the drawback. He could not distinguish between the portion manufactured here and that

imported; nor could he swear to the value at which the imported portion was purchased. He could not make the necessary affidavit, and would find when his ship was ready to go to sea, that he would not get a dollar. How was the fisherman provided for in this tariff? On the free list they found his hooks, nets and lines, twines and salt, but those articles had always been free, so that the fishermen had nothing to thank the present Ministry for in that. His flour, everything he ate, drank and wore, was taxed. He could not buy his jacket to the value of 16s. sterling, without paying \$2.04 into the Treasury. The fisherman wanted protection against the Americans who came with purse-seines to his very doors and literally swept the fish from the sea. They surrounded everything in the water, gathered them up, culled out a few mackerel or such fish as they required, leaving the surface of the bays for miles strewed with dead fish, the very fish our fishermen expected to get. He next came to the lumber interest, a very important interest. We exported, in 1877, \$27,124,000 worth of lumber, but not a sufficient proportion, as many people supposed, to give us the control of the markets of the world. The imports of lumber into Great Britain, in 1877, were \$-5,000,000, but \$27,000,000 of which came from the Dominion. What Protection did lumber get? As had been proved by the hon. member for Queen's, it was taxed 60c. per 1,000 superficial feet, under the new tariff, in addition to the 70c. under the old tariff, which, with the 80c. imposed by the Local Legislature of New Brunswick made a total tax of \$2.10 per M., or 52c. per tree. This was a great hardship, an amount of taxation which these people could not stand. He held a document from a person engaged in the trade, showing the cost of a quantity of goods that he imported a few weeks since actually going into that trade. What did he find in this statement? He heard his hon. friend, the other evening, say that the advance on cottons and woollens was only 2½ per cent. The very first thing in this invoice was a bale of flannels which cost £53. 2s. Under the old tariff the duty would have been 17½ per cent.,

or \$44.80. Under the new tariff it was as follows:—The goods weighed 320lb. at 7½c. per pound, and 20 per cent., making the total amount \$75.60, or an advance of 70 per cent. The next item was a bale of cottons, valued at £63. 1s. 10d. sterling; at the old duty of 17½ per cent., \$53.20. Under the new tariff, it was \$102.17, or 95 per cent. of an advance on the old tariff. The next item was a bale of winceys, £25 9s. 10d. sterling, at 17½ per cent., \$21; under the new tariff, \$45.72, an advance of 115 per cent. The next bale was also winceys of cheaper quality, costing £19 14s. 5d. sterling. Under the old tariff, the duty would be \$16.10, while under the new one it was \$37.98, making a difference of 135 per cent. He would like to know how this was going to be contradicted. In every item he was prepared to go down to the minutest particulars. The next was a bale of bed-ticks, which cost £11 10s 6d., and they paid, under the old tariff, \$9.80, and under the new, \$16.72, there being a difference of 72 per cent. The next was a piece of serge to make a summer suit for the importer himself. Of course, he had money to pay for it; he was not a labourer, and there was a little consideration shown him. On this article, the duty, under the old tariff, was \$4.20, and under the new, \$6.15, or under 47 per cent. advance. The next was a bill of small wares. The only thing in which there was a saving was a case of threads costing £13 18s. 9d.; under the old tariff the duty was \$11.90; under the new, \$8.50, showing a saving of \$3.40. Taking the whole invoice, the duties under the old tariff were \$233.28; under the new, \$409.94, or an advance of over 75 per cent. There were other things to the detriment of the poor lumberman. He was afraid they did not vote right in the last election. Possibly that was the reason the new tariff bore so heavily upon them. Supposing he wanted to buy a jacket, he would have to pay duty for it \$2.04. The average weight would be 7lb., at 10c. per pound, making 70c. Allowing it to cost 16s.—the lowest cost for a passable jacket—the duty on this, at 25 per cent., would be \$1. Allowing the trader 20 per cent. on his investments, 34c., would make the cost \$2.04 to the purchaser.

A pair of blankets, by the same calculation, the duty being $7\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, would cost the purchaser \$1.50 in duty on every pair of blankets that he put over him at night, which he must pay or freeze. He admitted that we had imported too many goods, which was injurious to the country. But here was a tariff of taxation that came right home to the poor people in the country, the shipbuilders, the carpenters, the lumbermen, the fishermen. He would like to know how his hon. friend was going to show that we were not going to be grossly taxed beyond what we were able to bear. It had been said that we could make use of the bonding system in bringing goods from the West. This was a system that many are unable to understand. He predicted that this bonding difficulty would be found great enough to divert trade from the West from us, and compel it to find its way to the sea through other channels at a serious loss to the Dominion. He was surprised to hear the assertion that the Grand Trunk Railway, that great artery of communication between the East and the West, would, in the future, undertake this bonding system free of charge. Could it be supposed that they would gratuitously undertake the labour of bonding, in addition to the risk they would have to assume. It was an insult to the British people whose money was invested in that railway, to suppose that they would consent to assume this extra trouble and expense when this very tariff would ruin their Canadian trade. It would be an insult to ask them to bond our own goods at their expense. He repeated the whole tariff would be a burden on the people of the Maritime Provinces. They were an industrious and self-reliant people, but they would not be able to bear these new burdens. He had no sympathy with those who talked of England's trade and commerce declining. Hon. gentlemen might believe it, but he could not. He was proud of that old land which had nourished and sustained us in our colonial infancy, and he hoped we were all proud to claim her as our parent. He hoped her flags would never cease to wave over us. Talk of England's power waning. Her enemies might hope so. But look at her to-day, and the giant that guided her des-

tinies, as she swayed her sceptre over the greatest empire on earth. She was the wonder and terror of the world. A terror to evil-doers, and a tower of strength to those who would do well.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) said he had no intention to make a speech on the question of Free-trade and Protection, as it had already been fully discussed in this House, both during the last Session and the present one. That question was placed before the people at the last general elections, and they had pronounced in favour of Protection by an overwhelming majority. He accepted that verdict as conclusive. He was not one of those who thought that the majority was wrong, and the minority right. The thanks of the whole country were due to the hon. the Finance Minister for having obeyed the wishes of the people in bringing down his tariff resolutions. The Opposition would show far more patriotism in helping the Government to carry out the National Policy, than by pursuing their present undignified course. Time would tell whether a Protective policy was a correct one or not, and whether it was suitable to this Dominion or not. For himself, he had faith in it, because we knew by experience that a contrary policy had ruined this country. Protection had made the United States one of the great commercial countries of the world, enabling them even to compete successfully with European nations in their own market. The fact that the United States had been able to redeem their national currency was a striking proof of the prosperity they enjoyed. Protection had also made France one of the most prosperous nations; and no one could deny that the latest policy of Germany was a Protective one. More than that, Protection was steadily gaining ground in Great Britain, where the people were becoming dissatisfied with a Free-trade policy. Finally, he was in favour of a Protective policy, because he believed that Protection alone could save this country from starvation. It had been said that this tariff was anti-British; he could better understand the reproach if it was said that this tariff was anti-Canadian. Customs regulations were not matters of sentiment; they were not so in England

or in any other country, and he did not see why they should be so in this Dominion. Let them look at the British tariff for the last ten or fifteen years, and see whether it did not contain some discriminating provisions against British Colonies, and in particular Canada. In the tariff for 1862 he found that the duty on beer and ale imported from the Isle of Man was 10s. the Imperial gallon, whereas the duty on the same article imported from Canada was £1. He found also, on looking at the Imperial Statutes of 1874, that spirits imported from Canada into the Isle of Man, except rum, paid a duty of 8s. 6d., whereas the duty on British and Irish spirits was only 6s. 6d. per gallon, being a discrimination of 2s. against Canadian products. By looking at the present tariff of Great Britain, it would be seen that spirits imported from British colonies paid a duty of 10s. 2d. per gallon, while the Excise duty on the same article produced in Great Britain, was 10s., being a discrimination of 2d. in favour of Great Britain, and against Canada. Finally, if they looked at the treaties that Great Britain made with other countries, and especially with France, they would find that discriminating provisions had been made against British Colonies. He held in his hands a list of about one hundred articles on which the duties were altogether in favour of Great Britain and against the British colonies, and particularly against Canada, in some cases even prohibitory. It would be sufficient to call the attention of the House to one or two items. The duty on cheese imported from England into France, was 3 francs per 100lb., while the duty on the same article imported from Canada into France, was 11 francs and 20 centimes. The duty on wooden ships imported into France from Canada was \$8 per ton, while the duty on those imported from Great Britain was only 2 francs per ton. In order to protect the ship-building interest of Scotland, the duty on ships made of iron and wood imported into France from Canada was 50 francs, while on those imported from Great Britain, it was only two francs. It was perfectly evident that, if we did not take care of our own industry, no one else, not even Great Britain, would do it for us. His policy to-day was exactly what

it was on the 17th of September last, and before that time—and what it would always be—before all he was a Canadian, *avant tout je suis Canadien*.

MR. WADE said he occupied, on this question, a position unlike that of any other hon. gentleman, since the county he had the honour to represent was the first of importance to pronounce against the late Government, which it did on the occasion when, during the last Parliament, the late Minister of Militia was defeated in the county of Digby. That election was run upon the question of the approval or condemnation of the Government of the day, in relation to its fiscal and general policy, and the verdict of the county of Digby was an emphatic condemnation of the late Government, and the policy under which the late Government came into power. He would ask, did they come in on any great principle? No. True, they raised the cry of retrenchment and reform, and the country and this House know well how their pledges were redeemed. Upon this platform, coupled with large promises made to the people of this Dominion, they succeeded in obtaining the seats of office, and the five years of misrule. He would not weary this House by going into its history; sufficient for to say, and he thought it would be generally conceded, that it was weak, imbecile, and disastrous in its consequences as a governing body, and, as had been stated by hon. gentlemen who had preceded him, resulting in large deficits being rolled up, which very materially conduced to bring about our present financial difficulties. He denied the Government was playing with the rights of the people; on the contrary, the Government was fulfilling and carrying out the principles shadowed forth by the right hon. the member for Victoria, in his resolution submitted to the House last year, and was the same position as taken by the Government this year, which had been adopted in the Province of Nova Scotia to a very large extent, as well as the other Provinces. The hon. gentlemen opposite were adopting a course which he considered was adding insult to injury, looking at the present state of the affairs of the Dominion. Those hon. gentlemen, when in power, had propounded nothing,

had given nothing to the country. They had, indeed, adopted a policy which had not met with the sympathy and approval of the country, and the position they had assumed was one that did not commend itself to his (Mr. Wade's) judgment, nor he believed to the country in general. It had been said that the question before the House was one of Free-trade v. Protection. He did not take it to be a question of Free-trade and Protection. On the contrary, the question he was speaking to, if it was anything, was a resolution for the readjustment of the tariff, for the purpose of endeavouring to avoid direct taxation, which might be the result if the course pursued by the late Administration was still followed. He would not bring into this debate, and repeat what had been the subject matter of the canvass in the different constituencies in the late contest. It must, he thought, be acknowledged by all that something had to be done to meet the financial difficulties into which the Dominion had been brought by the course pursued by the late Administration. He felt he need not say that there were public services that were languishing and required public aid. This was particularly the case in the county he had the honour to represent, and while referring to these public services, such as breakwaters, etc., he felt that he ought not to omit bringing to the notice of the House a matter which he had some reluctance in doing, but considered it his duty briefly to state what had come under his notice in his canvass during the election in the county of Digby. It was rumoured that a letter had been received from the late leader of the Government, now the leader of the Opposition, saying that the late Government was sure to be returned to power, and that Digby county would be treated as it had been last Session, if they sent back a representative who would not support the then Government. He (Mr. Wade) would be sorry if it was the case—that the leader of the Opposition had written such a letter—he thought he would give him more credit. However, he did not speak of that as a blow to the Conservative cause in the county of Digby, he rather thought it was detrimental to the Government of the day, and helped along its downfall. As far

MR. WADE.

as Digby county was concerned, the electors of that county, on the 17th of September last, supported the policy of the party who now held the seals of office on the issue before them. In that election, he would ask what position, what platform did gentlemen opposite take? What had the hon. leader of the Opposition and his supporters given to the country? What platform had they laid down in the various counties throughout the Dominion? What had they attempted to do to bring about a better state of affairs? Absolutely nothing. He might here say that he had been some years in public life in the Province of Nova Scotia, and had taken part in many of the great questions that had agitated that Province, and was a representative when the question of Confederation passed, which permitted him to hold his seat in this House, and holding the position he did, and in taking the course he was pursuing on the resolutions now before the House, he was doing nothing but his duty and what was called for by the necessities of the hour, and he trusted that his conduct would be in unison with the views of his constituents. He believed that the present resolutions were necessary, considering the exigencies of the Dominion and the present state of the finances of the country, and he was of opinion that, unless the present Bill passed, and the question of the tariff was set at rest, the country would continue to be disturbed and unsettled. In thus agreeing to the main features of the Bill, he did not wish to be understood as agreeing to the imposing of duties upon all the articles contained in the general statement of the tariff, as explained by the hon. the Minister of Finance, but should hold himself free to support or oppose the different items as they came up for consideration, as he considered best in the interests of the country.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said that the imposition of additional burdens on the people of this country was, in his opinion, in the present state of the finances, an absolute necessity. He had heard hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side endeavour to create the impression that the Administration, by the present tariff, would impose additional taxation

on the poor unfortunate taxpayers of this country, and had thought that they were thus pronouncing the strongest possible condemnation of the management of the affairs of this country by the hon. gentlemen on the front Opposition benches. They would recollect that the ex-Finance Minister, last year, who had a better knowledge of the state of affairs of the country than others not in the secrets of the Government, admitted that, if they had, in this country any tax that corresponded to the English income tax, he would feel it his duty to recommend to the House the imposition of such a tax during last Session. Well, were they in a better position to-day than they were last year? They now knew by the Public Accounts that the deficit was increased by the operations of last year \$1,100,000, to be added to the previous deficits of \$3,360,000, and they had the statement of the Finance Minister that the deficit of the present year would have been upwards of \$2,000,000. Then it was clearly the duty of the Administration to impose such duties as would bring about an equilibrium between expenditure and receipts. The difference between the policy of the present and the late Government lay in the manner in which those additional burdens should be imposed. The views of the hon. gentlemen opposite which had been fully enunciated during the last and previous Sessions, were, if he understood them aright, that the imposition of duties should be on such articles as were not produced in this country, so that the burden of taxation would fall as equally as possible on the whole population. He believed that the discussion of Free-trade and Protection principles was beside the question at present, because, whatever might be said by hon. gentlemen opposite, these questions were discussed during the past three Sessions of the last Parliament; and not only discussed in this House, but crystalised in pamphlet form, and circulated throughout the country, so that the people might have an opportunity of pronouncing on the policy of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House respectively, which was done at the last election, the verdict of the people having been that the imposition of duties for the purpose of raising the

necessary revenue should be the system proposed by the hon. gentlemen now on the Ministerial side. What they had to consider now was whether the Ministers were carrying out the promises they made to the people while in Opposition—that they would so arrange the tariff as to give a fair measure of Protection to the native industries, and endeavour, to the best of their ability, to develop the undeveloped resources of this country. It seemed to him that they had endeavoured to fairly carry out their promises. He had heard a great deal said with regard to the position of the United States to-day, as the result of a Protective policy, the ex-Finance Minister having declared that it had not been to materially increase the prosperity of that country, but only to change the character of the employment of the people. That hon. gentleman laid it down as a proposition that the imposition of a high tariff in the United States had the effect of removing the agricultural population from pursuits they were all fitted to follow, and placing them in the cities; he (Mr. White) thought that the hon. gentleman was not borne out by the facts. In the United States the production of wheat, in 1860, reached 173,000,000 bushels, and in 1870, 287,000,000; oats, in 1860, 173,000,000 bushels; in 1870, 282,000,000. That last year was only some four years after the country had emerged from a struggle that had materially exhausted its resources and population. So it seemed that the argument of the member for Centre Huron, that the introduction of a Protective policy would have the effect, not of increasing the population and its consuming power, but of changing the character of the employment of the people, was not borne out by the statistics of the country nearest us, and with whose circumstances we were best acquainted. He (Mr. White) had heard a great deal said in this debate—while admitting that this new policy would benefit the manufacturing interests—with respect to its injurious effect on the lumber interests. Hon. gentlemen on the other side seemed to have developed a very violent affection for that particular trade, at a very late hour in the day. They did not consider its interests in 1874, when the ex-Finance Minister made the general advance of 2½ per cent.

on the 15 per cent. tariff—when they took tea out of the free list, and ultimately placed a tax of six cents per pound on it, extensively consumed as it was by the lumbermen. But, during this Session, hon. gentlemen opposite had endeavoured to create a feeling against the present Administration because, as they alleged, that particular industry, which was of great importance to this country, had not been protected. He was quite free to admit that the lumber trade was, and had been, of very great importance; but they could not get over the hard fact that the exports of the forest from this country were annually decreasing; that from \$28,000,000 worth in 1873, they had declined to \$20,000,000 last year. He agreed with the member for Glengarry, that though this industry was of vast importance to this country, giving employment to a great number of hands, he did not look upon it in the same position as other manufacturing industries.

Mr. ANGLIN: Is the decline in values or quantities?

Mr. WHITE said the decline was both in values and quantities; for instance, he found that the exports of lumber to the United States amounted, in 1873, to \$12,498,000, and last year to but \$4,481,000; the decline being made up, to some extent, by the reduction in values. He was speaking from a lumberman's standpoint in saying he was not one of those who believed it was in the interest of this country that the export of lumber should be increased, and he agreed with the hon. member for Glengarry that, in the manufacture of this article, they were, for every foot of lumber they exported, drawing upon their capital account, cutting away the national wealth of the country; and if they were doing that, without deriving a profit equal to the value of the capital they were annually removing, they were transacting their business at a loss. He believed, while willing to admit the importance of the lumber trade, that, before many years, they must look to other industries to take its place. When the tariff was first brought down, it did appear to him likely to impose additional burdens on the people; but, when he heard the leader of the Opposition declare that the duties on corn and breadstuffs

would not benefit the farmer, which it would do if it increased prices at all, and when he heard the ex-Finance Minister declare that the home competition between manufacturers would be of such a character as to bring down prices, so that the manufacturers would be ruined, it struck him (Mr. White) that he had been wrong in supposing that this tariff would increase the cost of producing that particular article, and that, if the arguments of those gentleman were true, the people would be rather benefited by the Protection allowed those particular industries than injured. The hon. member for Northumberland, N.B., (Mr. Snowball) had declared that the new duties would increase the cost of the manufacture of every thousand feet of lumber by 60c. He did not know how that hon. gentleman made that calculation, but, according to one that he (Mr. White) had made—even assuming that every article entering into the production of lumber would be increased in price—an opinion combatted by hon. gentlemen opposite—the increased cost would not exceed 15c. a thousand feet. He might be mistaken, but he had based it on his knowledge of the trade, which he thought was tolerably accurate. It had been declared by the people of this country that a policy like the present they believed to be in their interest, and he thought that Ministers would be recreant to their duty, and would follow the course of hon. gentlemen opposite, if they failed to carry out their pledges made in Opposition. The hon. gentlemen now in Opposition had predicted and contended, during and since the elections, that the Administration had no intention of carrying out the policy on which they went to the country, and it appeared to him that the fact that Ministers had had the courage to come to Parliament with a policy that fulfilled their promises and pledges, was the reason that the hon. gentlemen were so much grieved. Whatever was the cause of their chagrin, and of the long speeches they had made in this House in opposition to the tariff, he, for one, was disposed to think that the present Administration had endeavoured to carry out their pledges to the country; and, whilst there were one or two items in the tariff to which some exception might be taken, as, for instance, the compara-

Mr. WHITE.

tive difference between flour and wheat, which, he thought, gave an unfair advantage to the American miller, and, while he should have been much pleased if the Finance Minister had seen his way clear to remove the duty on tea, or, at all events, put it on the *ad valorem* system, he repeated the present tariff bore out the promises and pledges made by the members of the present Administration, and he believed it would prove generally acceptable to the people of this country.

MR. MUTTART said that, if there was one thing more than another which had struck him in listening to the speeches of hon. members on the Opposition, or as they said themselves, on "the sunny side of the House," it was the evident desire they had shown to make this a purely party question. To make political capital by arraying section against section, and Province against Province, by attempting to raise hostility in one portion of the country, and exciting the local prejudices of another portion, seemed to be the one grand object in view of the speakers on the Reform side of the House. The people of Ontario were told that, while they would have to pay a higher price for the oats which they bought, the price of oats would not be raised on the farmers of the Maritime Provinces who had oats to sell. Surely these hon. gentlemen must think the country people very gullible if they expect these two contradictory statements to be believed. The electors listened to these arguments over and over again, and to show what value they placed on these facing-both-ways declarations, they need only point to the verdict of the 17th September last. They were told the subject was not fairly put before the people, and another opportunity was asked to fight the battle over again at the polls. This game of bluff would not do. If there were a general election to-morrow he believed the present party in power would be returned to Parliament with a majority even larger than that now claimed on the floor of this House. The old cry of increased taxation had been again raised. But this cry of taxation and ruination raised by Reformers on all occasions to do service against

their political opponents had been raised once too often to have the desired effect. The people understood them; and, although the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) stated that the people were easily led astray on this trade question owing to their lack of knowledge of the subject of political economy—a nice compliment this to the free and independent electors of this Dominion—he believed that the people were too intelligent to give a verdict such as was given on the 17th of last September, without well weighing the many arguments in favour of, and objections to, the so-called National Policy. It would be conceded, he presumed, even by their political opponents that a revenue must be raised or the country ruined. Excise duty, as his friend from Vandreuil (Mr. Morgennis) would tell them, was in many cases unpopular, and as for direct taxation, it would be most unpopular of all, and would not be tolerated by the people. The present mode of imposing duties for revenue purposes, and at the same time guarding and protecting the various industries, was the proper mode, and the one which was acceptable to a large majority of the electors of this country. He admitted that, looked at from a purely sectional and selfish standpoint, every Province in the Dominion might feel itself oppressed by the duties on particular articles, but, when the system was completed—and in some of its details he did not pronounce it faultless,—the burden would be equal on all, and the various industries would be encouraged and the country become self-reliant and prosperous. Coming, as he did, from a Province whose chief sources of wealth were her fisheries and agriculture, he naturally felt more interest in these branches of industry than in any other. Now, he held that agriculture would be materially benefitted instead of injured, as some would have them believe, by the encouragement of manufactories, inasmuch as it would open up an extensive domestic market for the surplus produce of the soil. They were told that the farmers of the Lower Provinces were going to be ruined because a duty of 50c. a barrel had been levied upon flour coming from the United States. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) stated in this House the other evening—and his

speech had been recently reproduced in one of the city papers, for general information—that the Maritime Provinces grew no wheat. He was not acquainted with the part of the country which the hon. member represented, but he was strongly inclined to believe that wheat was grown in the Maritime Provinces. He knew that last year they in Prince Edward Island had a most excellent crop of wheat, and he believed the day was not far distant when they would not have to import flour even from Ontario, as they would be able to grow their own wheat as successfully as in any part of the Dominion. Ignoring the fact of our having interprovincial Free-trade altogether, speakers on the Opposition side of this House told the farmers of Ontario that a duty on American wheat and flour was not going to raise the price of wheat at all, and, in the same breath, they tried to make it appear that, to the people of the Lower Provinces, it would raise the price. How they proved this directly contradictory statement had not yet appeared. Why, the hon. the leader of the Opposition himself said in his speech the other day :

“It was a principle which no one could dispute, that, where there was a surplus of any article, it was impossible to raise the price by imposing a duty upon the same article coming in from a foreign country.”

And the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said :

“The duty on those articles, of which we had a surplus, for export, could have and would have no influence whatever on the prices.”

Surely this was authority enough to convince the most sceptical on this head. According to the trade returns for the financial year 1878, the number of barrels of flour imported from the United States into Prince Edward Island was 8,445. A portion of this was flour that came from Ontario, and was purchased in bond in American ports. The navigation between Boston and the Island being open sooner in the spring than between Montreal and the Island, the merchants imported an odd cargo, but there was no necessity for our going to the United States for a single pound of flour, while we had much more than we could consume within the Dominion. They were told that a duty on United

States coal was going to be a great hardship to the poor people. We had no need to go to the United States for our coal while we had such abundance of it in our own country. The coal mines of Nova Scotia were almost entirely abandoned at present—hundreds of people were out of employment in consequence. If 50c. a ton on American coal would give us our own market, and enable us to compete with the Americans, let us have it; and if 50c. was found, after a trial, to be insufficient, let us have 75c. by all means. He believed that, while a duty upon American coal would lead to our own mines being worked, it would not raise the price of coal to the consumer. On the contrary, partly owing to the increased output which would result, and partly to the keen competition which would spring up between the coal mining companies of the Dominion and the United States, the effect on the coal trade would certainly lead to a reduction of the price of coal to the people of this country. They were told that salt would be taxed, and that the fishermen of the Dominion would be ruined. What were the facts? Under the new tariff, all salt coming into the Dominion for the use of the deep sea or inshore fisheries, came in free. He was sure many of their opponents were sorry that salt for the fisheries was not taxed a dollar a bag. Of course, it would ruin the fishermen, but then it would advance their party interests to some extent. It would have helped their party wonderfully. But they had been cheated out of this little game, and they were to have salt for the fisheries free. On the article of molasses—an article largely used by workmen and their families—there would be a saving of some thousands of dollars to the taxpayers, as a reduction of duty of 10 per cent. must necessarily give the consumer a cheaper article. The effect of the new tariff would be to give tea to the consumers from one to two cents a pound cheaper than under the old unfair tariff. The number of pounds imported last year into Prince Edward Island, direct from Great Britain and the United States, was 348,399lb. This would give, under the new duty, a saving of \$3,483. In addition to this, large quantities of tea were imported from Halifax and Mon-

MR. MUTTART.

treasurers by their merchants. This tea was sometimes bought in bond, but principally the duty was paid in these ports. The duty being added to the cost of the tea, the Prince Edward Island merchant really paid the duty, although it might be collected in these ports, so that the whole amount of duty saved to the people of Prince Edward Island, on this article alone, would be \$4,000 or \$5,000. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) had stated the other evening, in this House, that he stood here as the representative of the majority of the people of the Maritime Provinces, and that the present tariff was particularly obnoxious to the people of that part of the Dominion. He (Mr. Muttart) denied that the hon. member represented the Maritime Provinces on the trade or any other question, except in the sense in which the three Tooley-street worthies represented the city of London. He might represent a certain class of politicians, who were ever anxious, while in Opposition, to do something for the good of the country, but who, when a chance was given them, forgot their promises, laid on the taxes, and then stood with folded arms, declaring that they could do nothing more—that the people must do the rest themselves. Was it not a fact that, at a time of unusual prosperity, when, instead of a deficit, this country had a large surplus revenue, the late Administration increased the people's taxes by \$3,000,000. Now, when—thanks to the great Reform party—a deficit of about \$2,500,000 was to be met, and the credit of the Dominion was at stake, because the present Government had had the courage to face the difficulty, because they were now trying to carry out, while in power, a policy which they advocated while in Opposition—a policy which was discussed on every political platform throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion—they were met by a hue and cry from the Opposition benches that the country was going to be ruined by the policy which the present Government were adopting, and that, if the dear people, whom they professed to love so much, would only give them another chance “to raise the standard,” prosperity would at once set in, and the desert and waste places would be made to blossom as the rose.

Encouragement to home manufactures and industries had been the policy of the United States almost from its earliest history to the present date, and, instead of such a policy producing ruin, it had made the United States what it was—one of the foremost and most prosperous countries on the face of the earth. Imposing a duty on articles which we could manufacture ourselves, did not necessarily raise the price. On the contrary, in nine cases out of ten it tended to lower the price to the consumer. Take the case of the United States as an example. On all manufactures of wool, of which wool was the component part of chief value, there was a duty of 45c. per pound and 31 per cent.; wheat, 20c. per bushel; leather, upper of all kinds, 20 per cent.; house furniture, 35 per cent.; hair dyes, 50 per cent.; hemp, used extensively in outfits for fishing-boats, \$25 per ton; glue, 20 per cent.; canvas for sails, 30 per cent.; carriages, 35 per cent.; brooms, 35 per cent. He had selected these articles out of the many more which could be cited, and to-day in the United States they could purchase these articles at as low a rate as they could be purchased for in Canada, proving conclusively that an import duty on articles which we produced ourselves did not necessarily increase the price to the consumers. If, by the adoption of the policy submitted to this House by the present Minister of Finance, we could succeed in bringing our American neighbours to terms, it would be a great boon, especially to the people of Prince Edward Island. But, if the people of the United States were determined not to give us reciprocal Free-trade, but to continue to levy prohibitory duties on our products, while they expected to have free access to our markets, we must only stand on our rights, and endeavour to protect our farmers and fishermen as best we could. No part of the Dominion would be benefited so much by reciprocal Free-trade, in proportion to its population, as Prince Edward Island, and he was glad to find the present Government ready and willing to meet our neighbours across the border half-way—ready to reciprocate to the fullest extent, by taking off cent for cent with the Americans. If there was any other mode which was more likely to

lead to reciprocity, let the present Opposition announce it, and he, for one, would be only too glad to sink all party leanings and follow them. But, until they announced their policy, and convinced him that the present Government was wrong, and that they were able to bring about Free-trade with the United States, he would support the present Government in their endeavours to readjust the tariff so as to lead to the fostering of our own industries, and eventually to a reciprocity of trade between this country and the United States.

MR. McDONALD (Victoria, N.S.) said a question of graver and greater importance had not been discussed within the walls of this Chamber since the passing of the British North America Act than that which was engaging the attention of the representatives of the people of this country at the present moment, resolutions calculated to bring about a complete revolution in our commercial and financial relationship with foreign countries, and which the Government and their friends assured them would lead to that prosperity enjoyed by the country when the leader of the present dominant party in this Parliament placed the management of public affairs in the hands of the gentlemen now occupying the front seats on the Speaker's left. On that occasion, the country was in a prosperous and flourishing condition; our bankers, manufacturers, merchants, mechanics, farmers and labourers, were on the highway to prosperity; but now all this was changed. Instead of happiness we were surrounded by misery, and instead of prosperity we were hemmed in on every side with distress. At no period of our history had the suffering been greater, the anguish more keen, the distress more oppressive, than at the present, until a wail loud and long issued from every corner of the land, including the rich and the poor, the halt, the lame, and the blind, for immediate relief to our commercial depression and financial disaster. At no period of the history of British North America did the welfare of its people require more than at present that the wisest and most experienced statesman, with the keenest and brightest intellect that the country could produce, should have

MR. MUTTART.

control of our public affairs; and no Government ever required the aid, sympathy, and co-operation of a wise, intelligent, and thoughtful Parliament than our present rulers in the very difficult task they had undertaken in turning chaos to order, and restoring our former prosperity. In a crisis of this kind, would it not be well that both sides of the House should, at least for a time, forget their party feeling and animosity, and combine in maturing a policy that would be equal to the occasion, and command the confidence and respect of Parliament and the country? But evidently the millennium must arrive before such an order of things could be expected to exist in Dominion politics. To inexperienced politicians, like himself, it appeared somewhat remarkable that, while the Government and their friends were so sanguine that the change which they had recommended in the fiscal policy of the country was the only channel through which they could expect to escape the inevitable ruin which had been staring the country in the face for some time, their opponents were equally sanguine that the application of those changes would lead to still greater disaster and ruin, if that were possible; that the inevitable result would be that farmers, mechanics, and labourers, would starve; that our bankers, manufacturers and merchants would be ruined; that our magnificent lakes and rivers, including, of course, the Falls of Niagara, would become perpetual fields of ice and snow; that our highly cultivated fields and meadows would again turn into a wilderness; that the intelligent inhabitants of our fair land, including Government and Opposition, Tories, Liberals, Conservatives, Reformers and Grits, would become utterly and for ever extinct, and that our extensive Dominion would become a vast feeding ground for the red man, the moose, the bear, the wolf and the owl. He trusted, in order that their utterances might carry more weight in the country, that the Opposition would deem it their duty to enlighten the House on the policy they would pursue, if again successful in obtaining the confidence of the people of this country, as an improvement on the scheme submitted by the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury

benches, to bring about the new order of things so ardently desired by every person having the welfare of the country at heart. He trusted they would not disappoint the sanguine expectations of their friends by bringing down amendments to the resolutions of the hon. the Minister of Finance merely condemning the policy of their opponents, without submitting a more perfect scheme to take its place. He would not for a moment suppose that they did not feel the keen necessity of introducing some change into our political system, by which the serious depression now existing might be removed; that they would again insist on governing the country under the system so decidedly and recently condemned by the electors of the Dominion. Let them, therefore, have their new departure, and, if found superior to that of the present Government, he had no doubt that it would be readily adopted by this House. He would not suppose that they made ducks and drakes of our trade and commerce through their inability to manage the ship of State properly. Had they not their repeated assurances that the affairs of this country had been most faithfully, righteously and economically administered; that they had effected a saving of thousands, if not millions, in the various Departments of the Public Service, while under their control; had it not been proclaimed from Cape North to Vancouver, that they, of all men, were pre-eminently qualified to govern a rising nation in its infancy; that they could borrow money in the London market on much better terms than their predecessors and their successors, and, to crown all, that they could roll up deficits of millions of dollars annually, without thought or consideration? They could not, therefore, come to the conclusion that the loose screws were all in the management of our affairs, and was it not possible that much of our misfortune was owing to the one-sided Free-trade policy, so persistently adhered to by our late rulers? He could not come to the conclusion that the scapegrace, general depression, was responsible for all our suffering, but quite the reverse. He maintained that no country under the sun should suffer less from a general depression than the

Dominion of Canada, and, instead of participating in the universal disaster, we should have been enriching our country in population and capital; and, if we had taken advantage of our opportunities, we would be now enjoying the prosperity formerly enjoyed by the neighbouring Republic, when they were filling up their waste lands and developing their resources with the surplus population and capital of Europe. He thought it would be admitted by a majority, and a very large majority, in this House and the country that, in order to regain a portion at least, if not the whole, of our lost prosperity, it was absolutely necessary that we should pay more attention to legislation that would equalise our taxation, and develop our extensive resources; legislation that would suit our own interests, and give less consideration to the interests of our neighbours; legislation that would encourage the colonisation of our rolling prairies and fertile meadows, that would utilise our immense forests, as well as our shore, lake, and sea fisheries; that we must propound and pursue a policy that would commend itself to the home and foreign capitalist, and establish that confidence in our ability to govern wisely and judiciously, which was so essential to induce them to invest largely in the enterprises of our country; a policy and legislation that would enable and compel us to feel like the members of a united and rising young nation, and not like the members of a disunited confederation, cut up into subdivisions and sections, with each part anxious to improve its condition at the expense of its neighbour; a policy and legislation that would give a stimulus to our industries, and increase the volume and importance of our interprovincial trade, by which the coal and marble proprietors of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton would feel a common interest in the welfare and prosperity of the manufacturer and wheat grower of Ontario and the North-West, and enable the manufacturer and farmer to feel equally interested in the welfare and prosperity of the coal and marble industries and kindred enterprises in the various sections of the Dominion. An All-wise Creator had certainly bestowed many talents and treasures upon us, but we, like the unfaithful and unprofitable

servant had, so far, neglected their development, improvement, and increase, and had left them hid in the earth, where, in all probability, their Giver would find them at His coming as he left them, if our present rulers were to continue in the footsteps of their predecessors. It was utterly impossible and unreasonable to expect that we, as a people, could attain that power, importance, and wealth which we should possess, taking our resources and advantages in consideration, if we neglected, ignored and refused to be guided by the commercial and financial principles which experience had proved to be so essential to the growth and maturity of nations. We could no more expect such a result than the farmer who used the implements of the last century could expect to compete successfully with his neighbour, who used the improved implements of our present time. It must be borne in mind that we had invested largely in real estate as well as street rails, and on no account must we allow the former transaction to be equally ruinous to the country as the latter. Our broad and fertile acres extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and only awaited the tool of the husbandman to make them the comfortable and happy habitations of millions of the human race. Our forests were unlimited and should give employment and sustenance to an unlimited number for an indefinite period. Our mineral resources were undeveloped and unknown, and afforded ready and remunerative investment for millions of capital, which would circulate money freely into every corner of the Dominion, to the advantage of our entire population. Our lakes and rivers were extensive and formed an outlet to well-protected harbours on our seacoast for the products of the interior. We certainly possessed the natural resources and advantages, and only required the application of proper legislation to enable us to offer superior inducements to the surplus population of over-crowded Europe to come to our shores and assist us in building up a prosperous, powerful and happy nation. But, in order to arrive at this position, we must have statesmen in charge of our affairs who understood our requirements, and wants, statesmen who would make diligent and earnest

Mr. McDONALD.

enquiry, and, having ascertained the cause and extent of our depression and distress, and having the proper medicine at hand, would mix and administer such remedies as were suited to our malady. We must not lie down like whipped spaniels, and give our neighbours all their own way because they counted forty and we four millions. They all remembered their admiration of the plucky youngster of their school days, who would not submit to the insults of the overgrown bully; and was it not possible, if we exercised the determination we should exercise as British subjects to maintain our rights, that our American cousins would admire us all the more, and, in a very short time, meet us half way with a tariff that would be a blessing to both nations. But we need not expect an improvement in our condition while we continued, as it were, to allow foreigners to cultivate our fields and carry away the profits, while theirs were protected by a well-built picket fence, with every gate and wicket doubly barred and bolted. How could we expect a reciprocity treaty with the United States while we continued to legislate in their interest, and gave them every privilege they required without an equivalent? He did not say that our late rulers were actually in the pay of foreign Governments, and received their quarterly cheques from them as regularly as they did from the Treasury under their own immediate control, but he did say, if such had been the case, they could not have legislated more faithfully in the interest of foreigners than they did. While admitting that it was a matter of very great gratification to this House and the country that our tariff, which had hitherto been considered by its framers as stereotyped, unimprovable, and unchangeable, and like the laws of the Medes and Persians of old, admitting of no alteration or change, but a piece of legislation perfect in every particular, to be admired and imitated by the Governments of all civilised countries, had been pronounced by their successors as defective in many instances, and entirely unsuited to our times and circumstances, and susceptible of very great improvement and readjustment so as to do equal justice to our various industries, by which the depres-

sion now existing would be removed, so far as it was possible for legislation to do so. He regretted that the Government had not, in his opinion, given the interests of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton the same degree of justice in the arrangement of the tariff as they had given to the industries of the Provinces of the interior, and very notably in this direction was the low duty on coal and the high rate on corn meal, which was so largely used by the poorer classes in Cape Breton, whose interest and welfare should engage the serious attention of the Dominion Government at all times. Not only had the coal interest of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, with its millions invested, been entirely neglected and ignored, but it had been fairly hampered by previous legislation, while from the soap and oil man of Ontario to the manufacturers of the most expensive machinery all received some consideration and protection, while he maintained that coal was entitled to as much protection and consideration as any other article manufactured in our Dominion. The Local Government of Nova Scotia, in order to keep its political soul and body together, had been obliged to collect a royalty of ten cents on every ton of coal raised, and, in addition to this, everything by the coal proprietor in placing his goods in the markets of the world had been heavily taxed by the Dominion Government. It certainly required as much energy, capital and skill to operate a coal mine as it did to sink and work an oil well, start a soap or candy shop, turn out a piece of cotton, a keg of nails, a sewing machine, a mowing machine, or wheel rake, and why should not every man's capital receive the same justice at the hands of the Government? Was it not as legitimate to collect a revenue from the coal we burnt as from the oil we burnt, the tea which was so essential to the comfort and cheerfulness of the rich and the poor, the soap which was so necessary to our cleanliness, or any other articles required for our daily comfort and use? But this was not the only grievance they had down east, and he regretted that he had not the ability of some gentlemen of this House, to enable him to plead the cause of his suffering Province with more effect; but he could

not refrain from raising his voice in behalf of the interests of his constituents. The withholding of the legislation to which the mining interest of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton was entitled was not the only injustice done them, grave as it was; but, in addition to this, the withholding of the additional subsidy of \$82,000 was unmitigated hardship, and the very fact that they were allowed this amount was proof positive that they were unfairly dealt with at the outset, and, instead of receiving this sum for a number of years, they should have received a much larger amount in perpetuity. Certainly, if they were entitled to this sum for ten years, and as it was absolutely necessary that they should receive it in order to provide for their Local requirements, it was equally necessary that they should hold it for twenty; and if for twenty, why not for forty, and if for forty, why not for a much longer period? What was the position of their Local affairs at the present moment? Their Province was irredeemably in debt; their educational grant was largely reduced; their roads and bridges were scarcely passable, while they could not begin to think of improvements that were necessary for the comfort and welfare of their people, and enjoyed by other sections of the Dominion. They might be asked, why not retrench and reduce the expenditure of the Local Government and Legislature, and apply the money thus saved to the improvement of their education and the perfecting of their roads and bridges? But the fact was that the pruning knife had been busily engaged in this direction for some time, and, unless they used it as an instrument to commit political suicide with, they must sheath it for the future. Their Local Government was now reduced to a tandem team, and they must very soon, he presumed, do their own cooking and washing, while their representatives would be obliged to pay their own way while attending to the affairs of the country. During recess they might start a circus and menagerie, in which their late rulers would figure prominently as destructive animals, but, even with this curiosity, he feared they would fail to collect the necessary revenue for their requirements. There-

fore he trusted the present Government would give the interest of Nova Scotia a little more consideration than their predecessors had done, and place it beyond the possibility of any person to say truthfully that they were to continue in the future what they had been in the past—the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the more powerful and influential Provinces of the Confederation.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. TASSÉ: Mr. Speaker, it is with some diffidence that I rise to speak on the momentous question now before us—especially in a language which is not my own. New and young members are supposed to have much to learn, and it would be wiser, perhaps, on my part to observe that golden silence which the hon. the leader of the Opposition has prescribed to us—the men of the young generation—the occupants of the back benches—the hon. member for Shefford having given us also a lecture in the same direction: lessons of wisdom which have been, no doubt, fully appreciated. Nevertheless, the interests involved in this question are so many and so important; they are so closely wedded to our prosperity and to our future greatness; the policy propounded by the Government is such a new departure, such an economic revolution—implying, as it does, our commercial autonomy; and the political metropolis which I have the honor to represent, has so distinctly expressed its opinion on the matter, that I feel bound, however unequal to the task devolving upon me, to submit candidly my views on the policy which is the best suited to the progress of our Canadian Dominion. At the outset, I must congratulate the Government, I must congratulate the Finance Minister, for having submitted a tariff which, I am confident, will commend itself to the approval of a great majority of the members of this House, of a great majority of the people of this country. This tariff is a complete vindication of the principles professed by the Conservative party. It is not a half measure, “neither fish nor flesh”; it is a thorough

protective, a thorough Canadian, a thorough national tariff. Whilst on the Opposition benches, our party committed themselves to a measure which—according to the motion of the then hon. leader of the left, since happily transferred to your right, Mr. Speaker—would protect the agricultural, the mineral, and the manufacturing interests of this country. And the most inveterate opponent of the Government cannot dispute the fact that our pledges, that our promises have been fully redeemed—even the late Finance Minister having admitted, to use his own words, that we have gone “great lengths in particular directions.” So whatever may be the consequences of this policy—may they be beneficial, may they enhance the general prosperity, or may they disappoint our legitimate anticipations—no one is warranted to impugn the sincerity of our present rulers, no one can justly assert that the confidence of the country has been betrayed or snatched under false pretences. In the course of the elaborate debate now still going on, much has been said on Free-trade and Protection. Notwithstanding what may allege our Free-trade theorists, political economy, on which they base their arguments, is not a science in the true sense of the word. It has no exact, no absolute, no invariable principles. Their application depends on so many conditions, on so many circumstances,—geographical, political or commercial—that they cannot be strictly adhered to. The idea of full liberty, the idea of an unfettered commerce might tempt me to be a Free-trader if everyone was a Free-trader; but as long as Free-trade is but a myth—as long as nations are opposed to direct taxation, and find proper to collect the revenue necessary to meet their expenditure through import duties on foreign products—I will believe that the true policy of every country is take care of its own interests, according to the circumstances under which it is placed, and to adopt a fiscal system that, while giving a sufficient revenue, will foster the production and the development of the interests most congenial to the resources of its soil and to the genius of its inhabitants. Free-trade theories, Sir, may be very good in themselves, but so far they have not gone beyond the sphere of mere

MR. McDONALD.

theories. A young nation, whose arts are in their infancy, cannot compete, for instance, on equal terms with an old country, whose skilled labour, whose commerce and whose industry have reached their highest pitch. As far as Canada is concerned, it is my humble opinion that its fiscal policy must depend to a great extent from that of its immediate neighbour, the United States. England has practised Free-trade more perhaps than any other nation, but it cannot be strictly said she is a free country, collecting as she does an immense revenue from Custom duties—which in 1877 alone reached the sum of £95,110,000. And we must not forget that when England obeyed the voice of Richard Cobden, the great apostle of Free-trade—that when she assented to the policy of Sir Robert Peel—her commerce was so large, so expanded, her industry so powerful—promoted, as they had been, by a system of almost prohibition, by a system of a most tyrannic character—that she was in a position to control the markets of the world, and to defy foreign competition. But even for England times have changed. Many years, probably, will not elapse before the Free-trade bulwark surrenders, for she commences to realize the fact that ere long she might be compelled to prevent her own market from being flooded by the products of other countries, such as France, the United States and Belgium—all protected countries. Our Reform friends are fond of extolling the prosperity of England, but we are fully aware that if the Mother Country possesses an immense capital, that if her funds are invested in almost every land, that if she rules the seas—an object of pride to every son of Britannia—few countries have to-day as many unemployed hands, few countries suffer as much from depression as England herself. Whilst these hon. gentlemen exalt the prosperity of the Mother Country, they forget systematically to mention what Protection has done for some of the most important and richest peoples under the sun. They do not state, for instance, that France under a healthy system of Protection, enjoys probably the largest sum of prosperity, and that nowhere is wealth so generally distributed. Not many years ago, Sir, she seemed to be prostrate after one of the most disastrous

wars that ever afflicted a nation. But a great man was then at the helm of affairs, M. Thiers. He set himself nobly at work, fully determined to stir up the despondent spirits of the people, to repair the ravages of the war, and to restore France, if possible, to her former proud position. Did he adopt Free-trade principles to save France, to restore her affairs? Not at all. Although the hon. leader of the left contends that “no man in his senses” can favour Protection—a very graceful compliment to the intelligence of this House, to the intelligence of the great majority of the electors—M. Thiers resorted to one of the most protective systems that ever were inaugurated—a system which, although called an “unmixed evil,” has given to France an immense revenue, has enabled her to pay her exorbitant war ransom, has revived her agriculture, her commerce, her industry, to such an extent that she has fully recovered her former prosperity. Like the hon. leader of the left, M. Thiers claimed to practise the policy of common sense—*la politique du bon sens*; but the difference between the two administrators is, that after a liberal reign of only five years a once prosperous people became a poor people, whilst M. Thiers made a prosperous country from what was an almost ruined country. In adopting that policy, M. Thiers was only following the example of Colbert—the great minister of a great king, Louis XIV—the real founder of many industries of that nation, and who has done so much for Canada when it was New France. In adopting that policy, M. Thiers was only following the example of another great man—who was not only a great conqueror, a great sovereign, a great legislator, but also one of the greatest administrators that ever presided over the destinies of any country.

“One of the few, the immortal names,
That was not born to die.”

Napoleon may not have been “in his senses,” according to the hon. leader of the left, but the important industries—such as the cotton and the beet root sugar industries—created in France, under his fostering care, will be everlasting monuments of his genius. In a most interesting chapter of his memoirs of St. Helena, this

great man relates some of the deeds of his wonderful career, mentions the astounding results produced during his reign, not only by Protection but also by prohibitions—ridiculing, at the same time, those “modern systematisers”—fairly represented on the other side of the House, who “imagine that the whole wisdom of nations is centred in themselves.” The whole chapter is worth while perusing, being a most valuable page of political economy; but not to trespass too much on the time of the House, I will read only a short extract:

“I opposed the principles of Economists which may look well enough in theory, though erroneous in their application. The political constitution of different States must render these principles defective; local circumstances continually call for deviations from their uniformity. Duties which are so severely condemned by political economists, should not, it is true, be an object to the Treasury; they should be the guarantee and the protection of a nation, and should correspond with the nature and the objects of its trade. During my reign I have considered:—First, agriculture as the soul, the first basis of the empire. Secondly, industry, the comfort and the happiness of the population. Thirdly, foreign trade, the superabundance and the proper application of the surplus of agriculture and industry. Time will unfold what I have done and the national resources which I have created. Amongst other industries, I naturalised in France the manufacture of cotton, which includes: First, spun cotton; secondly, the web; thirdly, the printing. The printing was the only part of the manufacture that we performed ourselves. I wished to naturalise the two first branches; and I proposed to the Council of State that their importation should be prohibited. This excited great alarm. I sent for Oberkamp, and I learned from him that this prohibition would, doubtless, provoke a shock, but that, after a year or two of perseverance, it would prove a triumph. Then I issued my decree in spite of all; this was a true piece of statesmanship. Now, we possess the three branches of the cotton manufacture, to the great benefit of our population, which proves that in civil government, as well as in war, decision of character is often indispensable to success.”

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen opposite, forgetting the example of that great man, forgetting the example of other great men in almost every country, forgetting the almost uniform experience of every people—and experience is much more valuable than all the speculations of brilliant theorists—contend that Protection cannot improve the condition of a country; that commerce

must be left to its chances and mishaps; that industries must take care of themselves, if they can, and die if they cannot, and that no wealth can result from a proper system of legislation,—although a single stroke of the pen of Napoleon created most important industries. Protection has produced such marvelous results in France that Germany has been compelled, reluctantly, to adopt the policy of her old rival. Prince Bismarck may not have been “in his senses,” according to the hon. leader of the left—I wish he had not been in his senses a few years ago, he would not have done so much harm to the country of my ancestors—but we all know that, after having given Free-trade a fair trial, he has been forced to admit that it had ruined his country, and that Protection alone could ameliorate the condition of trade and manufactures. “As some of my colleagues,” said Prince Bismarck, “with whom I have hitherto worked on my former platform, will not range themselves by my side on my new platform, I must rid myself of them, and get others who will carry on my resolves.” Our country had also Ministers who refused obstinately to adopt the same system, who refused to give, at least, a fair trial to Protection; and the people seized the very first chance, not in the autocratic way of Prince Bismarck, but in the true constitutional way, to replace them by true and experienced statesmen who understand better their wants and their interests. It cannot be well denied that Protection has been the main spring of the prosperity of the United States;—the main cause of their prodigious industrial development, unexampled in the history of nations. It cannot be denied that Protection has built their great centres of commerce and manufactures, and that Protection has enabled them not only to supply their own market, but to over-match England on her own ground, in many branches of trade. Some of the advocates of the Reform party have given us the assurance that, ere long, Free trade will be established in the United States, but no greater delusion could be indulged in. I may err, but I contend that the experience of the last years must have convinced us that no party is prepared to take the responsibility of inaugurating

Free trade on the other side of the line. I may err, but I contend that Protection has taken as deep a root in the American public mind as the gigantic trees covering the Californian soil, and that it will resist any popular wave that might agitate the great Republic. In 1818, in 1832, in 1846, and even later, the United States have tried Free trade, or rather low tariffs, but, after a few years of disastrous experiment, they have been obliged to resort to Protection—which has been, at all times, their anchor of refuge. Since 1865, we have been longing after the renewal of commercial relations with our neighbours, but what have we obtained? We have sent delegates to Washington for that purpose,—Mr. Brown being the last,—and what has been the result of their mission? Whilst we opened our market freely to most of their commodities, they built a Chinese wall around them, imposing duties almost prohibitive on our products. As it had been said the other night by the hon. member for Rouville, no man has done more than Henry Clay to establish a sound Protective system in the neighbouring country, and his name is associated with the tariff of 1824, which saved her from a most ruinous commercial crisis. Clay may not have been “in his senses,” according to the hon. leader of the left, but he is believed, by a grateful people, to have been one of the greatest patriots, one of the greatest statesmen that America ever produced. The circumstances under which he proposed his tariff are, unfortunately, so similar to those in which Canada is now placed, that his gloomy picture of the depression then existing might make one imagine he was depicting the present condition of Canada. Henry Clay said:—

“In casting our eyes around us, the most prominent circumstances which fixes our attention, and challenges our deepest regret, is the general distress which pervades the whole country. It is forced upon us by numerous facts of the most incontestable character. It is indicated by the diminished exports of native produce; by the depressed and reduced state of our foreign navigation; by our diminished commerce; by the numerous bankruptcies, not limited to the trading classes, but extending to all orders of society; by a universal complaint of the want of employment, and a consequent reduction of the wages of labour; by the ravenous pursuit after pub-

lic situations, not for the sake of their honors and the performance of their public duties, but as a means of private subsistence; by the reluctant resort to the perilous use of paper money; by the intervention or legislation in the delicate relation between debtor and creditor; and, above all, by the low and depressed state of the value of almost every description of the whole mass of the property of the nation, which has, on an average, sunk not less than 50 per cent. within a few years. The distress pervades every part of the Union—every class of society. All feel it, although it may be felt, at different places, in different degrees. It is like the atmosphere which surrounds—all must inhale it, and none can escape it.”

Such, Sir, was the picture drawn at the time of a situation so similar to our present situation, that it would appear the very picture of it, were it given without mentioning the date. What was the main cause assigned to that universal distress? The fact that wars were no longer raging on the other side of the ocean, and that instead of receiving the American products to supply their wants, the European nations were themselves pouring their staples of trade on the American market, crushing the home competition, crushing the home manufactures, unable to resist the rivalry of foreign industry. Are we not precisely in the same circumstances towards the United States, now that they are fully recovered from the effects of their last war? What was the remedy proposed by Henry Clay, to the evils existing? Protection to native industry; creation of an American system—the equivalent of our National Policy. Mr. Clay continued:—

“Having called attention to the present adverse state of our country, and endeavoured to point out the causes which have led to it, the Committee will agree with me in thinking that it is the solemn duty of Government to apply a remedy to the evils which affect our country, if it can apply one. Is there no remedy within the reach of Government? Are we doomed to behold our industry languish and decay, yet more and more? But there is a remedy, and that remedy consists in modifying our foreign policy, and in adopting a genuine American system. We must naturalise the arts in our country and we must naturalise them by the only means which the wisdom of nations has yet discovered to be effectual: by adequate protection against the otherwise overwhelming influence of foreigners. This is only to be accomplished by the establishment of a tariff, whose sole object is to tax the produce of foreign industry with the view of promoting American industry.”

Well, Sir, what were the results of that Protective American policy? The country became so prosperous during the next seven years, the arts so flourishing, the people were so fully and profitably employed, the debt of two wars so entirely redeemed, the public treasury so overflowing, that Congress was embarrassed afterwards, not to find subjects of taxation, but to select the objects which should be liberated from the impost. Clay himself proposed, in 1832, the reduction of certain taxes which were no more necessary, and he could then say, with a just feeling of pride:

"If that term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the establishment of our present constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824. The transformation of the condition of the country from gloom and distress to brightness and prosperity, has been mainly the work of American legislation, fostering American industry, instead of allowing it to be controlled by foreign legislation, cherishing foreign industry. The foes of the American system, in 1824, with great boldness and confidence, predicted first the ruin of the public revenue, and the creation of necessity to resort to direct taxation; secondly, the destruction of our navigation; thirdly, the desolation of our commercial cities, and fourthly, the augmentation of the price of objects of consumption, and further decline in that of the articles of our exports. Every prediction which they had made has failed, utterly failed."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that our national policy will produce the same good results throughout the Dominion; I venture to say that it will change the condition of the country "from gloom and distress to brightness and prosperity;" I venture to say that it will foster Canadian industry instead of allowing it to be controlled by foreign legislation, by foreign industry; and I venture to say further, that the predictions of ruin which have been so freely uttered, as they were in the United States in 1824, in connection with this Protective tariff, will also fail, utterly fail. But, Sir, even in this country, Protection is not an unknown thing. In fact, it has been the rule rather than the exception, having been maintained till the abolition of the corn laws by England in 1849. At a time of a great commercial depression, a Conservative Government established, in 1859, a

Protective tariff of 20 per cent. and even 25 per cent. in certain branches of industry. The Conservative rulers of that time—of whom one of them is our present Prime Minister—did not proclaim that they could do nothing to alleviate the commercial suffering, that the causes of the distress were beyond their control, and that nature must supply the remedy. They held, on the contrary, that they could do much to improve the condition of the country; that it was their duty to help the people over whom they were ruling by such legislative means as were at their disposal; and they made the first and successful step in the way of a Canadian National Policy. Mr. Speaker, every true citizen of this country must have suffered, for the last four years, beyond measure, in witnessing the policy of inaction of the late Cabinet. As it has been well said by Sir Alexander Galt—the author of the tariff of 1859—in a letter on the fiscal policy of the late Cabinet:

"By their inaction they must be held to the position that when a commercial dullness exists in the country, they can, as a Government, do nothing whatever to relieve it. I affirm that the tariff is eminently artificial, and therefore open at all times to beneficial changes, and that, in a period of severe distress, the duty of the Government is to try the effect of changes. It has a most gloomy and depressing influence on the minds of the country for the Parliament to assume the attitude of admitted incapacity to afford relief."

From a party point of view, Conservatives might have rejoiced at their admitted incapacity to afford relief; but from a patriotic standpoint,—and I believe there is such a thing as patriotism, such a thing as a national spirit, our duty towards our country being paramount, in my estimation, to our duty towards our party,—every Canadian must regret that effectual measures have not been adopted sooner, if not to create prosperity, at least to relieve the unexampled suffering pervading the whole land. One of the reasons for which the Reform party denounce the tariff is because they want a cheap country to live in, and that such a country, according to them, cannot exist with Protection. Our Dominion, Sir, has been a cheap country—a very cheap country—during the last four years, as far as the price of commodities is concerned; but the many thousand

people who have suffered from want of food, and who have been clamouring, not for *panem et circenses*, as the Romans of old, but for bread and labour, have found it a very hard, a very dear country. Notwithstanding all the theories of our Canadian *doctrinaires*, common sense tells us that the price of an article is not high or low according to the quotations on paper, but according to the ability to purchase it. A loaf of bread may be dear at 3c., and a yard of cotton at 2c., whilst they may be cheap at six times that price. Tantalus was surrounded with the most tempting articles, but he could not reach them—a vexing situation which has been our own under the most eminently Liberal policy of a so-called Liberal Government. Let us have, rather, a dear country; let us have high prices rather than low prices, if the people are then in a position to secure their necessary wants. But how can the price of goods be increased when the late Finance Minister, after having loudly contended that every article would become dearer, warns, at the same time, the manufacturers that this tariff is hostile to their best interests, on the ground that “it must assuredly create here, as it did in the United States, a most intense home competition, in place of a very moderate foreign competition?” Who can reconcile such a contradictory statement? Who can justify such an utter violation of the primary laws of logic? Is it not a striking proof of the unsoundness of the arguments adduced against this tariff? Our friends opposite have laid great stress on the fact that this tariff is hostile to British interests, that it is principally directed against British manufacturers. I may say, firstly, that I am rather amazed—and gentlemen opposite are probably more amazed to find themselves in such a position—to see them so anxious to defend the interests of the Mother Country. A party who could entrust the military portfolio, the command of our loyal forces, to a man who was charged with asserting he would “cheer when the British flag would be torn down from the citadel of Halifax,” has given good ground to make us suspect the sincerity of his war cry. A party of whom one of the leaders in this House—the hon. member for Shetford—is a pronounced advocate of Independence—and Independence, in the esti-

mation of a good judge, Lord Beaconsfield, is “veiled annexation”—cannot be very well so jealous of British interests. The hon. leader of the left may be as loyal to the British Crown as any man in this House, as any man in this country, but I cannot admit that all his followers profess the same warm feelings towards England. Many of them not very long ago entertained a deeper admiration for the stars and stripes than for the cross of St. George. Mr. Speaker, one of the many reasons that have induced a great many of my fellow-countrymen, whose loyalty is beyond suspicion, and that have induced me, since I have been able to study the history and the real tendencies of the parties existing, to give my allegiance to the Conservative party, was the spirit of disloyalty which animated some of the French Liberal leaders. The hon. member for Quebec East never misses an opportunity to speak of the late Mr. Papineau as a “great patriot,” and his friends, who appreciate the charms of his eloquence, have even christened him the “young Papineau.” In Mr. Papineau’s career there are two different parts—two different chapters; the first has always elicited my warm admiration, the other my complete disapproval. In the first, the great tribune fought for the liberties of his country, he fought for the establishment of responsible government, he thundered with his powerful voice against the one man’s power then represented by many an English Governor; but his denunciations of tyranny, and his praises of liberty, are hardly in accord with the speech of his talented disciple, who proclaimed so recently that a Lieutenant-Governor can overpower and dismiss a Ministry enjoying the full confidence of the representatives of the people, without infringing the principle of responsible government. In the latter part of his career, Mr. Papineau hardly appreciated the extent of the advantages obtained by the concession of responsible government, and, instead of accepting manfully the situation, instead of upholding the Canadian party founded by a greater political man—Sir L. H. Lafontaine, he continued to denounce England, to denounce our system of Government, eulogising at the same time the

American institutions, and advocating boldly the annexation of Canada to the United States. Such were the sentiments, such were the principles of the founder, of the father of the French Liberal party—sentiments and principles which he professed openly till his last day. If anyone doubts my assertion, let me read a few lines from a letter which Mr. Papineau wrote as late as 1871. This letter was addressed to Mr. Batchelor, the secretary of an annexationist club at New York:—

“During the fifty years in which I have travelled in the United States, my love and my admiration for the great and good men I have known, for the magnificent and stupendous things I have seen, for its history, which I never cease from studying in all its details, have ever continued to increase. The Unionist Club of New York shares these feelings, and with a full knowledge of the case. With me it is irritated at the servility of the Canadians, those who bear rank, and others who do not, deserters from the Liberal party in their own country, flatterers of England, and constant insulters of the United States. I regret being obliged to end my days in a country oppressed and daily insulted by the English Government, and betrayed by the Colonial Governments. * * * Let us remain firm and persevering in our convictions, they will be realised. The moment the Colonial Legislatures demand from England either independence or annexation, they will obtain it. *Fiat lux*. This is the whole point. Let us make evident the humiliating character of our colonial dependence. The last elections turned out better than the preceding ones, the next will be still better, and in this way our deliverance will come.”

It is almost needless to say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Papineau was a very unsuccessful prophet, that the elections, from which he expected his “deliverance,” in case the Reform party would succeed, did not always take the turn he anticipated, specially the last ones; that he utterly mistook the spirit of loyalty, the attachment to British institutions, which animated the mass of his countrymen, who are freer and happier than they could be in the vast neighbouring agglomeration—who believe that they could not be engaged in a greater work than that of contributing to mould the destinies of a new nation, and of whom it has been truly said, by the good and noble Lord Elgin, that the last hand that would wave a British flag on this continent would be that of a French-Canadian. The ideas expressed by Mr. Papineau in

MR. TASSÉ.

that letter—and they could not be more disloyal—were then adopted by a great many French Liberals of Quebec. Were it necessary, Mr. Speaker, I could accumulate the most convincing proofs on which to ground my assertion. I could point to an annexationist manifest, signed by most of the leaders of the French Liberal party; I could mention many articles of French Liberal organs teeming with disloyal sentiments as late as 1870; I could quote *Le Pays*—the defunct organ of the Rouge party—who almost promised, on one occasion, at a very cheap price, immortality to an American Senator named Pomeroy, who had taken the initiative in an annexationist movement; I could read a vehement speech in favour of annexation, by Mr. L. H. Frechette—a late member of this House, your opponent at the last election, Mr. Speaker—in which he proclaimed that he hoped to see the day “when all the members of the great French family of North America would have the happiness to live and to prosper under the standard of liberty, the glorious banner of the American Union;” I could refer also to an annexationist lecture delivered in 1871, by the Hon. H. Fabre—then and yet editor of a Liberal organ, *L'Evenement*—in which he pretended that two-thirds of the inhabitants of Quebec were annexationists, which must exclude, if his contention were true, every member of his party, who do not represent even the third of the electors, every Conservative being indisputably a loyal subject. I will read, however, a short extract from a most remarkable article, published at the time of Confederation by *Le Courrier des Etats-Unis*, of New York, a paper entirely free from our party proclivities:

“There is in Canada a party, small in number, but very active, who preach annexation to the United States. That party is composed of some honourable men, fascinated by the greatness of our Republic, and others who, having experienced disappointment in their country, would not hesitate to sacrifice the French-Canadian nationality to satisfy their personal rancour.”

Mr. Speaker, if, during the last years, since probably they have enjoyed the sweetness of office, they have all become loyal subjects to our Queen; if they are convinced that our system of govern-

ment affords us the fullest freedom, that it can be compared favourably with Republican institutions, I will greet heartily their conversion, as that of the prodigal son; but I contend it ill becomes such loyal neophytes to taunt their opponents with ideas hostile to British interests. Mr. Speaker, on more than one occasion, the hon. member for Quebec East has claimed to be the disciple of such a great Reformer as Daniel O'Connell. Well, the celebrated Irish patriot was a Protectionist in the fullest sense of the word. He established an association for the encouragement of the consumption of Irish manufactures, and he went as far as to propose: "That no member be allowed to speak or to vote at the Board of the Association who shall not be clothed in Irish manufactures, and that the ladies of Ireland be entreated to encourage the wear of their native manufactures, and not to introduce any others." Mr. Papineau proposed also a similar plan, fifty years ago—he had the ambition of being the O'Connell of Canada—but I am sure that the most ardent supporter of the National Policy does not intend to stretch his patriotism to that extent. As I have already referred to the French wing—which is far from being formidable—of the Reform party, let me state that no men advocated more warmly, a few years ago, the cause of Protection. My hon. friend from Maskinongé has fully established that point, having produced the formal declarations of the Reform leaders of Quebec in favour of Protection, not later than 1872; but I may add that, even at the last elections, they had Protectionist candidates in the city of Montreal, in the counties of Hochelaga and Chambly, if not elsewhere, but, as the people do not like men who sail under false colours, they were all left at home. And, far from opposing the policy of the Government, they should be the most ardent supporters of the present tariff—the proposed national system—which, according to their past declarations, can alone save Canada, can alone make this country what it has been destined by nature to be—a great agricultural and manufacturing country, it being already a great maritime country. So the hon. member for North Norfolk and some of his hon. friends from Ontario, need not expect

to monopolise the jewel of consistency in having advocated alternately, at short intervals, Free-trade and Protection, with the same eloquence, with the same alacrity, and undoubtedly with the same sincerity. Mr. Speaker, after the last general elections, the organ of the Reform party at Quebec—*L'Evenement*—fully admitted that his friends had been Protectionists in the past, and that it would be easy enough to unite themselves with the Conservatives, on the basis of Protection, and to worship, hereafter, the same political god. This is the very same paper which acknowledged—but only after the result of the elections—that its Lower Canadian friends had been ill-treated in the Administration just defeated, and that the French leaders did not exercise their legitimate share of influence in the Reform Cabinet, under the controlling, the absorbing power of the hon. member for Lambton. Let us give some attention to this most significant article:—

"We are, all of us, or almost all, Protectionists of yesterday or Protectionists of to-day. Protection has been the cradle of the National party, which has put the Liberal party into power. In 1872 our programme was one of Protection; our political leaders Mr. Joly, Mr. Jetté, Mr. Laurier; our political writers, Mr. David, Mr. Richard, and Mr. Beausoleil were Protectionists. The wise men (the paper is then alluding specially to the Nestor of the Reform party, the worthy member for Chateauguay), who struck off this article from our programme, were not as wise as they thought themselves to be. We would have no great difficulty in becoming Protectionists again, for our Province is devoted to Protection, from its peculiar position, its mode of conducting commerce and its industrial condition. It has always required and there will be always necessary for it a certain amount of Protection."

I have no particular fault to find with this candid admission, but, if the French Liberals are convinced, as they were in 1872, that Protection is necessary in our common interests, they should not have supported, and they should not support such a suicidal, such a do-nothing policy as the one advocated by the leaders of the Reform party. As far as Mr. David is concerned, I am bound to state that he has had the patriotism, the manliness to lay aside his party feeling, and to stand by the cause of Protection which he has ably advocated during some years, in

endorsing publicly the National Policy, thus giving a noble example to his Lower Canadian friends, if they were willing, for once, to put their country above their party. Whilst on this point, I will draw the attention of the House to two articles published in the *Free Press*, the organ of the Reform party in Ottawa. The first appeared on the 11th October last, and the second on the following day :—

“The subject of union between the *Bleu* and *Rouge* parties is being discussed by the respective organs, and it is difficult to perceive any ground for disunion. The question of Protection is the principal one that divides parties throughout all the Provinces of the Dominion, and it formed the only test of importance at the recent elections. With both parties in Quebec united upon it, the wonder is that the Mackenzie Government were sustained so well as they were in that Province, or rather that their defeat was not more marked and decisive than it was. It is evident that this difference between the so-called Liberals and Conservatives in Quebec is little more than nominal, and the sooner they become united in name, as they appear to be in sentiment, the better, probably, for themselves and the country.”

As far as the defeat of the Liberal party in Quebec is concerned, I may fairly presume that, in the estimation of the hon. leaders of the Opposition, it was, however, as marked and as decisive as it could be. The foregoing article was followed the next day with a strong attack against the French Liberals, who attributed to their leader—to his refusal to grant or to promise, at least, a fair Protection—their unparalleled defeat. Our Reform friends having made many other pledges which they have not fulfilled, one more promise broken would not have mattered much. This article shows at the same time the estimation in which the French Liberals are held by some organs of their party :—

“Previous to the 17th of last month none were more obsequious than those who are now denouncing the late Premier as the marplot of the Liberal party, whose defeat they attributed to Mr. Mackenzie's tyranny, stubbornness and want of tact.” Referring to the ingratitude thus expressed, the *Montreal Gazette* says :— ‘No baser kind of ingratitude can be imagined than that of men willing to serve leaders when in power, and turning upon them when power passes from their hands. The Liberal party of Quebec added neither strength nor respectability to the Liberal party of the Dominion during the last five years.’ Although

MR. TASSÉ.

we are far from including all the Quebec Liberals in the list of ingrates, yet there is much of truth, manfully spoken, in what our contemporary utters. That the Liberal party of Quebec ‘added neither strength nor respectability to the Liberal party of the Dominion during the last five years,’ is too sweeping an assertion, as few will deny that the Hon. Mr. Dorian brought strength and respectability to the party. The *Gazette's* remark might apply to the situation during the last year or two, when the accessions to the Cabinet from the Quebec Liberals were not always accessions of strength or respectability.”

Mr. Speaker, I will be less severe than this organ of the Reform party. I do not wish to underrate or under-estimate our public men, as it is in the best interests of our own country that our public men should be esteemed, should be respected by all parties, by all classes, and I do make an exception for the hon. member for Quebec East, who refused to sit in a Reform Cabinet that included a man who, nevertheless, was believed worthy by his colleagues to become a representative of Her Majesty in the Prairie Province, although some of the other Ministers had not done more to elevate the standard of purity, one of them having closed his political career in a celebrated ballot-trap, not far from St. Anne, within the precincts of the county of Jacques Cartier. Under such circumstances, when it is proved, even by a Reform paper, that the hon. member for Lambton did not always select, as leaders of the French Liberal party, men who were a credit to our race—and a race is very often judged by the standing of its representatives—it is not surprising, not to speak of other powerful causes or agencies, that the hon. member for Quebec East should have returned from the battle with such a reduced escort,—not even the baker's dozen—to use an expression familiar to his friends when they were in more fortunate circumstances. It is not surprising also that the four French members elected outside of Quebec—two in Ontario, one in Manitoba, and one in New Brunswick—should give a cordial support to the party who continue the traditions of that great and lamented statesman, Sir George E. Cartier. The Reform party, Mr. Speaker, condemn this tariff because it is supposed to be hostile to British interests. But let us not be deceived by such a

sham. To give another illustration of the insincerity, of the inconsistency of their leaders, I will read the declaration made by the hon. member for Quebec East in a speech delivered before the Local House :

"It is now many years since the great patriot whom we have just lost, Hon. L. J. Papineau seeking a remedy for the evils of that time summarised his policy on this subject in this simple precept: 'We must buy nothing from the metropolis.' I am of opinion that this policy is imposed on us to-day as a duty with as much force as at the very time when it was formulated. It is, above all, the duty of us French-Canadians to create for ourselves a national industry."

"We must buy nothing from the metropolis," exclaimed the hon. member for Quebec East, and yet his friends in the press and in this House denounce vehemently this tariff because they contend it will have that very same effect. On many occasions the same gentleman has claimed to be a moderate Protectionist, yet, in this speech, he not only advocates Protection but prohibition—not against the United States, but against the Mother Country, for whom he professes now so much regard. I may fairly ask if the hon. gentleman is in earnest? Are his hon. friends in earnest? Or are they playing a double game, that will make no dupes however, in this House or out of this House? Or are they but repeating the cunning trick of the late Finance Minister, who boasted of having exhibited the "silver side of the shield" to the English capitalists, and the "brass side" to the Canadian electors, who were too sensible, however, to be so easily deceived? The Conservative party, Sir, do not advocate such extreme measures. They do not proclaim, like the hon. member for Quebec East: "We must buy nothing from the metropolis." They do not wish to shut entirely the doors of this country to the British commodities. But they are determined to protect our manufacturers from an unfair foreign competition, and to give them as much as possible what most properly belongs to them: the home, and the Canadian market—the first in order and of a paramount importance. The present tariff is not so much a protection against England as against the United States. The American press fully acknowledges the fact, and the New York *Herald* admits that this

tariff is the only policy that can induce the United States to give us what both parties are desirous to get: reciprocity on a fair and honourable basis. Not many years ago our exports to the neighbouring country were greater than our imports, but since the balance of trade has considerably turned against us. In former days most of our imports came from Great Britain, but they have decreased rapidly during the last four or five years, whilst our imports from the United States have increased in an alarming proportion. In 1878, we imported from the United States \$48,600,000, and from Great Britain, \$37,400,000; whilst in 1873, we imported \$68,500,000 from England and \$47,700,000 from the United States—the volume of our trade being in 1873, of \$217,300,000, whilst it reached only \$170,500,000 in 1878. Well, Sir, is it in the interests of the Mother Country that the Canadian market should be monopolised by our neighbours? Is it in the interest of the Mother Country that Canada should be kept in its present commercial bondage, and that it should not cultivate that spirit of self-reliance, of self-dependence, peculiar to every British community? Is it in the interest of the Mother Country that Canada should become a mere commercial satellite of the great planet on our southern border? Had the previous tariff been maintained, our neighbours would have continued to control our market, for they were bound to destroy our industries, even at prices ruinous to themselves, in order to become the full masters of the situation. What would have been the result? Our country would have continued, as it has done during the nefarious years of the previous Administration, to impoverish year by year; our industry would have continued to suffer and decay; our public debt would have increased alarmingly; large deficits would have been piling one over another, such as the large deficits of the late Cabinet; our credit would have been gradually destroyed, and our people, however loyal, would have been driven, I apprehend, by industrial distress and hopelessness, as many of them were during the commercial crisis of 1849, to see, perhaps, no other alternative, and, Sir, no greater calamity could fall on Canada, than to

join the United States, who then, and then only, could be warranted to make their favourite boast :

“No pent-up Utica contracts our powers,
The whole, the unbounded continent is ours.”

The enemies of British interests, the enemies of Canadian interests, are not the partisans of the present tariff, of this National Policy—they are those whose unwise, unpatriotic, and unstatesmanlike policy has given the control of our trade, the control of our market to our American neighbours. Notwithstanding the increase of our import duties, I am fully convinced that this barrier will not be strong enough to prevent a large trade being made between Canada and Great Britain. I rather think, with the Finance Minister, that this tariff, combined with an energetic railroad policy—not a water-stretches policy—will transform the boundless prairies of the North-West into happy and prosperous homes, will give an impetus to the increase of our population, and augment thereby the consumption of British goods, while the Mother Country will have the proud satisfaction to behold her great North American Dominion growing up rapidly, developing its resources, and holding a high rank among commercial and industrial nations. The day is past when the English Parliament could pass a resolution declaring that the establishment of manufactures in the colonies tends to destroy their connection with the Mother Country. Our position towards England has been very justly appreciated by Mr. C. B. Adderley, then Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, when he said, in the debates on Confederation in the House of Commons :

“All that can develop and increase the prosperity of the Colonies increases also the prosperity of the Empire. The time is gone when this metropolitan Parliament could assume to teach the colonies what they should do; they know it better than ourselves.”

Mr. Speaker, in visiting England a few years ago, I admired the many monuments—a nation's tribute—erected to the memory of her great men, her great soldiers, her great statesmen, her great orators; and, in examining one day the magnificent column of Horatio Nelson—a name dear to every Briton—I read on the pedestal the following words ad-

MR. TASSÉ.

ressed by the celebrated admiral to his mariners, on the eve of his Trafalgar victory: “England expects every man will do his duty.” Well, Sir, these very words, that solemn appeal to every man to do his duty, are well appropriated to our situation. At this present critical juncture, at this present critical phase of our history, we may well adopt as our watchword: “Canada expects every man will do his duty.” A country is not saved only by the sword, by the bavonet, by the heroism of her soldiers, it may be saved also by the patriotism, by the wisdom, by the statesmanship of its rulers. Sir, we are on the verge of ruin, our factories are silent or working on half-time, our mechanics are starving, our merchants ruined, our agriculturists find no profitable market, every interest in the land is suffering; gloomy as is this picture, it is unfortunately but the faithful mirror of the situation, and it requires a strong and united effort to save this country from an almost universal disaster. We have undertaken a noble, a grand task, that of establishing a nation on this continent. We have laid the foundations of the freest institutions that may exist; we have powerful means of action in the vigour and energy of our people; our soil is rich with treasures yet unexplored, and shall we perish in the midst of our riches, shall we continue to neglect those great natural advantages to the detriment of our country, and to the sole benefit of foreigners? The people have given an emphatic answer to that question from one end of the Dominion to the other, and it has been the answer of a manly and spirited people who has an unbounded confidence in its future. The Government, echoing the voice, the almost unanimous voice of the people, have taken the necessary steps to come to their rescue, and, if a legislative measure can save a country, this tariff will vastly assist to save Canada. With this tariff, Mr. Speaker, will be infused a new life and a new vitality in our agriculture, in our commerce, and in our industry. These three great interests of the State are inseparable, and what affects one beneficially cannot fail to benefit the others. I quite understand now the supreme horror which the late Finance Minister entertains for our

great centres of population, they having committed the egregious blunder to condemn his policy by overwhelming majorities. The two hon. gentlemen who sit behind me, as the representatives of our commercial metropolis, have alone obtained a collective and unprecedented majority of 3,000 votes. But, Sir, the rural districts have also utterly failed to appreciate the great advantages of his fiscal system. The rural districts of the country—in whose intelligence the Reform leaders had so much faith previous to the last elections, but who are now accused of ignorance, because they have ceased to believe in their statesmanship—have imagined that there was such a thing as agricultural Protection; they are more than ever convinced on that point, since they have examined the present tariff; and, far from believing that the interests of the manufacturing industry are inimical to their own interest, they are firmly persuaded that those two great interests are closely blended together, that thriving cities and towns are their best customers, and that they cannot prosper without partaking in their prosperity. In order to show that I am not misrepresenting the Reform leaders, when I state that, in their desperation, they attribute their defeat to the ignorance of the people, let me cite the following words of the late Finance Minister, in his last speech on the Budget:—"I know that, in time past, a great deal of the clamour which arose against the late Government, arose really from ignorance, arose from the people not having been trained—yes, from ignorance in the House and out of the House." The hon. the late Finance Minister and his colleagues have assumed to speak on behalf of the country in raising their voice—and in the case of the hon. member for South Brant, it has been a thundering voice—against the tariff, against that "thing," as it has been called, with a questionable taste, by that gentleman. Our Reform friends may sneer at that "thing;" but, Sir, that little "thing"—that bitter "thing" devised by the enemy—has been a lever powerful enough to move them from this side of the House to the cold shades of Opposition—where that very same little "thing" will keep

them longer than they dream of. Under such trying circumstances, we cannot fail to admire the undaunted courage of the late Finance Minister and of his friends; but, after their overwhelming condemnation in almost every Province, in almost every section of the land—from Charlottetown to beyond the Rocky Mountains; after their Bull's Run of the 17th September last, which was nowhere more disastrous than in their own stronghold of Ontario—these hon. gentlemen, in assuming to speak on behalf of the country, recal to us—if the comparison is not offensive—those three famous tailors of London, who one day addressed a memorial to the British House of Commons, in the name of the people of England, although our Reform friends have not been able to elect such a formidable trio in three Provinces combined—Prince Edward Island and our two western Provinces. With this tariff, we shall cease to be mere exporters of raw materials to be purchased by foreigners and brought back to Canada in some manufactured shape. Our country, Sir, imports foreign fabrics every year to the extent of \$60,000,000, and, if these articles, or a great part of them, could be fabricated here, thousands and thousands of operatives would get employment, while now a proportionate number of artisans subsist by us in foreign lands. We would save, also, and keep here an immense capital, which we export every year to enrich foreigners, and which drains the best resources of the nation. With this tariff, Mr. Speaker, we shall see our most valuable mines of coal and iron fully worked out, thus enlarging the field of labour, and giving a new impulse to our development. Coal and iron are two of the main elements of a nation's industrial wealth. Coal and iron have largely contributed to build the fortune of England, the fortune of the United States, and they will produce here the same wonderful results. We import every year about \$15,000,000 worth of iron-ware—including steel rails—and there is no reason why we should import what we can produce so profitably. In this very valley of the Ottawa, whose resources are so abundant and so diversified, we have immense beds of iron, of a superior quality, covering an immense area, and I hope to see the day when the

neighbouring country will be covered with blast-furnaces and rolling-mills to such an extent that it will resemble the Black Country of England. It is a matter of regret that our many railways have not been built with our iron; but, as the Government will require an immense quantity of iron in the building and the renewal of our railways, they will, no doubt—impressed, as they are, with the importance of the subject—favour, as much as possible, the home producer—the Canadian miner. With this tariff we shall create and develop an immense trade between our different Provinces—Nova Scotia, for instance, supplying a great part of the Dominion with her coal, and receiving, in return, the wheat and other products of the Upper Provinces. These commercial relations will have another most desirable effect: they will assimilate the Provincial interests, and strengthen the political ties that should bind closely together the members, however distant, of our great Canadian brotherhood. With this tariff we shall revive, among others, the sugar industry, once flourishing here, and we shall be in a position to renew a profitable trade with the West Indies. That this industry has been destroyed by the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, there can be no doubt, and I will quote to that effect no less an authority than the Hon. Mr. Jones—the defeated leader of a defeated party in Nova Scotia—who, not later than 1877, condemned, on the floor of this House, in severe terms, that same policy in reference to the sugar interests. “The sugar interest,” said Mr. Jones, “demanded some consideration, because, if some legislation did not speedily take place, he was afraid we were going to lose a large trade with the West Indies. That trade, in the Maritime Provinces, at the present moment, involved from three to four millions of dollars a year, but the inevitable result of the present policy would be to drive the whole trade to the United States.” The prediction of Mr. Jones has been, unfortunately, fulfilled to the letter. That large and beneficial trade has passed into the hands of the United States. We have thus lost an important source of wealth and revenue; but the present tariff will repair, to a great extent, the shortcomings of the previous

MR. TASSÉ.

Administration. It has already inspired confidence in our sugar refiners, who are reopening their manufactories, and it will give back to the Maritime Provinces, to this country, the benefits accruing from that most valuable industry. To summarise in a few words: With this tariff, we shall be able to meet our obligations, we shall restore, or rather elevate, the credit of Canada, we shall convert deficits into surpluses, we shall give employment to our people, and attract foreign emigration, foreign capital. With this tariff we shall support, with greater facility, the burdens necessarily caused by our vast public works—it being impossible to build, to people, to govern half a continent without incurring great sacrifices, without assuming heavy burdens. With this tariff we shall foster the agricultural, the mineral and the manufacturing industries of our country; and, before all—what should be our common aim and our common ambition—we shall keep Canada for the Canadians. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose going into the examination of the details of this measure. There are items which I might have preferred a little higher, there are others which I might have liked lower. But, as it is positively impossible to fabricate a tariff capable of meeting everyone's taste, everyone's fancy, or everyone's interest, I take it to be a duty, a paramount duty of the occasion, to waive any personal opinion I may entertain on separate points, and to accept the result of the exertions of the Government as a whole, on this broad principle of Protection to our domestic industries, in order to secure what the country needs, and what I am sure the country will obtain by the adoption of the present measure—by the adoption of our National Policy.

MR. LONGLEY said that he almost shrank from the task of addressing the House upon a question so comprehensive as that of the National Policy, although an advocate of that policy since it was first announced. In his opinion, our future prosperity would be greatly promoted by a system of Protection to native industries at this particular crisis in our history. There were two most important objects to accomplish at the present time,—first, an increase in our revenue, and, secondly, the development and pro-

tection of our manufacturing, mining, and agricultural industries. And the question to be considered was how we could best attain the objects in view. A simple mode of increasing our revenue would be by adding five or ten per cent. duty on all our imports, or on such portions of them as would give us, say, two and a half millions of dollars more revenue; but that mode would leave the more important object of the two unattained. It had, therefore, been proposed to so frame our tariff that both objects could be secured at the same time, and in the best possible way. So much had been said against the tariff, respecting its adverse bearing upon our trade with the Mother Country; and, also, about its tendency to evoke hostile feeling in the minds of our neighbours across the border, that, but for the strength of his own convictions, he should be almost deterred from becoming its advocate. And here he would say that the trade returns from 1873 down to the end of 1878 gave the most convincing proof that, whatever might be the result of the new tariff, the operation of the old one was such as to greatly reduce the volume of trade, during the interval in question, between Canada and Great Britain. In 1873, our imports from Great Britain amounted to \$68,000,000. In 1878, they had fallen to \$37,000,000. It might prove an interesting mental practice for some who had been so exercised of late about the probable loss of trade to Great Britain, and possible alienation between us and the Mother Country, as a consequence thereof—to state how much longer it would take, at the rate we had been going for the last six years, to kill out our trade with Great Britain altogether. It would be seen that it fell off \$31,000,000 in six years, or more than an average of \$5,000,000 per annum; at that rate a little more than seven years more would reduce it to nil. But it was worth while to remark in this connection that, while the operation of the old tariff was so adverse to our trade with Great Britain, it seemed to have been very well calculated to foster trade with the United States; for, while, in 1878, the amount of imports from Great Britain was only \$37,000,000, the amount from the United States was \$48,200,000, or \$11,200,000 in

excess of that from the Mother Land. In view of such results as these, he thought that neither British manufacturers nor those who would cultivate trade between Canada and England, need sigh much over the ghost of the old tariff. He assumed that all desired to perpetuate the connection which bound us to the Mother Country; and that, in respect to whatever we might be obliged to import, England should continue to have our trade. There was scarcely a doubt that the new tariff would prove promotive of trade between England and Canada. We hoped not to want so much from any country in years to come as in years gone by, for we expected largely to supply our own wants, but that would be such a result as need not create dissatisfaction in any quarter, and would be very much more to our credit than to our discredit. It seemed almost superfluous to say that our present tariff was framed with no hostile intentions towards the United States. When they deemed it necessary to make alterations in their fiscal policy, they did not come and consult us, and he thought it would puzzle anyone to tell why we should consult them. But there was scarcely anything to which the people had a greater repugnance than to taxation; and it would be most pertinent to the discussion of the question in hand to enquire how the country had been brought into a condition to render this necessary. He did not think it could be shown to be the fault of the present Administration. True, they heard a good deal said years ago about the burdens laid upon the shoulders of the people of Canada by the improvidence and bad management of the men now in power, but, as those making the charges had never been able to prove them, people had ceased to attach importance to mere assertion. He would, therefore, assume, and would justify the assumption by reference to public documents under his hand, if necessary, that the present state of financial embarrassment had been brought about almost entirely by extravagance and general bad management on the part of the late Government, and not by the party now in power. He had observed some statements in the American papers lately, to the effect that the union of the Prov-

inces had not been a financial success, and he believed that some within our own borders shared in that belief. His own opinion was that the union had been attended with a very gratifying measure of success, from the date of its inauguration down to 1873, viewed from any standpoint they pleased. Financially it was, undoubtedly, a great success. The men who ruled the country during these years had dealt with the various services of the country in a most liberal manner; had been subjected to a good many unusual, and quite exceptional, expenditures arising from Fenian raids, the purchase of the North-West Territory, the incorporation and organisation of new Provinces, etc., and still, year by year, there remained a surplus in the Treasury, in certain years exceeding \$3,000,000, the total surplus from 1867 down to 1873 amounting to upwards of \$15,000,000. That was a financial record of which any men, and any country, might well be proud. In nearly all other respects the results were equally satisfactory. If they looked at the reverse side of the picture from 1873 down to 1878, what would be found to be the condition of things, especially in a financial point of view? Until lately they had flattered themselves that the deficits during the last three or four years had not exceeded \$5,000,000, but now it was said they amounted to \$7,000,000. Most people thought the former sum was bad enough, but the latter was far worse. What a contrast did these deficits present alongside of the surpluses rolled up during the former period of our history. After making certain allowances for the difference in the times, must they not conclude that the main difference was fairly attributable to good government on the one hand, and bad government on the other hand? In view of so radical a change in our fiscal policy, it was impossible to tell as to the effect likely to be produced upon the volume of imports. Doubtless there would be a reduction in respect to some of them, but, probably, not to the extent of the increase of duty in a general way. In respect to the classes of goods which we could not produce at all, there would be but little falling off, so of other classes which we should not produce for a time; but this

whole subject had been studied very carefully, and the tariff so arranged, he doubted not, as to give us the additional revenue sought for. The Finance Minister had a pretty good reputation for accuracy in calculating his income in former years, and had lost none of his caution since. An attempt would be made now—the first for several years—to equalise income and expenditure. We, surely, had had enough of deficits, and should try once more to have a balance to our credit at the end of the year. He could scarcely imagine anything more discreditable in a Government, than to go on, year after year, borrowing money to meet ordinary current expenditures. They had been treated to some novel methods of reasoning, by the opponents of the new tariff; but it was quite certain that two results, diametrically opposite in their nature, could not very well occur at the same time. In other words, different sequences wholly divergent in character were not likely to be brought about by the same agency. For illustration, they had been told during the debate, by some energetic orators, that the farmers would not be benefitted, for they would get no more for their produce than heretofore; although upon the back of that declaration the lumberman was told that he would have to pay ten cents per bushel more for his oats, and forty cents per barrel more for his cornmeal, etc. Then they were told that manufactured goods of all sorts would be higher; that the cost of living would be enhanced; trade and commerce would be disturbed, and general mischief ensue, finishing up the picture of distress by declaring that the wealthy manufacturers, for whose special benefit this tariff had been framed, would be brought to ruin. He thought that people would not be much impressed with such reasoning. They had been told that, not only would Protection enhance prices, but that they would, at the same time, have to put up with inferior goods. He contended that the history of the United States, and he might add of all countries, was directly opposed to such an assumption, for, as respected the United States, no country ever furnished better or cheaper goods, as was conclusively shown by the fact that she had become a successful competitor in the markets of the

world, in some cases actually sending her manufactured wares to Manchester and Birmingham, and to Germany, Russia and Australia. How, but by a system of Protection, coupled with frugality and thrift on the part of her people, had France recovered from the terrible disasters which overtook her in connection with the war of 1870? Eight or nine years ago she was thought to be a crippled power; now she was in the van of civilisation and progress, and as powerful as ever. Her fiscal policy had been eminently protective. It could not be doubted, either, that even Free-trade England had come to greatness through the adoption of a system of Protection through a long course of years, adhered to until she felt that she could almost command the markets of the world. But what was England's position as a manufacturing country to-day, alongside of several others that might be named—Germany, Belgium and the United States, especially? Scarcely that of superiority upon the whole, and one of inferiority in regard to some manufactured goods. England would not probably be so wedded to the system of Free-trade in four years from this as she was now, else she was prepared to rank second in manufacturing industry. Fortunately, Free-traders were not as numerous in Canada as they were a few years ago, and he thought they must grow "small by degrees and beautifully less." He now proposed to deal with the American policy by briefly tracing its history. It had been held by some that there was no analogy between the United States and Canada; that what was good for a country with a population of forty millions would not be good for a country with a population of four millions. In order to show the fallacy of that objection, he proposed to go back a hundred years, or thereabouts. In 1791, the circumstances of the United States were quite similar to those of our own country to-day. Their population was then scarcely in excess of our own now, their resources were undeveloped, their industries in their infancy, and their finances in an embarrassed condition. They had just started out on a national career, since crowned with such wonderful success. On the 5th of December, 1791, Secretary Hamilton submitted to the House of Re-

presentatives his celebrated report, the opening paragraph of which read as follows:—

"The expediency of encouraging manufactures in the United States, which was, not long since, deemed very questionable, appears, at this time, to be pretty generally admitted. The embarrassments which have obstructed the progress of our external trade, have led to serious reflections on the necessity of enlarging the sphere of our domestic commerce. The restrictive regulations which, in foreign markets, abridge the vent of the increasing surplus of our agricultural produce, serve to beget an earnest desire that a more extensive demand for that surplus may be created at home, and the complete success which has rewarded manufacturing enterprise in some valuable branches, conspiring with the promising symptoms which attend some less matured essays in others, justify a hope that the obstacles to the growth of this species of industry are less formidable than they were apprehended to be; and that it is not difficult to find, in its further extension, a full indemnification for any external disadvantages which are or may be experienced, as well as an occasion of resources favourable to national independence and safety."

He would gladly quote more extensively from this celebrated State document, but he had given enough of it to indicate the nature of the views of one of the greatest men of his time, views endorsed by a majority of his countrymen, and which, then embodied, and ever since substantially retained in the fiscal policy of the country, had, in an eminent degree, led it on to fortune and fame. It was not unworthy of remark that the United States had, but a few years previous to the period under review, emerged from the war of Independence, and that the country was poor and burdened with debt. He passed over the Tariff Acts passed from 1791 to 1812 as being quite too numerous for reference, merely remarking that their tendency was steadily in the line of Protection, and never lost sight of the leading idea—the development of the industries of the country. He wished that they could get a similar idea into the heads of some of the noisy Free-traders beside him, but their stock in trade would be gone were that to happen. He would now refer to what might very well be regarded as a crisis in the history of the United States, namely, the year 1812:

"While the war against Great Britain was a pending question, Mr. Smilie, from the Committee of Ways and Means, reported to the

House a Bill imposing additional duties upon imported goods, wares and merchandise, amounting to one hundred per cent."

This was on the 22nd May, 1812, and on the 18th of the following month war was declared. It was urged against this enormous increase of duty, that it would enable the merchants to sell the stocks they had on hand at a great advance, thus taking millions of dollars out of the pockets of the purchasers, without any advantage, whatever, to the Treasury. This prediction seemed not to have been verified. Not only did this tariff impose an additional duty of 100 per cent., but a further increase of ten per cent. upon such goods as were imported in foreign vessels. On vessels belonging wholly, or in part, to the subjects of foreign powers, which should be entered into the United States or Territories, it imposed an additional duty of \$1.50 per ton. It was provided that this Tariff Bill should continue in force during the continuance of the war with Great Britain, and till the expiration of one year after the conclusion of peace, and no longer, and that the additional duties levied should be collected on all such goods, wares and merchandise as had been previously imported. Specific duties were also levied on a variety of articles, such as 20c. per bushel on salt. This was, of course, a war measure, outside of mere fiscal or industrial considerations; but it served, nevertheless, to illustrate one distinctive feature of American character, and, he might say, of American legislation, namely, boldness and energy, and adaptation to the surrounding circumstances and emergency. To put it in another form, the Americans, so far as he was aware, had never adopted the policy of drift, or borrowed money, to meet ordinary current expenditure, as we had been doing in the recent past, but had met their difficulties face to face, of whatever character they were, and had usually overcome them. This tariff supplied the means to carry the nation successfully through the war, and of course was modified as soon as the occasion which gave rise to it had passed away. Before passing away from the subject, he desired to refer to some comments made by Mr. Granger, of New York, upon the subject of the Tariff Act of 1857. He said:

MR. LONGLEY.

"Since the war of 1812, we have at three different times resorted to a Protective tariff to relieve us from financial distress. From 1818 to 1824, with a mere revenue tariff, the balance of trade was against us, and during that term of six years our exports of specie exceeded our imports \$10,000,000. This caused the Protective tariff of 1824, and the effect of the change was soon felt, confidence and activity returned, and instead of exporting specie we imported specie to a large amount. The effect was so obvious and gratifying that the still higher tariff of 1828 was enacted—the highest we ever had.

"Under these two Protective tariffs of 1824 and 1828, up to 1834—ten years—the whole country was blessed with a prosperity perhaps never before equalled in this or any other country. In these ten years of Protection, from 1824 to 1834, we imported \$30,000,000 of specie more than we exported, and paid off the debts of two wars—that of the Revolution and of 1812—in all, principal and interest, \$100,000,000."

No one would deny but that these were results of a highly gratifying character—results fairly attributable to a Protective policy. But now for the reverse side of the picture, or a little in the way of illustrating the fruits of abandoning the Protective for a mere revenue tariff. He would give it in the closing words of Mr. Granger:

"Next came the descending compromise tariff of Mr. Clay, reluctantly conceded to the opponents of Protection. By a sliding scale this tariff brought us down in nine years to a horizontal tariff of twenty per cent. The result was that the Government soon found itself out of funds and out of credit. The tariff of 1842 was arranged for Protection and revenue incidentally. It justified the expectations of its most sanguine friends, but it was allowed only a brief existence. It was said, in high places, that the principle of Protection was wrong, and in an evil hour Congress adopted the maxim, and the tariff of 1842 was repealed, and that of 1846, the present one, substituted. Sir, unless we have a radical change in our tariff laws we shall surely have another financial crash. We must manufacture more and import less, and keep our specie at home. We have a foreign debt of nearly \$250,000,000. Protection is vastly more important to us now than revenue, but we can have them both at once, if we will."

It would be well to study these two pictures presented by Mr. Granger, both as regarded their general as well as specific import. Our position, to-day, was certainly analogous to, if not almost identical with the position of the United States in 1857. The United States, like Canada, wanted revenue; but they needed Protection more, and by

a wise and patriotic policy, they attained both of the objects sought, and so might we by doing likewise. Various theories were propagated as to who paid the duty—the producer or the consumer. His own opinion was that it was sometimes pretty hard to tell, and that sometimes the one paid it, and sometimes the other, and that sometimes it might be shared by each. That the consumer paid the duty on articles which were procured exclusively from abroad, might be true in the main, but certainly not so as regarded domestic manufactures. This was the view of Mr. Mallory, of Vermont, at that time Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, in combating the theory that the consumer paid the duty :

“Again, it is urged that all duties on imports are taxes on consumers. This may be true as to those articles which we exclusively procure from abroad. It is untrue as to such articles as are produced by domestic industry, nearly, or wholly, sufficient to supply the demand. It is supposed that we produce cotton fabrics to the value of \$50,000,000. A great proportion are valued at 16c., and under, the square yard. The duties and charges would be about 10c. Remove the protection, and, according to the rule that duties are a tax on the consumer, we should be furnished with the fabric at from 4c. to 6c. the running yard. The absurdity is apparent. Take a fabric valued at 9c. the square yard, the duties and charges would be about the same I have before stated. According to the rule, the fabric could be afforded to the consumer for nothing. Take nails; the duty is 5c.; the average price may be 7c. in the market. The consumer, by the rule laid down, should have them for 2c. per pound. I will mention but one article more—I mean cheese. The duty is 9c. per pound. The average value in market not over 7c. If duties on the foreign article are a tax on the consumer, he is, in equity and good conscience, entitled to 2c. for every pound he eats.”

He would now pass on to 1861. That was the year of the breaking out of the terrible Civil War. Mr. Morrill, of Vermont, from the Committee of Ways and Means, had reported a Bill the previous Session, “to provide for the payment of outstanding Treasury notes, to authorize a loan, to regulate and fix the duties on imports, and for other purposes,” but the Bill did not pass into law that Session. The following year it did, however, and much as it was exclaimed against then and afterwards, it answered most important ends. He had before remarked that the results of the tariff of

1857 had been very unsatisfactory. The average duty on all imports had been found to be only 14½ per cent., yielding an average income of only \$46,000,000, while the average expenditure had been \$66,000,000 between 1857 and 1860, involving annual deficits of \$20,000,000, not including the interest on the public debt, which amounted to \$5,500,000. Including this and some other charges upon the revenue not provided for, it was assumed that the annual deficits were \$24,000,000. The addition made to the tariff at this period was 30 per cent. About this time the Internal Revenue Bureau was created, under which additional taxes were levied to the amount of \$101,925,000; direct taxes, \$12,000,000; duty from imports, \$50,000,000; making a total of \$163,925,000. Of course, bonds were issued and other means devised for carrying on the war. Thus did this great nation meet her almost unparalleled difficulties, and, in meeting them, stood forth to-day pre-eminently successful and free, taking her place alongside the foremost nations on the face of the globe. She could never have sustained herself and made such a record, had she, instead of supplying, in a very large degree, her own wants, been dependent upon foreign countries for her supply. The history of the United States furnished arguments of a character quite irresistible in favour of Protection, fully justifying us in following her example and adopting it. Having referred to certain industries peculiar to Nova Scotia, he wished to make a few observations in respect to certain others of scarcely less importance. First among them he would place the iron industry. With vast quantities of iron ore in several parts of the Province, and an unlimited supply of coal, in some cases in near proximity to the ore, what was there to hinder Nova Scotia from largely supplying herself with the various kinds of iron which she required? He believed that the proper development of the industry, at the Londonderry mines alone, already happily considerably advanced, would be of great advantage to the country. Why should not the extensive beds of ore at Nictaux Falls and Clementsport be turned to practical account? At both these places, a good deal had been done in years gone by, and now, under a sys-

tem of Protection, why should not more be done with like benefits to the proprietors and the country? It would not be inappropriate for him to give a few facts in this connection drawn from the history of this industry in the United States. He had under his hand a tabular statement of the quantities and values of pig iron, railroad iron, including steel rails, bar, rod, hoop, sheet and plate iron, covering a period of twenty-three years, but he could not think of giving the whole in detail. He would, however, supply a few facts therefrom, taking the imports of the two years most widely separated, namely 1855 and 1877. In the former year there were imported 98,925 tons of pig iron, valued at \$1,979,463; of railroad iron, including steel rails, 127,516 tons, valued at \$4,993,900; of bar, rod, hoop, sheet and plate iron, 144,911 tons, valued at \$7,728,406. In the latter year, 1877, there were imported of pig iron 62,922 tons, valued at \$1,556,415; railroad iron, including steel rails, 30 tons, valued at \$1,464; bar, rod, hoop, sheet and plate iron, 26,306, valued at \$1,632,815. Thus it would be seen that, in reference to these different kinds of iron, there was an immense falling off in the volume of the imports, especially in connection with the railroad iron, including steel rails, and the bar, rod, hoop, sheet and plate iron, especially the last class, of over \$6,000,000. Instead of importing the various kinds of iron, as in former years, the United States were now largely exporting them, and, in some cases, underselling all competitors—the simple fruits of Protection. In order further to show the tendency of things respecting the production of iron of various classes, he would give the cost of production for different years: In 1875 pig iron cost \$27.87 per ton; in 1876, \$23.20; in 1877, \$18.36; in 1879, \$16.88. In 1875, bar iron cost \$61.37 per ton; in 1876, \$54.21; in 1877, \$46.72; in 1879, \$43.83. It should not be forgotten that the coal and iron industries usually went hand in hand the world over, where the crude materials were found in the same country, or within reasonable distance of one another. As it had been and now was in other places so let it be here. A good deal had been said with a view of making the tariff obnoxious to

MR. LONGLEY.

the members from the Maritime Provinces, but to little purpose. He thought, doubtless, they could have wished it different in some respects, but those of them who supported the Government—and he was glad to know that the most of them were of that class—believed that the tariff had been framed in such a way as to promote the good of the whole Dominion, without sacrificing the interests of any part, or parts thereof, and would, he believed, heartily support it. The duty of 7½c. per bushel on Indian corn, and of 40c. per barrel on cornmeal would, perhaps, bear somewhat hardly upon the Maritime Provinces, but had they not got an equivalent in the duty of 50c. per ton on coal, and 40c. per barrel on apples, and the sugar duties arranged with the special view of promoting sugar refining? He could not but feel that some important concessions had been made to the Lower Provinces, and, perhaps, he might say to Nova Scotia especially. He had not here referred to the probable revival of the West India trade, of itself of vast consequence, to Nova Scotia especially. He hoped under a system of Protection, to see the product of Indian corn doubled in Canada before three years, and he thought that that result might be reached in the Annapolis Valley. Indian corn was about as sure a crop there as any other, and he saw not now why greater efforts should not be made to raise it. In respect to all the products of the soil, of our mines, workshops, mills, and factories, we wanted to produce more and import less, thus keeping vast sums of money in the country, instead of sending them away for foreign manufactures and products. We had a country broad enough and productive enough, and full enough of resources, if properly cultivated and utilised, to supply nearly all our wants, and it should be the ambition of every man in it to contribute his part towards its future prosperity and greatness. He looked upon the present period as an all-eventful one in our history. As already shown, and as all were ready to admit, we had prospered greatly during the first seven years of our history as a Dominion, and why, with the same men at the head of our affairs, should we not prosper for the next seven years to come? Perhaps it were better

not to say much about the interval between the two periods; but, if there had been lack of management, or blundering, let them now all join heartily in retrieving any errors of the past, and thus make the country prosperous and happy. Fortunately our affairs were now in the hands of some of the best men that Canada could produce, he might say, of statesmen who would do credit to any country. He presumed that he would be excused if he mentioned the name of the Hon. S. L. Tilley, the present Finance Minister, as a gentleman who had stood out prominently before the people of New Brunswick for a period of thirty years; who, during that time, had, perhaps, done more in the way of moulding the institutions of that Province than any one other man in it, and, as a result of his services, had been honoured with her continued confidence, and had shared in her highest gifts. When he mentioned the name of the Hon. Charles Tupper, he referred to one not less distinguished and deserving. True, he had received a liberal meed of abuse from his enemies, but that was to be expected from men whom he had effectually held in check; but, despite their efforts to disparage him, he lived to-day in the affections and confidence of his countrymen, and they never had occasion to be prouder of him than now. Were he to particularise, it would but add to his fame, but he had said enough, and would forbear. He hesitated to speak of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, the Premier, whose ability and statesmanship were still more widely known, but he was sure he would be justified in saying that his return to power was a source of unbounded joy and confidence to the people of Canada, and he fervently hoped that subsequent events would abundantly fulfil the general expectations. Other members of the Cabinet were justly entitled to be named in the way of praise and commendation, but he felt that he would be excused if he stopped here. A great deal had been said about the revival of business; and disappointment had been expressed that marvels had not been wrought by the mere advent to power of the friends of Protection, but he apprehended that the men who talked thus had scarcely expected to see so sudden a transformation of things as that. What

MR. LONGLEY.

they might fairly expect to see was a gradual revival of trade, and a steady, but, perhaps, not rapid, return of prosperity. They could not shut their eyes to the fact that our national debt was large in proportion to the population, and still growing larger, but it was not so large in proportion to the breadth and value of our territory. But a large proportion of our indebtedness had been incurred in the way of constructing works of great public necessity and utility, and, if not immediately remunerative, they were at least remotely so, in promoting trade and intercourse between the various parts of the country, and to some extent with the people alongside our border. The Pacific Railway was a work of great magnitude, and far-reaching in its probable results; but much as it would cost, it would open up a vast extent of country equal in richness of soil to any portion of the globe, worth three times the cost of the railway. With a population of ten millions in the North-West Territory—a population which we might soon get if the country was soon opened up—with that vast work accomplished, our debt might not be relatively greater in proportion to the population than it was now.

THE CASE OF LIEUTEAANT-GOVERNOR LETELLIER.

REMARKS.

MR. OUIMET: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the debate, I would ask your permission to make a few observations on another subject. Everyone remembers the rather startling statement that was made to the House this afternoon by the right hon. the Premier, in reference to what had passed between him and His Excellency the Governor-General, regarding the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec. This House was informed by the right hon. the Premier that, in pursuance of the motion of censure passed by the House on the 14th of March last, the Government had thought proper to recommend to His Excellency the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, on the ground that the Hon. Mr. Letellier was no longer useful in that office. The right hon. the

Premier further stated that His Excellency had been pleased to inform him that, inasmuch as the question was a new one, that our Federal system was not thoroughly understood in England, and that there was no precedent in this country for the dismissal of a Lieutenant-Governor, he would refer the matter to the Government of Her Majesty the Queen. In making the few remarks I intend to make now, I wish to place myself in a right position before this House. I rise here, not on account of my being, and having been in the past, and hoping to be in the future, a supporter of the Government of the day; I do not rise to throw any blame upon the Government, but I rise as a representative of the people, whose rights, I think, have been trampled upon by the Governor-General, who, I believe, has acted unconstitutionally. The Letellier question, as it is called, or the Quebec question, has now entered a new phase; it is no longer a party battle; it is no longer a question upon which we may differ in opinion. The Letellier question had been disposed of by this House on the 14th March last, and now the question that rises before us is this: The illustrious gentleman who is now Governor-General of this Dominion, believes, at least so we must understand from his act, that he has authority to refuse the advice of his Ministers in a question purely and simply of internal administration, wherein Imperial interests are in nowise concerned, and which, according to our understanding of our Constitution, and, at least, in the opinion of this House as already expressed, ought to be settled by this Government, or by His Excellency under the advice of his Ministers. While listening to this long debate on the tariff, it occurred to me to ask myself what was the use of this discussion, what was going to come from the debate on this, the most important question that has been discussed since the establishment of Confederation, the tariff question, if His Excellency has the right to interfere, and say to his Ministers that, in a matter of internal administration, he has the right to refuse their advice—perhaps I should say not precisely to refuse the advice of his Ministers, because I suppose that, if it had been squarely refused, the Government would have acted differently

than they have done—but to refer the matter over to the Home Government, and, in fact, to ask them to send their advice to England, and there have it reviewed by the Downing-street clerks, or the representatives, whoever they may be, of the Imperial Government. If this tariff, after it has been debated for many days, and passed by this House, and in the Senate, is to go back to England, and there be reviewed by these Downing-street clerks, I suppose this House might just as well say that it would be much better to send the tariff to England at once, and first have their views upon it, and then discuss it afterwards. It may be that, if we thought proper to make any amendments to the tariff, the question would have to be again referred to the Imperial Government, and no one can tell where the end of it would be. As a representative of the people, I have felt humiliated this afternoon; I have felt that we were nothing here. I had been accustomed to believe, during the last 28 or 30 years, that we enjoyed responsible government, but I have been taught this afternoon that I was wrong, and that responsible government no longer existed in this Dominion, since the advice of a Ministry, backed by a majority of 85 in a House of 180 members, has been refused, and has to be sent home to England to be reviewed. On the other hand, I felt that the distinguished member of this House who made that statement—that gentleman who, I believe, has always fought the battle for responsible government—after so many years of disinterested and very important and profitable services to his country, must have felt himself deeply humiliated when he had to stand up here and make that statement, which, I believe, implied a renunciation to responsible government. Moreover, I suppose that I would belittle, underrate the position of the hon. members on the other side, if I thought that they do not feel as much as we do that announcement from the Prime Minister. After all, we are not here to fight a battle to preserve or maintain in power a few men, whoever they may be, who happen to occupy the Treasury benches, or to fight them out in order to take their places. We are here as representatives of the people, and defenders of their

liberties and constitutional rights, and, when these rights are tampered with, to whatever party we belong, we must see that those rights be upheld, and be not violated by any party with impunity. I do not see the use of this debate going on any further, and I intend to move for its adjournment. It might go on for many days, and, after all, as was announced by an hon. member on the opposite side, orders might come from the Mother Country, and we, accordingly, might have to change the tariff. Let us know, first, before we indulge in further discussion, what our rights are: if we still have responsible government—still free control of our affairs, and, more especially, of our administrative affairs. Because, I beg this House to make this distinction. In the dismissal of Mr. Letellier, there is nothing more than the dismissal of an officer of this Government—the same it would be with the appointment or dismissal of any other officer of this Government. I maintain that His Excellency the Governor-General had no more right to refuse the advice of his Ministers with regard to the dismissal of any one employé than he has to contról the appointment of another employé. On a question of tariff, the case might be a little more favourable to the construction that seems to have been put by His Excellency on our Constitution; because, in trade questions, there would be matters affecting the material interests of the Empire, and, of course, when this Parliament came into contact with the interests of the Mother Country, His Excellency, who is an officer of the Imperial Government, might step in and say: I must refer this matter to the Imperial Government. But in a mere matter of administration it was quite different; we are the masters. And now the question is not merely as to the propriety of the verdict rendered by this House, or as to the conduct of Mr. Letellier, which is a dead question; but the question now is this: Should this House allow the Governor-General to refuse the advice of his Ministers, sustained by them, in the matter of local Administration, or should we protest and say that we believe, uphold and maintain that we have responsible government? It seems to me that we cannot allow this proceeding to pass

without entering our protest; and, although it was very late in the evening, too late to bring up a question of such importance, I thought that this day, the 3rd of April, ought not to pass without having expressed our emphatic disapproval of the proceedings which have taken place to-day. In moving the adjournment of the debate, I want this to be understood, that it is in order to allow myself and other members to express their opinion on that very important question—a question of the greatest importance—far more important than all questions of trade or legislation, since all others are to be regulated by that first question—namely, are we free to govern ourselves, free to legislate as we think proper for our own benefit?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I proposed to make at twelve o'clock that motion which very likely would have prevailed even if my hon. friend (Mr. Ouimet) had not made his remarks and given his reasons for moving the adjournment. Before I say anything with respect to his remarks, I may observe that this subject of the tariff has now been debated six days, and it is to be hoped it will, ere long, be finished. A great many hon. members have addressed the House, and doubtless, on an important subject like the tariff, it was a matter of course that full and ample discussion should be given to the resolutions propounded by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. But, still, there must be an end to it, and I hope, ere long, the debate will close—the debate at all events on the general principles, and that we may address ourselves as soon as possible to the details. With regard to the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ouimet), and his statements that the Constitution of this country had been infringed upon by the illustrious individual at the head of the Government, in taking the course that he proposes, I must say I cannot agree with my hon. friend that there has been any infringement of the Constitution. We are a portion of the British Empire; the Queen of England is the Queen of Canada; she reigns here as in London. It is true, she cannot be here personally, and, therefore, she sends her representative here with such powers, more or less limited, according to the

Commission she gives him, to represent her in this country. But she is the Sovereign. We are governed by a Queen, Senate and House of Commons. Her officer here, acting as an Imperial officer, in an important matter—which he, at all events, thinks important—and which he says is without precedent, says he desires instructions from his Sovereign and our Sovereign. He, the representative of the Sovereign, says that he will ask for specific instructions from his and our Sovereign. There is nothing unconstitutional in it. I would have been pleased, gratified, and I think it would have been well, had our advice been at once accepted. We unanimously thought that it would be for the interest of the country that Mr. Letellier should be dismissed. That advice has not been refused or rejected; but the representative of the Queen, of the First Estate in this land, states that he would like to submit the matter to the First Estate, to our Sovereign, and ascertain what the action of the Sovereign is. We are just as safe in the hands of the Queen as in the hands of the Queen's representative; and we may be well assured that the principles and practice of self-government which were granted by Her Majesty years and years ago will not be infringed upon by Her Majesty. I have no doubt that Her Majesty's officers in England, who are fully conversant with all our rights and privileges, will see that, in the advice they give to Her Majesty, upon which she will act, beyond a doubt, will be quite consonant with our privileges and constitutional rights, and our Charter, or Constitutional Act, as a self-governing people under a paramount authority.

Mr. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): I regret exceedingly I cannot accept the explanation of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. I regret it extremely, because it does not enter into my mind as such a reasoning as should convince this House and country that the course that has been taken to-day is in accordance with the Constitution granted to this Dominion. And, whilst I say that, I cannot either support or repeat the language that has been used by the hon. member who moved the adjournment, for this reason: That we should

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

not, in this House, for a moment, breathe a word that reflects either upon Her Majesty, Her Majesty's representative, and there were words used to that extent. We know that, in this House, and by Parliamentary usage and practice, the only complaint that we can prefer against the Crown is against the advisers of the Crown. Sir, I do not wish to do that to-night, but I must express my extreme regret at the course that has been announced to Parliament to-day as having been taken, and which has been made known to the House by the Premier. It is, I think, a mistake to suppose that this is a matter upon which we can stand quietly by and allow the responsibility to drift away upon the plea that we are quite safe in the hands of Her Majesty's Imperial advisers. It may be so to-day, and so possibly to-morrow, in case another instance of the kind were to occur, but that is not the principle upon which the Government is to be carried on. We have, under the Constitution given to us, complete and absolute control over certain matters and things under the British North America Act; one of these, I believe, is the appointment of the Lieutenant-Governors, over whose conduct and actions, in their respective offices, this House can be the only judge. We know that, in the case of the New Brunswick School Act, discussed in this House, and respecting which the question was sent home by the consent of this as well as the Provincial Government, and a case made for the opinion of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Her Majesty was advised officially and judicially by that body that, under the British North America Act, she had given up all her prerogative rights, all her powers and constitutional authority to this Parliament, over the Provincial Legislatures and the executive powers of those Provinces. That was the official answer made to this Government in 1873 or 1874; and why at this moment a question of equal gravity, which has shaken not only the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, but that of this Dominion, and has been debated in this House for many days—when the whole question of constitutional government in connection with the Provincial Legislatures

was ably debated and carefully considered—why, after that question of a strictly Provincial character, which we already know by judicial authority is one over which the Queen has no control, and as to which she had advised herself that under the British North America Act she had no constitutional authority—why this question should be again sent home, and not dealt with here, is, to my mind, an act that is unconstitutional and unprecedented. I do not like, to-night, to speak in the language of complaint; I prefer to see the debate go over to another occasion in order that the great crisis which I feel has come upon us should be gravely considered, and that the House, and every member of the House should feel the responsibility at this moment. I feel it is a very grave one, and that the future of Canada may be said to turn upon this half hour. I feel that I am not satisfied. I feel, as my hon. friend had said, and as I know many of my hon. friends feel, humiliated by the course that has been taken to-day, and which has been communicated to the House by the Prime Minister.

Mr. VALLÉE said that he seconded the motion to adjourn the debate. He would profit by the occasion to state, in company with the great majority of the members of this House, that it was with sorrow and surprise that he had heard the declaration made by the hon. the Premier, this afternoon, to wit, that His Excellency the Governor-General had refused to follow the advice of his Ministers, who had recommended the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. He ventured to say that the action of His Excellency was unconstitutional, and that no precedent could be found to justify it, since the establishment of responsible government in Canada. During the present debate, mention had been made of a law enacted by the Legislature of New Brunswick, that had been submitted to the Queen's Privy Council. In the decision given in this case by the Privy Council was to be found a declaration establishing the principle that colonial affairs were to be settled in the colony. See the declaration made by the Earl of Carnarvon to the Earl of Duffer-

in, in a despatch dated on the 18th of October, 1875. But here was something that could be directly applied to the present case. In a preceding despatch to the Earl of Dufferin, dated on the 9th October, 1873, respecting the prorogation of the Federal Parliament, and the appointment of a Commission to examine the complaints and charges made by Mr. Huntington, the following words might be read:—

“Her Majesty's Government have taken cognisance, with much interest, of these documents, as lucid as they are elaborate. It is not for them to pronounce upon the measures adopted by the advice of your responsible Ministers, but they congratulate themselves upon the fact that, in this respect, you have acted according to the principles of constitutional government.

“KIMBERLY.”

Lord Dufferin had followed the advice of his Ministers. It was impossible to deny that the question submitted to the House on the 14th March last, and that the Government had taken into consideration, was a question entirely within the control of the House, and one that affected exclusively colonial interests. As a representative of the people, he asked and claimed only the free exercise of responsible government, which had been denied and refused them, according to the statement made this afternoon by the right hon. the Premier. He could not, without failing in his duty, allow the first occasion to pass without entering his protest.

Mr. DESJARDINS said that he understood the position of this question at the present time to be this: That upon a resolution of the House of Commons, censuring the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, the Ministry had taken the risk of advising His Excellency to dismiss that officer, that His Excellency, instead of answering immediately, felt apparently, that in a matter of so much delicacy he should proceed with caution. His Excellency felt that prudence was the beginning of wisdom, and that, as he believed himself somewhat inexperienced, it would be better for him to enquire at the Colonial Office what course he had better pursue in the matter. If the answer came to His Excellency that the advice of the Government was to be accepted, then they would have carried

their point. If not, the Ministry rested in the same position in which they would have been placed, if His Excellency, instead of taking that *voie détournée*, had refused his assent immediately. Under the circumstances, he could not but feel the bitterest grief that His Excellency had not been able to decide upon the answer he could give, because the uneasiness and agitation which had too long prevailed in regard to the matter would continue throughout the country. He felt that, if such a course was to be repeated, there would be no other alternative, in order to avoid the inconveniences of going to the Colonial Office on the other side for the final decision of every question, than to provide for an additional supply for the maintenance of new machinery to our Constitution on our own shores; in other words, to provide for the appointment of a regency.

MR. MOUSSEAU said he had listened with much pleasure to what had been said by the hon. members for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) and Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), and especially to what had fallen from the hon. member for West Northumberland. He had heard with pain what had fallen from the hon. the leader of the Government. It appeared that the Queen was Queen of Canada, and that as Queen of Canada His Excellency might consult her. His hon. friend from Laval had shown that this was the mere removal of a Federal officer. If His Excellency might disregard the advice of his responsible Ministers in this respect, and seek the advice of the Colonial Office, they would have the same reference in the appointment of a Judge, or a mere canal paymaster. In fact it was a repudiation of our responsible government, and, painful as it was for him (Mr. Mousseau), he must entirely repudiate it.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at

Twenty-five minutes after

Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 4th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MR. DESJARDINS.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion to agree to resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th).

MR. OUIMET said that it was not his intention to make a long speech on the tariff. He thought that the members who had spoken had succeeded in adducing all the arguments for or against the resolutions of the hon. the Finance Minister. In his humble opinion, he believed that the arguments brought against the principle of Protection had been entirely refuted by the speakers who had preceded him. Everyone was aware that the late elections had taken place upon the relative merits of Protection and Free-trade. The members of the Conservative party and himself had strongly, courageously and victoriously fought the battle of the system that they considered the most advantageous for the country, not for the triumph of a party, but in order to extricate the country from the crisis which threatened to overwhelm it. He thought, therefore, that it was superfluous for him to say that he would vote for the principle of Protection and for the present tariff, which embodied this principle, though later, when the details of the tariff would come under discussion, he might object to some of them, and ask for a little more or a little less Protection, according to the case. But, although they might differ on some of the details of the tariff, he was of opinion that, when they would be called upon to vote for the principle of Protection, the great Conservative party would vote as a single man in favour of the resolutions brought down by the hon. the Finance Minister. In voting for Protection, they would only echo that which they had advocated during the late elections, and which the people had seen fit to ratify. The people had not thought of consulting a long array of figures, or authors who had written upon Free-trade and Protection. The people, with their characteristic good sense, had merely considered the question as a worthy father of a family would consider his own domestic

affairs. They said that with Free-trade they had continually bought more than they could sell, that they had their work done in foreign countries, whilst there was no employment at home; a crisis having been the result of this, the people concluded that in order to remedy this deplorable state of affairs, it was necessary to buy less, and produce more; to think less, and to work more. That was the line of argument pursued by the people in voting for Protection as against Free-trade, and this argument could be supported by figures and reasonings, furnished by authors and statisticians. From the commercial reports it might be seen that the products exported, and the few manufactured articles that were sold were not sufficiently profitable to pay for the importations. Canada bought from foreign countries \$56,000,000 worth of goods that might be produced or manufactured in the country. If, then, these goods were produced or manufactured here, the country would save, not \$56,000,000, it was true, but at least two-thirds of that sum. Canada would retain all the capital that was now sent abroad to purchase the goods that might be purchased here, such as farm produce, pork, butter, cattle, barley, oats, Indian corn, etc., which represents the sum of \$23,000,000, as well as the capital represented by the labour required for the manufacturing of articles, the raw material of which this country did not possess, but which could be made here. Why should Canadians pay foreigners for work that they could perform themselves? Why should they not keep this money in the country, thus enabling themselves to pay their debts, and develop their natural resources? Canada imported from foreign parts manufactured goods to the amount of nearly \$33,300,000, 75 per cent of which sum represented the raw material, and the remainder the labour required for the manufacturing of these goods. If this calculation were taken as a basis, it would be seen that the fact of the cost of these goods representing the value required could be economised by having the work done in the country; that was to say, that a sum of nearly nine millions of dollars would remain in the country. Was this not important, in view of the fact that the country was contracting every year new debts that would pro-

bably not be got rid of for a long time to come, if the present crisis continued? Was it not necessary, in order to pay the national debt, and the interest on the same, to keep in the country as much capital as possible? Then, whilst they could honourably meet all their liabilities, the Canadian people would have a surplus sufficient to enable them to extend their trade and develop their industries. Surely this result might be hoped for, in view of the immense resources of the country, which, if they were developed, would place Canada among the most important nations of the world, from a political and commercial standpoint. He did not intend to dwell at any length upon these considerations, which, according to him, presented themselves naturally to any ordinary observer whose mind was not filled with abstract ideas of political economy, and who examined, ever so little, what was passing around him. He said that everyone was a Free-trader in principle. It was understood that, if the Americans were willing to exchange their produce for Canadian goods, on an equal footing, there would be no need of racking one's brains in order to create new industries. If things were thus, the industries the most suitable to Canada should alone be developed. But, since the neighbouring people would not consent to exchange with Canada on an equal footing, it had become necessary to endeavour to get along without them. Since they imposed heavy Customs duties on the mineral, agricultural, and other products of Canada, it was only natural, in order to counterpoise this action, that Canadians should endeavour to reciprocate. Was it necessary to show that Canada was not on an equal footing with other countries? Free-trade did not exist anywhere; it was impossible to establish Free-trade with a Protectionist country. Canadians were obliged to say that, since their neighbours were so unreasonable, they should treat them as they treated others, and put themselves on an equal footing with them. That was the position Canada occupied towards the United States. Nature had endowed Canada with the means of protecting her own interest, and she should profit thereby. He believed that these considerations would be sufficient to convince the House that his

opinion was the same now as it had been for the last few months, and during the late elections; that was to say, that he was in favour of Protection. He was not in the habit of taking up the time of the House, and he certainly would not have done so had not so many circumstances rendered it necessary for him to reaffirm his principles. The opponents of Protection, in spite of the severe rebuke they had received from the people, had seen fit to reaffirm their theories in the House. It seemed to him that this was laughing at the opinion of the vast majority of a whole people who had formally expressed their views at the last election. This House was obliged to accept Protection, since it was imposed upon them by the people. It might happen, though he did not think so, that experience would prove that Protection would not procure all the advantages that were expected from it; but the people asked that a fair trial be given it, and it was the duty of every Canadian, whatever might be his preconceived ideas upon the subject of political economy, to accept the verdict rendered on the 17th of September last. It had been stated, in a threatening way, that England would not approve of a tariff that seemed contrary to her interests; but where was the Englishman who could seriously refuse to Canada the right of legislating in her own interests? Even in England public opinion was divided on the question of Protection, and there were many who thought that it was the only remedy against the financial and industrial crisis that threatened to make of that country a heap of ruins. It was possible, however, that in England it would be thought that Canada was wrong; but he believed that public opinion in England would not blame Canada for having tried, by all possible means, to develop her agricultural, industrial and mining resources. He held, on the contrary, that England should give Canada credit for the effort she was making in order to meet the liabilities she had contracted towards English capitalists. By increasing her commercial and industrial prosperity, not only would Canada be able to pay the debt that she had contracted in England, but she would likewise be able to meet the expenses of administration. She could then reduce,

MR. OUMET.

year by year, the sinking fund of the divers loans she had made. Moreover, when responsible government had been granted to Canada by the British North America Act, had she not been conceded the right to frame her tariff as she saw fit? Canada had the right of governing herself, and if this right was now refused to her, she would be well able to demand it. He thought that the conduct of the Opposition was unpatriotic, for, on the one hand, they were calling down upon the House the anger or rather the tyranny of Great Britain, whilst, on the other hand, they threatened the country with the retaliation of the United States. If Canadians could not exist as a free people, if they were not intelligent enough to settle their own affairs without the help of English officials, it would be better that they should be told so forthwith, so that they might endeavour to educate themselves. If, on the other hand, Canadians had not resources enough to live independently of the neighbouring Republic, if they could not subsist without the help of the Americans, it would be well that they should be made aware of the fact at once. For, if they were obliged to throw themselves into the arms of the Americans, it would be preferable to do so without delay, before they were entirely ruined. He said it reluctantly, for the word annexation was repugnant to the feelings of a true British subject, but, if such were the case, immediate annexation to the States would, perhaps, be better. That was how the Opposition had seen fit to speak. On the one hand, the anger of an implacable tyrant, on the other, the rancour of a relentless neighbour, who would never forgive Canada for having done that which he had been doing himself for the last few years; that was to say, having closed her markets against him, as he had closed his. The vote that was to be taken on the resolutions submitted by the hon. the Finance Minister, unless it pleased the gentlemen on the other side to move some amendment, would merely be in favour of the principles of Protection. The tariff, as a whole, was worthy of approval. Whilst it protected Canadian industries, it would help trade, agriculture, and the mining interests. At the same time, it would procure for Canadian workmen the em-

ployment they were in want of, because this employment was now given to strangers. In the second place, the vote that was to be given would be a protest against the statements and the speeches of the Opposition, that had endeavoured to scare the House by threatening it with the anger of the United States, and of England. It would be a vote given in favour of the constitutional and commercial liberty of Canada; it would be a vote that would assert the existence of Canada as a nation distinct, not only from England, but also from the United States. As he had already stated, this great National Policy, by increasing the wealth of the country, would furnish Canada with the means of meeting all her obligations to England, and, consequently, Englishmen could not but rejoice at the thought that there was in Canada a population, intelligent and industrious enough to go and borrow their capital from England, and to pay her the interest thereon, as well as to refund the principal when required. That was the true meaning that he gave to his vote, in as far as England was concerned. It was not a financial, industrial or administrative revolt, it was merely the assertion of the rights of this Confederation, it was the assertion of the national existence of Canada. At the same time it was the most solemn assertion that could be made of the fact that there was in this country an honourable population that sought the means of living, the means of developing its resources, and of meeting its liabilities. It was, therefore, with pleasure that he would vote for the resolutions of the hon. the Finance Minister, but he wished to be perfectly free with regard to the details of the tariff, when they would come up for discussion.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said, referring to the resolution now in the Speaker's hands, it would seem that but little more could be said on the subject. However, the policy now being pursued by the Government, being a revolutionary one, as had been stated by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), it seemed the duty of every member opposed to such a retrograde step to enter a protest against the tariff now being introduced by the Minister of Finance. Nearly all the hon. mem-

bers opposite who had spoken upon the question seemed to think, because they had been returned to power by the election of the 17th September last, that the question of Protection was settled, and should be accepted by the House without any remonstrance from those opposed to it. No such proposition as was now submitted to the House was submitted to the people during the last election, nor would the party now leading the House have dared to take such a tariff to run the elections on, particularly so in the Maritime Provinces. When it was announced in New Brunswick that a 35 per cent. tariff was to be proposed by the now leader of the Government, if his party succeeded to power, immediately a telegram was sent to Sir John A. Macdonald asking him if such was the case. He immediately answered that the assertion was an absurd falsehood, and that he had never proposed an increase but only a readjustment of the tariff. Did not the Minister of Finance, among his constituents in St. John, repudiate any increased taxation? Did he not, on three different occasions, in his campaign speeches, repudiate Protection as their policy? Did he not say he would have voted against a duty on flour, meal, coal, etc., if he had been in Parliament in 1875, thus leading them to suppose he would do so in 1879? Therefore he (Mr. Burpee) denied that this matter was settled on the 17th of September. At that time the question of Protection, as submitted to the House now, was not before the people. There were a large number in this House, and a very large proportion of the people, entirely opposed to it. In Ontario it had, no doubt, formed part of the issue, but in Quebec another powerful influence had turned the elections, and, as for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, if this tariff had been placed fairly before the electors, they would have rejected it and the men who supported it, as unsuitable to their interests, as he believed it was to the interests of the whole Dominion. He went further, and said that this tariff was diametrically opposed to the understanding with which the various Provinces entered into Confederation, and he was quite

sure the people of the Lower Provinces, had it been presented to them at that time, would not have entered the Union, neither would Great Britain have consented. The Opposition believed that manufacturers, under a revenue tariff, which would enable them to import their raw material free, had prospered, and would prosper more than under this system of Protection that was now imposed upon the country. This was the reason, he contended, why our manufacturers had suffered less during the depression than those of the United States. When our manufacturers had confined themselves to manufacturing, without embarking in other investments, they had prospered more than any other class in the country. Above all other considerations, both parties should strive to make this a cheap country to live in; to lessen instead of increase taxation, so as to encourage immigration, and especially immigration of an agricultural population. He would read from a speech delivered in Toronto by Sir Alexander Galt, in favour of inducing immigrants to come here by making Canada a cheap country, keeping duties at a moderate rate, and in opposition to the doctrine of Protection. Sir Alexander on that occasion had said:

"If we are to succeed in getting immigrants to Canada, we must not lose sight of the fact that it must be made attractive to them. It must be a cheap country. Immigrants must not find it as dear as other countries, which, perhaps, offer more advantages. That leads me to consider the question of high duties on imports. High rates have, unquestionably, made the United States a dear country, and Canada is a comparatively cheap country because of its moderate duties, which, perhaps, afford the most direct compensation for the natural advantages which the adjoining Republic possesses over the Dominion. I do not believe there is any advantage whatever in the doctrine of extreme Protection. I do not believe it is possible to develop manufactures on any large scale by high duties. Our market is too limited. We have only four millions of people to supply, and it must be perfectly clear that the result of high duties would be to create an artificial industry—an industry which does not rest on its own intrinsic merits. It is to be observed that Protection—high duties—enhance the cost of every other article as well as that in which a particular manufacturer may be interested. It renders it more expensive for any manufacturer to manufacture his goods. If everything the boot and shoe maker uses is taxed, it is evident that his goods must be dearer. The result would

MR. BURPEE.

consequently be that the exportation of our surplus goods to foreign countries would become absolutely impossible. We cannot have an export trade if the goods are made artificially dear in this country. We have in the United States a most complete example of that. That is a country which ought to be the cheapest country in the world, which has the largest amount of available lands, and every material advantage, and yet, by a wrong system of legislation and economic policy, the people have succeeded for many years past in making it one of the dearest in the world instead of the cheapest."

He (Mr. Burpee) would point out that the result of Protection was to make the rich man richer, and the poor man poorer; to tax the great consuming class of our country, to make the necessaries of life dear, to divert labour and capital from natural to artificial channels, to draw the farming population from the rural districts into cities and towns, and to injure the labouring classes by enhancing the price of everything they used. He asked what was the first thing the manufacturer did when commercial depression came upon him? He did not first seek to curtail his own and other expenses, but looked around to see first how many men he could dismiss, and next how far he could reduce the wages of those he retained. This was the way he curtailed his expenses, and it was the man who depended upon his daily wages who suffered. The Finance Minister had stated there had been a great depreciation in the value of our importations. This was true, and he (Mr. Burpee) was glad he had admitted it, and that was a proof of what those now in Opposition had said over and over again, that, if that depreciation had not occurred, there had been goods enough imported during the past three or four years to prevent any deficit taking place, and there would have been none. He was satisfied that Canada had not been such a slaughter market for the United States as the Finance Minister had supposed. When representations of that kind had been made to the late Government, they took pains to ascertain how far goods coming from the United States were undervalued, and the list of prices in New York was repeatedly sent to Customs officers, with instructions to collect the revenue upon the value there given. A specific complaint had been made by a manufacturer of weights and scales

in Canada that imported American scales were largely undervalued. The Government had made investigations at the several ports, which convinced the manufacturer himself that he was wrong in his impression, and he wrote the Department to that effect. He (Mr. Burpee) believed that the expectation of the Finance Minister that the price of tea would be reduced under the new regulations would not be realised. Facilities would be afforded to importers to import direct through the United States in bond, and the whole tea trade of the country would perhaps come in that way. Only two small lots of tea, he believed, had come direct by the St. Lawrence since Confederation, so that the 10 per cent. differential duty, as against the United States, would not give the consumer one single cent advantage that he had not now. The drawback system, which the Finance Minister offered to manufacturers to encourage the exportation of manufactured goods, he thought would result in so much trouble and expense to manufacturers that the amount of their drawback would be consumed in obtaining it. The Finance Minister had stated in his former speech that Canada, under the last tariff, levied a duty on merchandise from Great Britain of 17½ per cent. while she levied only 10 per cent. on goods from the United States, thus conveying the impression that Canada in her trade was favouring the United States as against Great Britain. This statement was not fair and was misleading. In his calculations, he (Mr. Tilley) included \$13,500,000 worth of grain and breadstuffs, \$12,000,000 worth of which was the production of the United States, and passed through Canada *in transitu*, destined for the European market, while giving Canada the great benefit of the carrying trade, and should not enter into such a calculation for dutiable purposes. He also included settlers' effects and coin and bullion, \$1,300,000, making in all \$13,300,000, and which should be deducted from his statement as to United States goods. Whatever discrimination existed in favour of one country over another by the old tariff had been made larger against Great Britain by the tariff the Finance Minister was asking them to pass. The goods paying duty was alike, 20 per cent.,

but the free list from the United States was much larger than from Great Britain. The proportion on the free list from the United States was larger now than before as against Great Britain. The Finance Minister had said that English goods paid 17½ per cent., while United States goods paid but 10 per cent. The fair statement of the case, including dutiable and free imports, would be as follows :—

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Dutiable and free goods imported | |
| from Great Britain..... | \$37,451,180 |
| Less coin and bullion and settlers' effects..... | 301,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$37,130,180 |
| The duties amounting to 17½ per cent. Of this total amount there were— | |
| Dutiable goods..... | \$32,130,783 |
| Free goods..... | 5,291,397 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$37,431,180 |
| Dutiable and free goods imported from the United States..... | |
| Less coin and bullion.. | \$ 626,315 |
| Settlers' effects..... | 676,145 |
| Breadstuffs, <i>in transitu</i> .. | 11,566,777 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$12,868,237 |
| Net..... | <hr/> |
| | \$35,759,952 |

On which the duties would equal 13½ per cent. This was a fair statement, taking dutiable and free goods together. But the fairer calculation would be to take the dutiable goods, as the free list was raw materials which were intended to be an advantage to a country to admit free. The dutiable goods were :—From Great Britain, \$32,139,783 paying 20 per cent. ; from the United States, \$23,464,563, paying 20 per cent. The Finance Minister, by the tariff now submitted to the House, had taken from the free list of goods from Great Britain \$3,430,882, leaving of goods imported from Great Britain, \$1,682,515 on the free list. Of free goods from France and Geamany, \$967,905, he took \$440,220, leaving \$527,685. From goods imported from the United States he took out \$16,959,400, including the \$12,000,000 of grain *in transitu*, leaving about \$8,000,000 on the free list for the United States. Taking the Minister of Finance's calculation as a basis on last year's importations, and adding the amounts taken out of the free list made dutiable, they would find the percentage of duty to be, from Great Britain 18¼

per cent., and from the United States $11\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., as against $17\frac{1}{8}$ and $13\frac{1}{2}$. But to show the further discrimination against Great Britain under the tariff submitted, they must take into consideration the increased duty to be levied on imports from each country, which would be found to be an increased duty over the former tariff, on goods from Great Britain $10\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., and on goods from the United States but 5 per cent., as he would explain presently in detail. The Finance Minister submitted to the House a statement showing the imports of certain classes of goods from Great Britain and the United States, showing \$28,606,691 from the United States, and \$17,983,321 from Great Britain, the object being to show our large importations from the United States. The Minister, in this statement, had included the \$13,500,000 of goods *in transitu* through Canada. He had also included raw cotton and other raw materials still left on the free list, which would reduce the \$28,606,000 from the United States, to \$13,000,000. There were other items that would reduce it still further. The hon. gentleman's statement was, therefore, not correct, but greatly misleading as to the true state of trade. The taxation proposed in the tariff submitted to the House would either place upon the people, for revenue purposes or take out of their pockets something over seven millions of dollars. He did not mean to say that this would go into the revenue, but for the first year or two probably between three and four millions of it would. The year 1878-9 would not receive much or any benefit from this, but revenue would be increased from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 millions during the next following two or three years, and the balance would be a direct tax on the people. He would give the details to which he had referred, based on the importations of 1878, as shown by the trade returns. The increased duty on specific dutiable goods would be \$244,095, made up of \$189,997 on goods from Great Britain, and \$54,097 on goods from the United States. The total increased duty under the tariff on goods subject to specific and *ad valorem* duty would be \$584,730, made up of \$294,730 on English goods, and \$290,000 on American goods. The total increased duty on the 20 per cent.

list would be \$33,447, made up of \$11,447 on English, and \$22,000 on American goods. The total increased duty on goods on the $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. list, which had been raised to 20 per cent., would be \$388,093, made up of \$233,300 on British, and \$154,793 on American goods. On goods formerly paying $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and now on the 25 per cent. list, the total increased duty would be \$247,885, made up of \$99,285 on English, and \$148,600 on American goods. On goods which formerly paid $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and now on the 35 per cent. list, the total increased duty would be \$503,296, made up of \$346,375 on British, and \$156,921 on American goods. On goods formerly on the $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. list, and now on the 35 per cent. list, the total increased duty would be \$87,454, made up of \$6,730 on British, and \$80,724 on American goods. On cottons, on which the duty was now, on an average, at least $33\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and formerly $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the total increased duty would be \$1,115,467, made up of \$700,000 on British, and \$415,467 on American goods. On woollen goods the duty was now 35 per cent. at least, formerly $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and on these the increase amounted to \$1,555,015, made up of \$1,477,382 on goods from Great Britain, and of \$77,633 on goods from the United States. The total increased duty on other goods, which had formerly been on the $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. list, would be \$186,970, of which \$62,325 would be paid by British as against \$124,647 by American goods. There would be other increases, which made up the total increased duty under the tariff of \$7,346,361, made up of \$4,528,190 on goods coming from Great Britain, and of \$2,818,165 on goods coming from the United States. He allowed for reduction of duties on molasses, tea, etc., \$291,812, made up of \$100,812 on goods from Great Britain, and \$191,000 on those coming from the United States. This left the total increased duty under the tariff to be \$7,054,549, made up of \$4,427,378 on British, and of \$2,627,165 on American goods. The increase per cent. of duties collected on goods coming from Great Britain was $10\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., and, on merchandise from the United States, 5 per cent. The amendments introduced by the hon. the Minister of

Finance, the other evening, would change some of the items, but would not affect the aggregate as submitted. This showed the amount the Minister of Finance stated he would transfer from English to American goods was not correct, and would not be carried out by the tariff. Further than this, he believed that this tariff, as it discriminated so largely against English merchandise coming to Canada, was one of the worst possible policies that this country could pursue towards Great Britain at the present time, when England was our best market for farm produce, lumber and other exports. She gave us a free market, and all possible advantages, to encourage our exports to that country, admitting our goods free of duty, and befriending us in every possible way financially, and, therefore, placing these heavy duties on English goods was, he maintained, the worst blow that ever was struck at the connexion between Canada and Great Britain. They had been led to suppose the taxation imposed was not against Great Britain, but the examination of the returns showed the very reverse. They had heard much about the tea duty, and that former taxation discriminated against the poor man's tea, which was not true. But, under the present tariff, a differential duty was imposed on flour. On the poor man's flour, costing \$5 per barrel, a duty of 10 per cent. was levied, and on the rich man's flour, costing \$10 per barrel, a duty of 5 per cent. The increase on meal was 16 per cent. against the man who used it, and on corn 15 per cent. The duty on cotton and woollen goods discriminated largely against the working classes—from 10 to 15 per cent. more than the rich man—and his clothing 20 per cent. more than the rich man. This was the case with books and crockery. So the duties imposed on articles of consumption largely used by the mass of the people and the working classes were much heavier than the articles purchased by those who were able to pay higher prices. It was a tariff discriminating largely against the great mass of consumers, and particularly against the labouring class, as well as discriminating against Great Britain. The duties were also increased on raw materials used for manufacturing purposes. The duty on

raw material entering into the manufacture of boots and shoes was advanced from 14 to 20 per cent.; of furniture from $5\frac{1}{2}$ to 9 per cent.; of carriages from 13 to 21 per cent.; of lumber from 10 to 22 per cent., and of agricultural implements from $6\frac{1}{2}$ to 16 per cent. The duty on founders' raw material was increased from 4 to 15 per cent., and on shipbuilders' material from 2 to 7 per cent., and so on all through the list. Therefore, besides the labouring classes, who were largely burdened by these taxes, the manufacturers themselves were burdened by an increase of duties on their raw material. The goods entered on the free list last year were valued at \$30,619,000, and this year would be valued at \$10,000,000 in round numbers. The free list in the United States was very large, showing how freely they encouraged manufactures in this way. The goods so entered last year were valued at \$171,000,000. Hence, he maintained that this tariff was not in the interest of any class in the community, while it was particularly burdensome on the labouring class, the lumbering interest, shipbuilding and the foundry interest, and especially upon the people of the Maritime Provinces. The people of New Brunswick consumed more dutiable goods than any other Province in the Dominion in proportion, excepting British Columbia, which stood in about the same position. They paid more to the revenue than the people of any other Province, and under the tariff their burdens, in this respect, would be increased more in proportion than would be the case in other parts of the Dominion, and they would feel it more heavily. Last year, and in 1876, they paid \$7.76 per head to the revenue, including all taxes for Federal purposes, and this tariff would further increase their burdens at least \$2.50 per head. It was consequently the duty of every member on the Opposition side of the House, and particularly of those from the Lower Provinces, to protest as strongly as possible against this increase of taxation on their people. The Finance Minister, under the assumption of wanting to raise \$2,100,000, had submitted a tariff to this House to tax the people of this Dominion to the enormous amount of \$7,000,000. They were not led to suppose that this would be the

case at Confederation, or to believe that the country would be committed to a highly protective tariff like this, in the face of our connection with the Mother Country, with whom we had Free-trade. It was unfair to England, as well as to Canada, and such a proposition would not have been recognised at the time of the Union. In view of the fact that England's ports were open to us, and we had the advantage of Free trade with Great Britain, the discrimination the proposed tariff imposed against her, as well as the evil consequences, and the enormous burdens it placed on the people of the Dominion, it was the duty of the people of Canada to protest vigorously against the resolutions submitted by the Minister of Finance.

MR. VALIN said he was in favour of the tariff as a whole, though there were some items which he might desire to see changed. In regard to the coal duty, one might suppose that he would vote against it, seeing that he was an importer to a considerable extent, but, on the contrary, he should vote in favour of it, because he thought it would benefit the whole country. The tariff question had always been a source of trouble in all countries. The late Government seemed to have forgotten the primary source of a nation's prosperity, in neglecting to do anything to foster our native industries. The first duty of every Government was to protect the working classes. When the labouring classes could obtain employment, they were quiet and peaceable, but, when they were without work, they became a source of trouble. He had observed, while on a visit to France, that she had protected the labouring classes, particularly her agricultural classes. In England, on the other hand, which was a Free-trade country, strikes and labour troubles were common, but there were none in France, for the reason that, in the latter country, the labouring classes were kept at work under a Protective system. He was well acquainted with all phases of the labour question, as he had employed, for a long time, 700 or 800 men. In the Province of Quebec they asked the late Government several times to protect the ship-building interest, which was absolutely necessary for large numbers of working-

MR. BURPEE.

men, but that Government had refused to do anything. The late Premier refused to call at Quebec when asked to do so, and having promised to do so on his return from the Lower Provinces, but passed off straight to Ottawa by special train. He noticed that under the present tariff there was a tax of 35 per cent. on furniture. This duty was absolutely necessary to protect our cabinet and furniture makers from ruinous American competition. In the city of Quebec there were furniture makers employing numbers of hands, who had been obliged to take their furniture to auction rooms in order to dispose of it, and that at a great sacrifice, whenever they wished to realise a little money. Instead of taxing American furniture 35 per cent. he thought Government should have taxed it 40 or 50 per cent. In Quebec, there was, until recently, a first class manufactory of cement, but it had been obliged to suspend operations. It might be said that the quality of the cement was not good, but he could testify, from experience in its use, that it was just as good as that imported. With respect to the wine duties, it had been said that the duty on French wine was too high, but he did not think so. It had been said that too high a duty on wine would encourage the manufacture of adulterated wine, which would poison the people. He believed, however, that the effect would rather be to secure greater purity in the wines consumed in this country. He had observed that France was protecting her shipping, and had lately voted 2,000,000 francs a year for that purpose. As France wanted to sell her wine, he thought we could induce her by-and-bye to admit our ships to her markets in exchange for her wine. Wine was always plentiful in France, and a great source of revenue. He believed she would shortly admit our ships on the same terms as English ships. In respect to the sugar duty, he would say that he was pretty well aware of the position in which that matter stood at present. During a period of 20 years he had traded with the West Indies, and had imported eight or ten cargoes of sugar, which he had sold in Canada. He thought that any policy which would increase our commerce with the West Indies deserved the cordial support of

this House. He thought a great trade could be built up between the two countries, Canada taking West Indies raw sugar, and that country taking our hay, hoops, boards and lumber generally. We knew that we wanted Protection on ships; although able to export a great many, we imported many likewise. This interest was neglected by the late Government, which had allowed the Maritime School, for granting certificates to masters and mates, to be shut up. The consequence was that vessels had sometimes suffered considerable loss and inconvenience from the difficulty in obtaining such requisite officers at Quebec, where they frequently lost a portion of their crews. With regard to the revenue, there must be the means of raising a sufficiency. Then our trade might be assisted at the same time, as we possessed many articles for which markets might be found abroad, where, also, our ships could find cargoes for Canada. To some countries they might carry ice, with profit, bringing back such useful articles as cotton and sugar. From India they could bring cotton for our mills, one of which, at Montreal, had prospered, paying dividends of 10 to 17½ per cent., which showed that manufactures might succeed here as well as in other lands. It was right to encourage, by the tariff, the sugar trade, from the indifference to which, shown of late years, it and the country had suffered greatly. We had imported, during the last four months, 17,367,000 lb. of sugar, which paid a duty of \$434,000. If it had been refined in this country, it would have paid but \$167,000. If we had paid our manufactures \$50,000 of bounty, there would have been left to the Government \$130,000. Now, with protection to our sugar and vessels, we would have more means of trading with foreign countries. We could lay down, in this country, sugar at 4c. per pound, exclusive of duty. He had presented petitions, some time ago, for a tax on foreign vessels navigating our waters. Such protection to Canadian vessels would give satisfaction to Quebec and the Lower Provinces, which would thereby be benefitted. In conclusion, he would say that he was in favour of the present tariff, which he hoped would be passed.

Mr. COURSOL said the resolutions would shortly be discussed item by item, and he would rather have waited till then to take part in this debate, in which every interest in this country was concerned, but he owed it to the large electoral division he represented; he owed it to himself, to express his views on the whole question, on the very principle of the measure. The inauguration of that truly National Policy could not be passed over in silence by the member for Montreal East; that, therefore, was his reason for asking the indulgence of the House for a few moments. The two parties who were divided in so extreme a manner on the questions of Free-trade and Protection, towards the end of the last Session, were once more face to face, and, if he might judge by the speeches of the hon. members on the left, as ardent for the struggle as ever; but, nevertheless, with this difference, that, in the interval, the people had spoken, the balance of power had passed to his side, and the Protectionist party had increased in number by reason of the weakness of the other. The Free-trade flag, which was waved so proudly, he might say so boldly, by the ex-Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright), that flag under whose folds had fled those brilliant orators, who, like the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), had, in times gone by, defended Protection, had been torn to ribbons by the spontaneous, but seriously reflected-on vote of the large majority of the electors of the Dominion. The people, ruined, starved for the past four years, were tired of high-sounding theories, and of those great economical principles which gave them no bread, and the complete defeat, deserved and foretold as it was, of the Free-trade party, was proclaimed by thousands and thousands of citizens, who gave free course to their joy—for the fall of that party who had proved their inability to do so little to countervail their faults had given them hope. The formation of a new Ministry to inaugurate a National Policy in harmony with the desire of the electors became necessary. The eyes of all were fixed on the right hon. member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald), who had so many times led his party to victory, and sustained the country through so

many trying crises. The Conservatives brought to mind the ardent, and so often prolonged struggles in which Sir George E. Cartier and himself had taken part, and in which they had so often defended their party's interests. He had pronounced the name of Sir George E. Cartier, that great statesman who could no longer serve his country but by the example he had left behind. Death had interfered, and cut asunder the union of two men who were the tie of two races. Sir George E. Cartier was no more; but his memory remained, his spirit was still among them, and the memory of this patriot—genial, courageous, faithful and loyal—would never perish. The Conservative party was again organised; men, possessing the confidence of their fellow-citizens, came from all parts of the Dominion, and one of them from beyond the sea, bearing their assistance to their victorious chief, and his motto, which had ever been the guide of his public acts, became theirs: "If we fight by the party and with the party, let us remember, also, that it is for the country." The Conservative party was logical, they honestly kept their promises, and the position they had taken proved it. They had promised, before the memorable 17th of September last, a Protective tariff to the people, a tariff which had for its aim and object to restore confidence to the public, to bring back to life our various industries, to extend our commercial relations, to benefit the agriculturists, to develop our mines, to utilise our water powers and manufactures. The Conservative party, which was the party of order, union and loyalty, had promised to put in execution a system of Protection. They had kept their word loyally, frankly, honestly, as they must other promises, the fulfilment of which was imperatively necessary if they wished to retain the confidence of the public. The National Policy had been already criticised in England and the United States, as had been mentioned by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Mr. Cartwright). They ought to have expected this—they did expect it, and, far from seeing in this fact an argument against the system which it inaugurated, they saw, on the contrary, a proof of its excellence. That policy was attacked because

it favoured our interests, our manufactures and commerce, because, through it we would be no longer at the mercy of manufacturers of other countries, and Canada would be for the Canadians instead of remaining, as it had been for the last five years, a mine open to foreigners and closed to ourselves. The introduction of those tariff resolutions had at once restored confidence among our various industries. It was but a few days since they were laid before the House, and already they saw, at Montreal, Hamilton, and a score more places, manufactories opening and preparing to commence operations. The joyous steam-whistle called the labourer to his work, and promised him bread. The American, practical and business-like, were among the first to place their funds in this new field of operation; before long, the English capitalist would follow his example, and prosperity would once more return to the hearth of our unfortunate fellow-countrymen, whom want of employment had forced to emigrate. But the benefit these resolutions had already been, and the greater benefit still they would be, in the economical situation of the country, was not their only importance. Those resolutions had already played an important part in the world of politics. They had worked a veritable revolution—pacific beyond a doubt—in our relations with the Mother Country. From them dated our commercial emancipation, as proved by the English Press, Liberal as well as Conservative. If, on one side, they blamed our new financial policy, because they were unable to judge of it from a Canadian standpoint, on the other, they were unanimous in declaring that the political change was the wish of the people, and that England had but one duty to fulfil, which was to leave to us the care of dealing with our commerce and our imposts as we saw fit. That fact was of vital importance to us, and would mark an era in our history. The verdict of the 17th September, and the firmness and honesty of the Ministry, had worked out this pacific revolution. We had acquired our entire commercial liberty and right to impose Customs duties, and the language of English statesmen, as well as the English press, recognised this state of things with a unanimity which should encourage

was to bring to perfection our National Policy. He had shown how the Ministry had fulfilled their pledges, given to the people during the late elections, so far as the National Policy was concerned, and he trusted would redeem the other pledges they had made. The system proclaimed on the 17th September last, the economical principle which had triumphed throughout the country, succeeded well, and should, by its application, afford a remedy to the evils from which the people had been suffering, and relieve their want. But the protection which would have allowed us to live free and independent of the foreign manufacturer, could not, seeing the limited number of our population, alone give to Canadian industry and commerce that impetus which all good Canadians would desire. The market being restricted, the productions of our manufacturers were condemned to be so likewise, as well as the number of the workmen employed. And, if the Ministry had adopted a policy of non-interference, like their predecessors, Protection might have been a remedy, but not a principle of strength and expansion. But those who formed Confederation and created the Dominion, the statesman who, for the last thirty years, had contributed more than any other to the rapid progress of the country, could not be contented with simply consoling our Provinces; they wished at the same time to heal these wounds and restore Canada and its flourishing market to the noble destiny which had awaited her. To do that, it was necessary to open up to our active and energetic population new fields of operation; to find outside consumers for the product of their work. Already, with England's consent, Sir A. T. Galt had opened negotiations with France and Spain, with a view to opening to us their ports and those of their colonies. This consent of the Mother Country, and those negotiations, were the crowning points of that economical revolution, the beneficial effects of which would be felt here years hence. That success, that undoubted progress, deserved a more worthy and more patriotic treatment than it met with from the Grit and Liberal Press. In its despair, smarting yet under its humiliating and crushing defeat, incapable for a moment of forgetting its rancour, it

seemed ready to give up the right of conducting our affairs, of watching over our destinies, of prying into our dearest interests—it seemed ready to renounce responsible government, the right to which was strengthened by the vote of last September. Their adversaries were deluding themselves if they thought for a single instant that the Mother Country would, in consequence of the tariff, dream of depriving us of our free institutions with which she had endowed us, of again plunging the country into trouble and discontent for the sole reason that we tried to procure more ample means of existence. Why should England wish to destroy our strength, our workingmen, our intellectual and moral advancement? Because they were born on the banks of the St. Lawrence, were they the less English subjects? Were they not under the shadow of the same flag as those who, by good or bad luck, were born on the shores of England? If it should come to that, they had espoused the quarrels of England, they had shed their blood on its battle-fields, and were ready to do it again. She knew it very well, and left us, without fear, every liberty of conducting our commercial affairs and our industries, and had shown herself more liberal towards us than even the so-called Liberals of this country. But since when had this fear of displeasing England occurred to our Liberals? Since when had they ceased to speak of independence? Since when had they ceased to turn their longing eyes on Washington? Since when had they ceased to desire annexation? Their extreme loyalty of to-day was not in accord with their sentiments of yesterday. They had invoked against these resolutions another line of argument. In the press, and even in the House itself, they quoted against them constantly American newspapers, and tried to convince the public that the course about to be pursued would have a disastrous result to the country. But what harm could the United States do us? Their tariff still existed, and had existed since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty—a tariff hostile to our interests. Had they not always treated Canada as a slaughter market for goods and manufactures? Had they not had for a number of years full liberty of

carrying off gold from our population, work from our labourers and bread from their families, ruining, one by one, all our manufacturers? How could we reproach ourselves if, brought by want to a sense of our duty, we wished Canada for the Canadians? Let them try, their adversaries could never convince them that they were serious in their arguments against the resolutions before the House. No; but the opportunity was too good for them to attack the tariff in view of the approaching elections in Quebec and Ontario. They hoped to gain ground. In rousing the prejudices of the people, they thought to obtain the power that escaped them. By throwing in discord, and trying to instil want of confidence in the minds of the people, they endeavoured, not to conquer Protection, but to arise from the abyss into which they were cast by the good sense of the people. He referred to a letter of Mr. Joly's, and to the speech of Mr. Laurier at Quebec, in favour of Protection, and asked were they sincere then, those Free-traders of to-day, when they so loudly proclaimed the excellence of Protection. Were they sincere to-day, those Protectionists of that time, when they advocated Free-trade? Whatever they might mean, he was sincere and convinced. He faithfully fulfilled his pledge when he declared himself in favour of the resolutions of the hon. the Finance Minister. He knew he spoke in the unanimous view of the largest electoral division of Canada—for even his opponents declared themselves Protectionists—when he said to the Government: "You have promised, we have together promised, to the people protection to every branch of industry. We hold your promise, and the people recognise that you honestly endeavour to find out that which will assure their existence and ameliorate their condition." The people would not be ungrateful, for their good sense and love of truth would make them always prefer uprightness to political charlatanism. But they had made other promises, other pledges, and the people expected them to do their duty towards them, for, if they needed Protection, they could not live without enjoying liberty, not only as to commercial relations and Customs, but, and above all, their con-

stitutional liberty. For himself, it was in the name of our ruined industries, now reviving; in the name of our closed factories and manufactures on the eve of reopening, and which would resume their operations with renewed vigour; in the name of the workingman, who would have work, and, with work, bread for his family; in fine, it was in the name of fifteen thousand electors, unanimous on this point, that he would pronounce himself, and that he would vote in favour of those resolutions. He again said that, in voting for these resolutions, he voted for the principle of Protection, reserving all his rights to vote, when they would be discussed in detail, according to the interests of his constituents, as it was his bounden duty and unflinching will to do, "by the party, with the party, but, and above all, for the country."

MR. GUTHRIE said he would like to make a few observations on some aspects of the question now before the House. He thought that some of the followers of the hon. gentleman the Premier had shown that they had a lurking fear and doubt in their minds as to whether this great National Policy would, after all, give that prosperity to the industries of the country which they had promised. They seemed to fear that it would fail, and they were prepared to take shelter under the plea that the people had demanded the policy. They were prepared to say, in the event of the tariff's turning out disastrously: "We were but the servants of the people in introducing it; we but followed the demands of the people." But who educated the people to the point of asking for any such policy as that? What political party pretended to set aside political principle for the nonce, and assumed the disguise of philanthropists and patriots? Who cried: "Vote for Canada for the Canadians," but the hon. gentlemen opposite? Who taught the people that the notions of old John Bull were antiquated, bad, ignorant, and infinitely inferior to those of the shrewd, practical Yankee? Not only were gentlemen opposite responsible for the introduction of this question, but for the working of it up, and, so far, they alone had reaped the benefits promised after the 17th September. He denied that the people had demanded

this policy. It had never been submitted to them. It had been abundantly shown that what the people demanded in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island was not a scheme of enormous taxation such as this, but simply a readjustment without increased burdens to the consumer. What was promised the people of Quebec and Ontario was a reciprocity of tariffs with the Americans, if Canadians could not get reciprocity of trade; and there was no reciprocity of tariffs in this proposal. It was concealed from the people that the tariff was to be framed against England, which admitted Canadian products free, in a spirit almost more hostile against England than it was against the United States. If this policy failed, as fail he believed it would, it was idle for hon. gentlemen opposite to take refuge from the charge of having revolutionised the fiscal policy of the country, to its disaster, under the pretence that the people demanded it. But, besides, those gentlemen were rather apprehensive as to what the Canadian people might say with regard to this scheme in respect to their relations to England, and as to what might be said of it in the Mother Country. They attempted to allay the fears of Canada on the one hand, and the fears of England on the other by misrepresentations. The Finance Minister told the House and the people that the tariff discriminated more against goods coming from the United States than from England; that was to allay the apprehensions of Canadians. Then, with regard to England, he said that they had constructed canals and railways in order to facilitate commerce with that country, and that they were putting on taxes merely for the purpose of paying the Canadian debt for those works, and thus the English people would be satisfied. Was that the whole truth? Had they not the avowal of the Finance Minister himself that this tariff was intended not merely to raise taxes, but to destroy foreign competition in Canada? The people of England would not have the dust thrown in their eyes in that way, and would not be satisfied either with the Ministerial explanations or policy. They further attempted to allay another fear; they said to the Opposition that, if they had been in power,

they, too, would have had to increase the tariff or raise more taxes. Had the Opposition party ever objected to raising more taxes to pay the deficits and the ordinary expenses? Had any member on that side blamed hon. gentlemen opposite for any endeavour to pay their way? Not at all. They knew better. Their complaint was that Ministers had put on taxes, not to obtain more revenue, but to destroy revenue.

MR. TILLEY: We are going to get \$4,000,000.

MR. GUTHRIE said that they were going to get \$4,000,000, but to make the people sweat to the extent of \$8,000,000 in the operation. The Opposition complained that by this tariff they assisted certain manufacturers at the expense of the people generally, while they only put a small part of the exactions into the public Treasury. The tariff bore evidence of an apprehension on their part that they had been grossly mistaken in advocating a retaliatory policy. If they were honest in advocating before the people that reciprocity of tariffs should be adopted if the Americans failed to give Canada reciprocity of trade, why were they afraid to come down with a tariff carrying out such views? Why did they shrink from putting the American duty of 10c. a bushel on corn, if honest? Why did they put the whole American duty on barley? Because they knew that there was no American barley imported into Canada; and they knew that 10c. on corn would prove a greater injury than 7½c., the 15c. on barley proving no injury at all. They had not the courage of their convictions, if they thought that a thorough reciprocity of tariffs would be likely to force the Americans to give reciprocity of trade. He charged them, then, with either presenting what was only a half measure, or else with a deliberate attempt to deceive the people when they preached the doctrine that, on Canadian products going to the States, they and not the Americans paid the duty; for, as had been well said, if the consumer paid the duty on agricultural products, why should they hesitate to impose the full amount of the American duty on agricultural products coming from them to this country? What was the apology

for the present change in their whole fiscal policy—the revolution which, in the words of the Finance Minister, “would reach every industry, manufacturing, agricultural, mining, shipping, fishing and lumbering, and which affected every person in the country?” What was its excuse? It was altogether based on what he did not hesitate to say was a foul slander on the position of Canada. It was based on an assertion which the hon. gentleman did not venture to establish, and could not establish—on the wild, reckless assertion that it was “certain that in two years, with the present laws upon their Statute-books, every manufacturing industry would be destroyed, and the capital invested in it lost.” What proof of this was offered? Absolutely none. The hon. gentleman had interviewed all the manufacturers. Had he taken means to ascertain whether the business of those whom he had interviewed was profitable or not? Certainly, if he had not, he was not justified in giving one man 25 per cent., another 30, and another 35 per cent. protection. He (Mr. Guthrie) ventured to say that, if he (Mr. Tilley) had made these enquiries, they had not been truthfully answered, if manufacturers said they were being ruined; and the assertions upon which this tariff was brought before the House were utterly baseless and without foundation. They were told that this depression which existed in Canada—and which he (Mr. Guthrie) asserted did not exist in Canada to as great an extent as in that highly protected country over the border—could not be removed and prosperity revived, except by the destruction of foreign competition. The whole burden of the song of the hon. gentleman in this House, and his party throughout the country had been, shut out foreign goods, retain the home market, and then they would have prosperity. Besides giving home markets, which it was avowed was the intention of this proposal, it was based upon the principle that they were to adopt a policy of equivalents. The whole theory upon which the proposition was based had been that they would not foster one industry at the expense of another, and the right hon. gentleman who led the Government had stated that they would give equal and equivalent

protection to every industry in the country—agricultural, manufacturing, mining, and all the rest. That was the resolution that was introduced by the present Prime Minister last year, and that was what the hon. gentleman, in his Budget speech to this House, asserted to be his intention. If it could be shown that this measure did not give these equivalents, that this policy gave protection to some industries and injured others, then he would say that out of their own mouths they had evidence for asking the House and the country to reject this policy as one that was not intended by the country, nor promised by those gentlemen themselves. They proposed to give a home market to the farmer by putting a tariff on American produce, because, of course, agricultural produce came from no other country; but the mere giving of a home market was of no use to the farmer unless it gave him better prices for his produce. It was because it had been asserted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and believed by the farmer, that he would get better prices for his products, that the farmer was ready to believe in the cry of a home market. Now, what were the facts with regard to Protection to the farmer? It had been admitted by the hon. the Finance Minister himself, and by the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn), and it could not be contradicted, that, in regard to the great majority of the articles produced on the farm, the tariff could not increase the price, for, where they themselves produced a surplus, no duty could enhance the price; and they were dependent upon the prices in the foreign markets for the price of the whole. He had never met any advocates of this Protective system prepared to deny this. With the exception of corn, and perhaps pork, there was not a single article of agricultural produce that would have the price increased by putting a duty upon it. The duty on other products would be purely ornamental, and put on purely for deception. He would ask whether the American farmer got a higher price for his wheat because of the duty of 20c. a bushel on it? It was notorious that the farther they went West the less the price was, because it was farther from the seaboard. They found that the prices in the Eastern

markets were higher than those in the markets of Milwaukee and Chicago. They found, also, that the American farmer, who ought to be blessed, if it were a blessing, with the largest measure of Protection, was compelled to seek foreign markets for about \$600,000,000 worth of his produce. American farmers found that, instead of Protection furnishing consumers for their produce among the population of the United States, they had to depend on foreign countries for profitable returns. They found that, last year, the United States exported something like \$97,000,000 worth of wheat, about \$50,000,000 worth of hams and bacon, about \$30,000,000 worth of lard, about \$4,000,000 worth of butter, \$12,000,000 worth of cheese, and millions of dollars' worth of fruit and similar articles. Even the products of the orchard were dependent upon foreign markets for their prices. The exports of the United States, last year, of agricultural produce amounted to \$82 out of every \$100 worth of exports. They found that a large quantity of cotton goods had been imported, while something like \$180,000,000 worth of raw cotton had been exported. This great manufacturing country could not even work up their raw cotton grown by themselves, and supply the world with the manufactured article. They found also that order of value of the United States exports was: first, raw cotton; next, grain; third, agricultural products; and next, petroleum, and that manufactured goods were down in the scale altogether. In the face of facts like these, how could the hon. gentlemen pretend that the effect of their policy would be to give the farmer better prices for the great bulk of his products? And yet he had been induced to consent to this enormous system of taxation, on the pretence that he would have a home market and better prices. What equivalent did they propose to give lumbermen? The only thing he could see was that they would get cheaper molasses. In fact the whole tariff, so far as equivalents were concerned, seemed to be a tariff giving cheaper molasses. The hon. gentleman—he (Mr. Guthrie) used this confession against himself (Mr. Tilley) as destructive of the whole

theory on which this tariff was constructed—in his Budget speech did not pretend that Protection was going to be any benefit to the lumberman. Out of his own mouth he stood convicted in that regard. Then, as regarded the fishermen, he was in the same unfortunate position. He could not help being amused at the position taken by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Ogden). That hon. gentleman was reported to have formed one of a deputation to have the duties taken off the articles used in the repairing of ships, and he had expressed his profound gratitude to the hon. the Minister of Finance for having given them cheaper molasses, cheaper tea, and free salt, as if salt had not been free before. Had there ever been a more interesting spectacle of a merciful Minister, and a grateful follower! Was it pretended that there was any equivalent for the shipowner, and the shipbuilder? Was it pretended that there was any equivalent for the ordinary mechanic and labourer, except the absurd promise of the hon. the member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), given with great emphasis, that they would get more work? He thought that the mechanics, who had already paid more for their food, their woollens and cottons, would want something more than a vague promise from even so great and learned member as the hon. gentleman from Niagara, before they would be satisfied with this policy. The point he desired to call attention to was that this avowed policy of equivalents in fact gave no equivalents, except to some manufacturers, for this enormous taxation. If those hon. gentlemen believed in their own assertions, believed it was their duty equally to foster every great industry of the country, they must withdraw this tariff and substitute some other for it, if any other tariff could be constructed to accomplish such a result. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that there was something inconsistent in the statement made on his side of the House that, while it would be beneficial to manufacturers, for a time, to men who had manufactories now ready to make goods, and take advantage of the high prices, it would, in the end, prove disastrous to them. They knew, from the history of manufactories in the United States, that

company after company, which years ago paid large dividends of from 15 to 30 and 40 per cent., in many cases had not, for years past, paid any dividend whatever. They knew that more than half the blast furnaces in Pennsylvania were now cold, and that a large portion of the rolling mills in the United States were stopped. Everywhere there were indications of the distress which Protection and undue competition had reduced manufactories to in the United States, and yet hon. gentlemen told them they were inconsistent, because they said some manufacturers would be temporarily enriched and ultimately ruined. Prices would go up and keep up wherever there were combinations. Why, even under the old tariff there were combinations to keep up prices. It was well known that, in the article of stoves, which ought to have been cheaper than ever, iron, coal and labour being cheaper, consumers were made to pay from 12 to 15 per cent. extra price, owing to a combination amongst stove manufacturers; and the same thing could be done again. He maintained that combinations to raise prices did exist, and that this tariff would tend to foster and extend them. It would permit the manufacturers to combine to charge more than intrinsic values to the public. When manufacturers could successfully combine as they had done to change the politics of the country, they would combine more readily to keep up prices amongst themselves. That was the reason they said it was quite possible to have increased manufactures, and yet maintain prices sufficiently high to shut out foreign competition. Foreign competition could not be destroyed without encouraging combinations. The hon. the Finance Minister, feeling the force of the charge that prices would be augmented, ventured to quote instances to the contrary. He said something about woollen goods being cheap in the United States. He (Mr. Guthrie) would like to know if there had not been twelve or fifteen years of high prices before the low prices in woollens had been reached? It was notorious that Americans visiting Canada for years and years past had provided themselves with clothes, and carried them across the line, because they were a great deal cheaper in this country. It

MR. GUTHRIE.

might be that some articles had become cheaper after this long period of high prices. In the interest of the smaller towns and cities, like Galt and Guelph, they did not want this hot-house system of Protection. They had factories there that were flourishing and doing reasonably well; but the moment they raised the tariff as they had done, they invited capitalists to go extensively into manufacturing in large centres of population and trade. In this way they crushed out the smaller factories, just as the great distillery of Gooderham & Worts had crushed out the smaller distilleries, although it did not give the people cheaper whiskey. They knew that Protection had worked in this way in the United States. He had been credibly informed by a carriage-builder that the manufacture of carriages was carried on in the large centres in the East, and the smaller manufactories throughout the country were being destroyed. The people, however, did not get any cheaper carriages in the long run. They might for a time, until the manufacturers got control of the market, when the price would go up. This tariff was framed for the purpose of aiding the rich against the poor; of increasing the wealth of the large manufacturers, and of crushing out the smaller ones. He had a letter in his hand which went to show the injurious effect of the present tariff on the carriage-makers. They had control of the Canadian market now. The Government could not give them any more of the Canadian market than they had, but they were increasing the cost of production by taxing their iron, their steel, their coal. The Government was pretending to give them increased protection from 17½ per cent. to 30 per cent. The sales of the maker were not increased, and these additional taxes would come either out of the workmen's pockets in the shape of reduced wages, or of the farmers and others in shape of enhanced prices. He noticed that the system of drawbacks was to be introduced in all its glory or inglorious. He supposed, when the system was agreed upon by the Finance Minister, it did not occur to him that he was destroying the favourite doctrine of his party, that the consumer did not pay the duties. He would like to know why our manufac-

turers were entitled to a drawback, if the Americans or the British paid the duty?

MR. MACKENZIE: That is paying them double prices.

MR. GUTHRIE said, why should the people of this country refund money that these gentlemen had never paid? He should think that if this system of bounties was to be encouraged, the hon. gentleman would have to start a commission of enquiry in order to find out the duties of the respective countries to which the goods were to be exported. It had been freely pointed out that this system of drawbacks practically destroyed any pretence of protection to the farmer on wheat and oats. They had abundance of products for the consumption of our own people, and if our oatmeal millers and flour millers were to get back all they paid in duties, in other words not to pay duties at all, what benefit would this system be to the farmer? No one could explain it.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 69) Further to amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, limited.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the North American Mutual Life Insurance Company.—(Mr Mackenzie.)

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 71) To amend the Act relating to Banks and Banking, and the Acts amending the same.—(Mr. Tilley.)

Bill (No. 72) To explain and amend the Act respecting the appropriation of certain Dominion Lands in Manitoba.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the debate on resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise.

MR. GUTHRIE said the policy of equivalents was sought to be applied to all the Provinces, as well as all classes during the canvass resulting in the late election. Nova Scotia was promised such a duty on coal as would give its mine owners the control of the Ontario market, a promise which has been broken, according to the confession of hon gentlemen on the other side. As an offset to that, Ontario was promised a duty upon flour and manufactured goods. There might be some pretence, some room for argument, to say that these were equivalents, although he did not admit it. But would hon. gentlemen tell him what equivalent New Brunswick was to get for the load of taxation her favourite son proposed to put upon her? No one had even pretended that New Brunswick was to have any equivalent under this tariff. What equivalent was Prince Edward Island to receive? If we obtained reciprocity, Prince Edward Island might get some benefit, but, in the absence of reciprocity, there was absolutely no equivalent for this load of taxation heaped upon her. What equivalent was Manitoba to get—a Province whose progress would be seriously retarded by such a policy as this? What equivalent was British Columbia offered? They might say there was some pretence of an equivalent to Ontario for the tax upon coal, and there was some pretence of an equivalent to Nova Scotia for the duty upon breadstuffs, but there was absolutely none to the other Provinces. They were put in a position of being burdened by taxation with no corresponding advantage. In examining this doctrine a little further, what he asked was the relative positions of the different industries which were to be aided by this policy. In reference to lumber, after supplying our own market, we exported \$20,000,000 worth; after supplying our own people with beef and breadstuffs, we exported over \$25,000,000 worth; after supplying our own market with fish, we exported \$6,000,000 worth. All these great interests were to be sacrificed in favour of one small interest, the exports from which came to the magnificent sum of \$4,000,000. That showed the position in which the interests of this country stood. They were to have Government bonuses to certain manufacturers at the expense of interests

of greater magnitude in every way. He had been challenged to read a letter to which he had referred, which he had not then by him. He, however, now had it in his possession. It was as follows:—

“Like all I have seen and heard from as yet engaged in the carriage business (and on both sides of politics) we are not only disappointed, but very much dissatisfied. We expected, like all branches of business, that a readjustment would take place, but did not expect that our trade would be made to suffer as we are prepared to prove, more than any other industry in the country. There seems to be scarcely an article we use that has escaped the rise. It appears to us that when the tariff was framed they made a speciality of our business, for they signalled out some of our stock, such as bolts, nuts, screws and other things, and put them right up, besides putting all carriage hardware up to 30 per cent. It is also put on our iron, our steel, our coal. My men say I cannot take down their wages, as the tariff is on all they use, as well as what I buy in my business. What is the result? It is this. If I was going to sell all the stock I make to those rich manufacturers that we hear of, no doubt they would pay me an increased price, but I am still compelled to sell to the Canadian farmers, and nothing has been shown in the new tariff where or how he is to get three bushels in place of two, or how he will be able to buy three buggies instead of two. I have then to contend with the farmers and get it out of them or lose it myself.

“There are some very amusing features in the National Policy, on the benefits for our farmers. For instance, there is 2½ per cent. put on jewellery and plated ware, and about 10 per cent. on the iron that makes his horse-shoe, 12½ per cent. on the nails that hold it on, 50c. per ton on the coal that makes it, and 12½ per cent on the rasp that finishes it—a great help to Canadian farmers.”

The author of that letter was one of the Reeves of the town of Guelph, and the letter spoke for itself. In speaking of the attempt of hon. gentlemen to escape from the responsibility of this tariff by saying that had they, on the Opposition side, remained in power they would have had to resort to additional taxation, he took it that there was no one on that side of the House who was opposed to the imposition of taxation when necessary. Duties were not put on last year, because it was thought this depression would pass away, and that the income from the public revenue would be increased. The duties that were added two years ago were put on tea and some other articles, off which they could readily be taken again without disturbing trade. Had the late Finance Minister been in power

MR. GUTHRIE.

now, no doubt he would have put on increased duties. No one denied the propriety of putting on taxes when more money was required, but what he objected to was the way in which this Government had levied the duties, and the false principles which underlay their scheme of taxation. It was the avowed system of giving bounties to a few at the expense of the many. Another confession made by the hon. the Finance Minister was that this tariff was the result largely of interviews with deputations. What representations did these make? On what principle was 25 per cent. put on type and printers' materials? What representation did the hon. member for Cardwell make, as to the hardships of type foundry? What balance sheet had been shown as to the ruinous condition of their trade? What foundation was there for putting 30 per cent. on other articles? On what principle or on what information was an enormous duty put on cotton goods? The House was entitled to know what information the Finance Minister possessed before it was asked to pass a discriminating tariff such as this, in regard to the various interests of the country. They had confessions, not only from the Finance Minister, but also from his supporters. They were a remarkably happy family. Everyone's own particular industry or section of country was disappointed with regard to something or other. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) considered himself completely deceived in regard to the tax on coal, because the promise had not been kept that a sufficient duty would be imposed to give the mine owners of Nova Scotia control of the Ontario market. He was, however, going to support the tariff. The hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) found fault with the duty on wheat, as compared with that on flour. The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw) was dissatisfied with the duty on salt. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulback) was dissatisfied with the duty on breadstuffs, as, in fact, the whole of Nova Scotia was. So one hon. member after another on the Ministerial benches found fault with the tariff. But they

had the wonderful spectacle that these dissatisfied people cordially supported this policy, because it was called the National Policy. What a delicious piece of logic the hon. member for Pictou had treated the House to. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) had truly told the House that the majority of the gentlemen returned from Nova Scotia were not returned to support such a tariff as this, but merely a readjustment of duties, without increasing the burdens of the people. Oh, said the hon. member for Pictou, in reply, they were returned to support the National Policy, and this policy, though of a very different kind from what was expected, goes by the name of the "National Policy." This name "National Policy," which was very elastic and covered a multitude of sins, was made the ground for union, whereas there was, in reality, no union among these gentlemen. Although they did not agree with regard to the tariff, they were universally agreed upon the policy of keeping the Tory party in office. The Finance Minister had, evidently, doubts as to the success of his experiment. He spoke of it in a hesitating way. He said: "If I am not over-sanguine; if my friends are not over-sanguine, prosperity will follow." With regard to coal, he said: "If we are successful in our policy, the consumption of coal will be increased." The whole thing was based upon the "if." He must feel that, in departing from the principles of his lifetime, he was taking a leap in the dark. Could a gentleman of his intelligence, who knew the condition to which Protection brought England, doubt that this was a vicious system? Could he, when he considered the condition to which Protection had brought the United States, doubt that this was a very uncertain experiment? Could he forget that he had gloried in the prosperity of this country, under his former reign, when we had a revenue tariff? With reference to the condition of England in 1842, when it had the most perfect system of Protection that human ingenuity could devise, he would read the following extract from Miss Martineau's History of England:—

"Serious as was the task of the Minister (Sir R. Peel) in every view, the most immedi-

ate sympathy was felt for him on account of the fearful state of the people. The distress had now so deepened in the manufacturing districts, as to render it clearly inevitable that many must die, and a multitude be lowered to a state of sickness and irritability from want of food, while there seemed no chance of any member of the manufacturing classes coming out of the struggle at last with a vestige of property wherewith to begin the world again. The pressure had long extended beyond the interests first affected, and when the new Ministry came into power there seemed to be no class that was not threatened with ruin. In Carlisle the Committee of Enquiry found a fourth of the population was in a state bordering on starvation—actually certain to die of famine unless relieved by extraordinary exertions. In the woollen districts of Wiltshire the allowance to the independent labourer was not two-thirds of the minimum in the workhouse, and the large existing population consumed only a fourth of the bread and meat required by the much smaller population of 1820. In Stockport more than half the master spinners had failed before the close of 1842; dwelling houses, to the number of 3,000, were shut up; and the occupiers of many hundred more were unable to pay rates at all. Five thousand persons were walking the streets in compulsory idleness, and the Burnley guardians wrote to the Secretary of State that the distress was far beyond their management; so that a Government Commission and Government funds were sent down without delay. At a meeting in Manchester, where humble shop-keepers were the speakers, anecdotes were related which told more than declamation. Rent collectors were afraid to meet their principals, as no money could be collected. Provision dealers were subject to incursions from a wolfish man prowling for food for his children, or from a half frantic woman, with a dying baby at her breast, or from parties of ten or a dozen desperate wretches, who were levying contributions along the streets. The linen draper told how new clothes had become out of the question with his customers, and they bought only remnants and patches to mend the old ones. The baker was more and more surprised at the number of people who bought half pennyworths of bread; a provision dealer used to throw away outside scraps, but now respectable customers of 20 years' standing bought them in pennyworths to moisten their potatoes. These shop-keepers contemplated nothing but ruin from the impoverished condition of their customers. While poor-rates were increasing beyond all precedent, their trade was only one-half or one-third, or even one-tenth, of what it had been three years before."

Some stress had been laid on the "Balance of Trade," but, if hon. gentlemen would look at the statistics of the United States, they would find that the only years in which the balance of trade was

in favour of that country were years in which there was notoriously no prosperity there. For instance, in 1858, after the crash of 1857; in 1862, during the war; in 1874, 1876, 1877, and 1878, all of which were years of hardship, the balances of trade were in favour, as it was called, of the United States. The hon. the Minister of Finance had ventured, confessedly, upon an experiment. True, he might say "We are prepared to risk it." He could not help, in this connection, being reminded of a story told of the late Dr. Norman Macleod. When he was a young minister, the Chartist excitement was at its height. A shoemaker in his parish attempted to convince Dr Macleod that Chartism was right, and, after having argued the matter to his own entire satisfaction, he asked Dr. Macleod what he thought of it. Now, this shoemaker was not blessed with two sixpences to rub together. "Think of it," said the doctor, "I think it would lead to national bankruptcy." "National bankruptcy," said the shoemaker. "Deed, I am prepared to risk it." So these gentlemen were prepared to risk their reputations on making this experiment. What had they to lose? The country had a great deal to lose, but it would not do for any Finance Minister to come down here with a policy which he himself admitted was merely experimental, and ask us to enter upon a complete fiscal revolution. References had been made to the character of the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite at the elections. These promises were very varied; they were all things to all men, if by any means they might gain some. But there was one common characteristic of their promises, which was that the people would be enriched, that prosperity should come on them at once. The Prime Minister, at Yorkville, said that as soon as the Conservative party would come into power, even before the adoption of a National Policy, there would be a great change for the better. That part of their promises had been broken, and what could be expected of the balance? It was now, however, of no consequence to the Government whether their promises were redeemed or not, so long as they kept power. They reminded him of the celebrated American politician, Ben Butler, who made large promises on one

MR. GUTHRIE.

occasion to the people. When a friend, remonstrating with him, asked him how he ever expected to be able to redeem his promises, he said: "What I cannot redeem I can renew." Hon. gentlemen opposite were in the same position. The silence of his hon. friends on many points was very significant. It had been shown on one side that this system tended to encourage the demoralising practice of smuggling; that it fostered the making of fraudulent and false entries at the Custom-house; that it also encouraged combinations to raise prices, and stimulated the formation of corrupt rings to influence and control legislation for their own benefit. It had been shown that this policy tended to introduce the spirit of sectionalism, to create dissatisfaction among the several Provinces of this Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite were silent as to these things, although they had been three weeks discussing this question, and some hon. gentlemen opposite had shown real eloquence in their speeches, composed not so much of argument as of promises and declarations of their general belief as to the glorious effect of this policy. No one had ventured, squarely and fairly, to meet the well-founded objections urged from the Opposition side. What did they find in connection with the promises of those gentlemen to the people? The Finance Minister was reported at St. John to have almost bled at the heart on account of the unfair and improper duties placed on tea by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Cartwright). The Finance Minister, in that city, dwelt upon the enormity of putting a specific duty on all kinds of tea—thereby taxing the poor man's tea as much as the rich man's, and yet this hon. gentleman had now done the very same thing with the poor man's barrel of flour. He challenged the Finance Minister to deny that he denounced his predecessor for putting a specific duty on tea, and yet had done the very same thing in regard to flour.

MR. TILLEY: There is no parallel.

MR GUTHRIE said both the parallel and argument were against the hon. gentlemen opposite; because if it was evil to put a specific tax on a semi-luxury, like tea, it was a greater evil to

put a specific tax on an absolute necessary of life like flour. When they pointed out that the tendency of this policy was to endanger British connection, what was the answer?—So much the worse for British connection. When hon. members in Opposition pointed out that its tendency was to lead to annexation, he supposed the answer would be—So much the better for annexation. Then hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side had taught the people to despise the policy of the Motherland in regard to tariffs; to look for wisdom in this connection to the other side of the lines. What more natural, after this, than for the people to come to the conclusion that, if the Americans were so shrewd and wise as to have a superior fiscal policy, their political policy would be likely to be equally good? Hon. gentlemen opposite, who had framed this policy might reply—So much the better for annexation. They had witnessed the spectacle, not only in the country, but in the House, of the heaping of odium on political economists, the authorities on this question, who had been sneered at as “*doctrinaires*,” and that by men, who, three weeks ago, passed a vote of censure on the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec on the authority of similar *doctrinaires*. They were then told to look at the opinions of Bagehot and Freeman, but now, when they appealed to the same class as authorities on political economy, they were belittled as being mere *doctrinaires*. This policy had another objectionable feature: Under it, the independence of Parliament was threatened more than when placemen and contractors, as in olden times in England, held the fate of Government in their hands; it was a policy which enabled an unscrupulous Minister, by a change in the tariff, to enrich a friend or crush a foe. There was more danger in such a policy than in permitting placemen and contractors to fill seats in that House. The Finance Minister seemed in the position of being able to change the tariff when it suited himself, and of having each change applauded to the echo. In fact, those gentlemen opposite were ready for anything for the sake of office—always ready to applaud the Finance Minister, do what he might. But let

them remember that they were entering on a system which, no matter how injuriously it might work, it would be extremely difficult to change. What had been the experience in England? Although Protection had dragged the country down to the lowest condition, as described in the annals he had read; although the people were starving, it was not till hundreds of thousands had perished during the Irish famine, that the advocates of Free-trade were able to secure the abolition of the execrable Corn Laws. And, although the Protection policy had been disapproved of by the people of the United States, or a large majority of them, still the influence of the trade combinations and rings was so great that the people could not, or, up to this time, had not, been able to repeal it. They would be in a similar position in Canada. If there was a change of parties in five years, and any proposal was made to moderate the duties, they would be met with the cry that vested interests had been created, and deserved protection. They would be told that it would be unjust to ruin men who had come here to invest their money, in good faith, in Canadian manufactures; and there would be a great deal of force in that representation—an amount that they might not be able to deny. It would be difficult to change such a system, even should they have changed their views regarding it. He did not know what its effects would be, though he hoped the country would prosper in spite of that policy. Should prosperity come, the Government might be seen claiming the credit, as physicians sometimes did for cures effected, not by means of, but in spite of, their medicine, which had merely retarded the patient's recovery, and weakened his constitution. God might open the windows of heaven and pour out a blessing on the land, so that there should not be room enough to receive it; frail men might then claim credit for prosperity due to the beneficence of the Supreme. But he believed that, sooner or later, the time would come in this land, as it had in the Motherland, when no man claiming the name of statesman, whether Liberal or Conservative, would stain his reputation by advocating a system so narrow, so antiquated, so false,

and so injurious as that proposed by the hon. the Finance Minister for their adoption.

MR. MCCALLUM said he did not know that it would take much time to reply to the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat. He (Mr. McCallum) had taken notes of his remarks, and had paid particular attention, since the beginning of the debate, to the observations of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who had all been playing on the one string, the one tune, all the time. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) had stated that hon. members on the Ministerial side wanted to shelter themselves under the plea that the people wished for this policy—should it not turn out profitable. Well, it was a very good plea, but he believed that it would turn out beneficial to the people, who, in its submission to them, had approved of it. But what did they find in this House? Hon. gentlemen opposite, when on the Ministerial side, used to praise the agricultural population, and call them the honest yeomen, and appealed to them when it suited the party. But they had gone back on them sadly, speaking of them as the ignorant farmers of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite had made very strong assertions at the beginning of this debate; what they lacked in argument they made up by assertion, strong language, or noise. But the people had their eyes on them. The hon. gentleman found fault with the extent of the duty on carriages. Well, he (Mr. McCallum) believed that the tax on the articles entering into the manufacture of a buggy worth \$100 would be about \$2.50; and he thought the maker had protection now to the extent of 20 per cent. He (Mr. Guthrie) stated that the people in his part of the country wanted no Protection. He wanted that statement to go before that hon. gentleman, who was going home that night. He would like to ask those people if they did not want Protection from the agricultural products coming in from the United States, or if the manufacturers wanted no protection. Furthermore, as an illustration of one of his arguments, he stated that Messrs. Gooderham and Wortz, of Toronto, had destroyed all the distilleries throughout the country, which was a very serious

thing, he thought, for the poor man, because injurious to him. He (Mr. McCallum) did not see that it was an injury to the poor man that he did not get whiskey. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) had said his party were ready to raise the taxes to pay the indebtedness of the country, and keep up its credit. But how would they do it? He thought they were married to the indiscriminate 17½ per cent. rate; and when he told them his party were going to increase the duties he should have explained in what way. He (Mr. McCallum) believed he would be able to show that the only thing they would have done, had they remained in power, was to have resorted to direct taxation, without, at the same time, encouraging the industries of the people. They on the Ministerial side had been accused of disloyalty in connection with this tariff, but it did not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to make any such charge. He (Mr. McCallum) hardly knew what it meant. He believed that ninety-nine out of every hundred of the people of Canada were loyal, and that, if there was a disloyal man to be found, he would be in the ranks of those hon. gentlemen. The late Finance Minister had, in his lecture on Parliamentary propriety, accused his successor of having, in his addresses, spoken in a loud voice, and thumped his desk. He (Mr. McCallum) believed that hon. gentleman had received treatment sufficient to excite any man. But, when the ex-Finance Minister was in office, he used to adopt a tone of voice, in delivering his speeches, which seemed to imply that he thought himself monarch of all he surveyed. He thought himself so high above everybody that he would not condescend to speak to people. He had found fault with the present Finance Minister for receiving so many deputations, and so much advice from business men in regard to the raising of the revenue; but he, when occupying the same position, would not condescend to accept such advice or even speak to those delegations, his manner appearing to say "What do you know about those matters? I have been brought up in the country, at the head of a monetary institution, and now am Finance Minister." Hon. gentlemen opposite told them that the Mother Country, the United States,

and their own people, were also dissatisfied with this tariff. That could not be all true, because, if it was unsatisfactory to the other people, it must be favourable to, and could not take anything out of the pockets of, our own people. We had a perfect right to collect the money that was necessary to carry on the affairs of the country, and the United States were dissatisfied because a portion of the money would be taken from them if they took advantage of the markets of this country. It might be the same with England. Hon. gentlemen said: Look at England; she lets our goods go in free. But he would remind them that she allowed the goods of the whole world to go in free also. It was a matter of necessity to her to allow foreign breadstuffs to enter free for her toiling millions. It had been stated by the late Finance Minister that the money negotiated by the present Finance Minister might have been obtained on more advantageous terms. He (Mr. McCallum) did not know whether that would be so or not; but he knew that, in his former Budget speeches in this House, he (Mr. Cartwright) was reported to have said that, if they wanted to get money on the most advantageous terms, they must arrange the affairs of this country so that they could, at their own time, and long before it was wanted, go to England to make their loans; but he went out of office, and left his successor to provide for a large amount of indebtedness maturing within a very short time. He said at the time that he was prepared to meet all obligations, for he had the money from the Fisheries Award and other funds on hand. He (Mr. McCallum) remembered when hon. gentlemen opposite thought it a disgrace to ask any money consideration for the fisheries; but the hon. gentleman would be very glad to take advantage of the money received from the Fisheries Award to pay the indebtedness of the country. It was said that this tariff would destroy the trade of the North-West; that, by this arrangement, the farmers in that section could not get oxen from the United States. Well, he remembered a former occasion, when the late Government bought oxen for the Indians in the North-West, in order to make them engage in agricultural pursuits. They bought 100 Mon-

tana steers and gave them to the Indians, but they all ran away excepting twelve, and were now roaming over the North-West along with the buffalo. That was the kind of cattle they gave to the Indians. He was satisfied with the explanation of the Finance Minister in regard to the lumbering interest, and that no great injustice had been inflicted on that industry, as was shown by his hon. friend the member for North Renfrew, who was a good authority on that subject. The hon. gentlemen opposite said we were adopting a hostile policy as far as England was concerned. That, he believed, was not intended. He did not, for a moment, think that this policy would endanger the good feeling in England towards this country, because we chose to collect money from our own people with which to meet the necessary expenses of Government. When the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they had deficit after deficit, owing to their reckless extravagance and mismanagement. If they had taken warning, and rearranged the tariff at the proper time, to assist the industries of the country, Canada might, to-day, be in a prosperous condition. It was said: "Look at the United States." He (Mr. McCallum) wished his country was in as prosperous a condition as that country. He wished we were able to produce enough for ourselves, and have a balance to send all over the world, the same as the United States. Hon. gentlemen had spoken of the blast furnaces in that country being idle. He would like to know how many blast furnaces there were in this country, either idle or working. He thought that, if this tariff were carried out honestly, there would, during the next ten years, be numerous blast furnaces in this country. The hon. gentleman talked about the consumer, but he had scarcely said a word about the producer. If the hon. gentlemen would but reflect for a moment, they would see that producers were also consumers. It was said that this tariff robbed everybody, and that it would rob the robber, in the end. That was a most absurd proposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite were very much afraid that wealth would come into this country, and that the people would get rich. He

was sure that this policy would encourage capitalists to come into this country and start manufactories. He predicted that, in less than five years, we would produce enough for ourselves, and have something besides to sell to the world. The late Finance Minister stated that this was a cheap country for the workingman, that he could buy a fair dollar's worth for so much wages; but the trouble was that, under the management of the late Administration, the poor men could not get work, could not earn a day's wages. The people of this country were, day after day, praying for work, but those hon. gentlemen refused them, and yet they said this Government was discriminating against foreigners. Why not, if that was done in favour of the people of this country? It was said by the hon. gentleman that this tariff would make some people rich, and others poor. The hon. gentleman said that, when a man got more than a certain amount of money, he was dangerous to the community, that he made use of it to influence elections, or something of that kind. Of course, they knew that some of the great institutions of this country had taken a prominent part in elections, at least hon. gentlemen opposite had been accused of so using them. He remembered a certain manager of a bank taking part in an election, and that the Government used to keep a very large amount in his bank at the time, without interest, and they knew that he used pretty strong influence. He was amused, the other night, when the hon. gentleman the late Minister of Finance said he did not want to borrow money seven months before it was required. But, if he (Mr. McCallum) recollected aright, he (Mr. Cartwright) had, on one occasion, borrowed money twelve months before he wanted it, and he had lent it to some of the favoured banks of this country. He (Mr. Cartwright) said that this Government was going to take \$2,400,000 from the people. Why, the late Minister of Finance had taken \$3,000,000 in 1874, and then he said it was all right. He had raised the duty from 15 to 17½, and then he said they would have a surplus; but, like all his prophecies, it did not come true.

MR. MCCALLUM.

Mr. Cartwright, in his Budget speech in 1874, page 20, said :

"While I am on this subject, I trust I may be pardoned for saying that I rather think it will be found necessary, in the course of a few years, to consider, very seriously, the position in which the taxing power now stands. I have always looked upon it as a very objectionable principle to allow this House, the Local Legislatures, and the municipal bodies, to have the power of imposing almost any amount of taxes we may severally think fit. I am bound to say that, in the light of the result in the neighbouring country, and in many of our own municipalities, I consider it would be highly expedient to have a revision of the system, in order to see whether we cannot devise some mode of redistributing this power. However, this has no farther bearing upon the subject in hand, except as it bears upon the necessity for caution in imposing taxation. The chief reason for calling attention to it is this : that when any question arises between direct and indirect taxation, it will be well to remember that six millions are already levied by direct taxation, for local purposes, in the Province to which I have referred."

That showed conclusively that the hon. gentleman had in his mind to go to the people for direct taxation. In proof of that, he (Mr. McCallum) could not do better than to take the hon. gentleman's last year's speech. He thought, if the hon. gentleman were on this side of the House now, the taxgatherer would be going round amongst the people to collect the taxes out of their pockets, as if they had not enough municipal taxation, without direct taxation, to carry on the government of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman said last year, from *Hansard*, page 437 :

"Now, under these circumstances, it may not unnaturally be asked by some members of this House, whether it would not be advisable, in view of the fact that we have had, for two years, considerable deficits,—to adopt such precautions as would render the existence of another deficit practically impossible. Well, Sir, I would say at once, if we possessed in Canada any tax equivalent to the income tax now in use in England, I would not hesitate to advise the House to have recourse to that means of increasing the revenue."

They could see what was the intention of the hon. gentleman if he had remained in power. With reference to what hon. gentlemen said about farmers, he desired to say a word. He was an agriculturist himself, and he could speak feelingly on behalf of the agriculturists of the country. The agriculturists were

going to be more benefitted by this tariff than any class, because it would give them a home market, which was especially necessary in regard to perishable articles that would not bear transportation. It was amusing to hear the hon. gentlemen talking about the interests of the farmers and the arguments they used in that respect. These were the arguments which they used towards the farmer and the cabmen, which showed that the hon. gentlemen had two faces. They argued, on the one hand, that it would increase the price to the consumer; and, on the other, that it would not increase the price to the producer. These arguments were incompatible. Did the late Finance Minister offer them a home market when he was on that side of the House? No, he offered them no English market, and told them they could take their wheat to England at one farthing to a half-penny sterling per pound. The hon. gentleman himself had said upon this subject:

"I believe I am strictly accurate in saying that, at this present time, almost every one of the products of the farm can be transported from the farthest point on the east of Lake Superior to the city of London at a cost varying from one farthing to one halfpenny sterling per pound, although it may be, and I dare say it is, true, at present, a very considerable proportion of the profits is intercepted by the various middlemen engaged in that transportation; still, if that rate of freight can be maintained, and I see no reason why it should not be, it must be obvious to every hon. gentleman that an almost unlimited field is open to our agricultural population, and these are many cheering signs that they are heartily disposed to avail themselves of."

But the hon. gentleman said that the Government did not intend to carry out the policy. He (Mr. McCallum) desired to see what the hon. gentleman said about them last year, when he fancied they were deceiving the people. He said:

"He (Mr. Cartwright) thought that these gentlemen who were interested in Protection would do well to notice that it was no part of the hon. gentleman to raise the taxes if he got back to power, and that in the resolutions which he and his friends had submitted to the House, loopholes were carefully left whereby they were not necessarily committed to raise the duty on any one article, or to fulfil any one of the many delusive hopes which they were now holding out for the purpose of catching votes at the next election. He gave the hon. gentleman credit that he knew very well the enormous difficulties he would have to con-

tend with in enforcing his policy, and he had no doubt, if the hon. gentleman got back to power—of which, so far as the next election was concerned, there seemed but very little prospect—that he would find himself so cribbed, cabined and confined in every quarter that, if he attempted to make a slight readjustment of the tariff, he would invoke such opposition that he would have to content himself with a general tariff, which would not afford one whit more protection than the present one."

So much for Mr. Cartwright. He desired, in the next place, to reply to a few remarks that had fallen from the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). He said the present tariff robbed the farmer, the manufacturer, the labourer, and the mechanic, and that the robbers were robbed in the end. That statement, he considered, was irreconcilable. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) had said that the Minister of Finance was introducing a tariff that he could not get rid of for twenty years. He thought that, if hon. gentlemen expected to get back to power within the next twenty years, his hon. friend from North Oxford would not have talked in that way. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had told them, the other night, that they, on that side of the House, had put him in mind of a story of a snake, in which the tail governed the head. He knew the hon. gentleman was a philosopher, and he had no doubt at all that he spoke feelingly, and from the experience he had when he was on the Ministerial side of the House. He knew that when the hon. gentlemen behind them wiggled, the head had to move. They knew that, on a former occasion, a certain member of this House went down to one of the Departments, at the head of a deputation, with a pistol in his hand, and the Government had to alter their whole policy. It put him in mind of the old story of Crockett and the coon: "If you don't come down, I'll shoot." His hon. friend went to work to show that the people of this country would lose, by this policy, a great portion of their carrying trade. He argued that the country made 8c. a bushel out of the corn imported from the United States. He (Mr. McCallum) maintained that they

did not make a half cent a bushel profit, and he defied contradiction on that point. As far as the carrying trade of the country was concerned, he could not see that it would be injured by the policy. He considered it would induce our farmers to increase their production, and, consequently, the carrying trade would be increased. The hon. gentleman said we had enlarged our canals. Did the hon. gentlemen think we would have less traffic through our canals? He contended that the tariff, as introduced by the Finance Minister, would have the tendency of keeping a large amount of money in the country that had hitherto gone out of it, and which would be used in employing labour, instead of going to enrich other countries. That was one of the advantages of the present tariff. Hon. gentlemen said it was a great hardship to the Province of Ontario that a duty was placed on coal. He (Mr. McCallum) had consumed a thousand tons of coal last year, and expected to consume two thousand this year, and was perfectly satisfied with this duty, and, even if the hon. the Finance Minister thought proper, in the interest of the country, to impose a duty of 75c. per ton, he would not object to it, because he considered it better to pay a little extra for coal and have the money remain in the country, where all his interests lay, than pay 50c. or 75c. less for it per ton, and see his money go out of the country, never to return again. He held in his hand a statement showing that, under the old tariff, \$13,551,842 worth of agricultural products came free into this country. Under this tariff, these products were excluded by sufficiently heavy duties, thereby giving our farmers the advantage of supplying their own markets to this extent; on any importations of these products, the farmers would have the satisfaction of seeing that the importers had to pay so much additional into the revenue of the country. Animals and their products, some of which previously paid specific duties, and others 10 per cent. *ad valorem* duty, were, under this tariff, taxed 20 per cent., the estimated amount so taxed being \$2,120,792. So here, in all, was \$15,364,634 worth, which our farmers would have the advantage of supplying. Of course, hon. gentlemen oppo-

Mr. McCallum.

site said to the Maritime Provinces and to British Columbia: What do you gain by this? They talked about the duty on corn and meal and flour in the Lower Provinces, about wheat in Quebec, about the extra cost of coal in Ontario; so they spread themselves around all the Provinces, airing a pet grievance for each, trying to excite Province against Province, community against community; and all because they had not been allowed to govern this country. His hon. friend from South Huron was very wise in his day and generation, and his own estimation. He had been, he said, a Protectionist at one time, but had got older, and, thank God, had got wiser as well. Was he right before, or was he right now? On the Government side of the House they were not all fools, and the people of this country were capable of judging what suited their own interests. He (Mr. McCallum) believed this policy would advance the interests of the country, that it would produce the revenue anticipated, and would be a boon to the labouring classes, who, for the last five years, had been clamouring for work. The price of the manufactured article would, no doubt, rise in the first place, but, as the results in the United States proved, competition would soon bring it down. Everything that was necessary for the comfort of the people was very high in the United States at the period of the Civil War, but, to-day, they could pry 17½ per cent. duty and swamp our markets with their goods. They would do it at 20 per cent. It was well known that, when a manufacturing industry was started here, they sold the same goods here below cost in order to crush it out, and, when they succeeded and obtained control of our markets, they raised the prices and recouped themselves. He was willing to stand by this tariff; there might be in it some little things he would like to alter. He would like to see a little more duty on shipping, and a small duty on wool. He would like to see the duty taken off tea, but they had the assurance of the Finance Minister that, as soon as he saw his way clear to take off this duty, he would do so. Hon. gentlemen opposite said they were going to rob the people, they were going to get too much money. He was satisfied that

no more money would be taken than was necessary to pay the legitimate expenditure of the country. If the Finance Minister found, next year, he had got more money than he wanted, it would be an easy matter for him to take the duty off coffee and tea, and they had his assurance that he would do it. It was amusing to read the articles in the *Globe*, from which hon. gentlemen opposite took their arguments altogether. Take its issue of the 22nd March. Of course it said this policy would ruin the labouring man and the farmer. In the same article, it told the farmer in one place that he would have to pay much more for labour, and then it told the labouring man that the price of bread was going to rise. Now, if the effect of manufactories being started would raise the price of labour to the farmer, the labouring man got the benefit. To the cabman it said: You require 600 bushels of oats per year for your horse, which makes your loss, by the tariff, \$60 on that article. He asked the hon. gentlemen who made these objections to rest in peace and have patience. The people were willing to wait. They knew that the Government were trying to carry out their pledges. They did not expect to become all rich at once, but knew that, if they were frugal and industrious, they would benefit by this policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite might rest assured the people were looking at them, and, although they might characterise the people as ignorant, the people were discerning and intelligent, and they told those hon. gentlemen, on the 17th September, to skeddaddle, that they had mismanaged affairs long enough, and must give way to men of broader views. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not submit to this with the good grace that they should. They were appealing against the inevitable, against the judgment of the people; but the people were watching them, and he was glad there was a *Hansard*, in which every word they said was entered, for he looked forward to an era of prosperity under this policy, and it was well that there should be a record of the utterances of hon. members on this question, in particular, so that the people would know who were their true legislators.

MR. MILLS: The hon. member said that a hundred of cattle were lost in the Montana territory.

MR. McCALLUM: I only said eighty-eight; you got twelve.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman has been misinformed on the matter. A number of cattle were purchased under contract with Mr. McKay, of the North-West Territory. Those referred to escaped from the parties who had charge of them, and having, therefore, failed to deliver them at a certain point agreed on, Mr. McKay was not paid for them, up to the time this Government left office.

MR. McCALLUM: What did you do with the twelve? Did you give them to the Indians?

MR. MILLS: He was paid for them.

MR. GILLMOR said the condition of parties was very much changed since the last Parliament. He did not envy the hon. gentlemen who occupied the Treasury benches or their supporters. If they had attained a majority by fair and honest representations, they were entitled to their position, and he did not envy them under these circumstances. If they deceived the people, and owed their position to misrepresentation, he envied them still less. He had never, during the five years he sat in Parliament, made reference to his own constituency, although he had seen members bringing in their own local difficulties; but he must say, now, with reference to his constituency, that the contest there was not waged on the policy now being discussed. The canvass made by his opponent was against himself personally, and the late Administration. The National Policy, as now presented, was but dimly hinted at. He had the honour of having, among his constituents, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who enjoyed an influence there belonging to any gentleman occupying such an exalted position. The hon. the Minister of Finance was also one of his constituents, and had visited his county on several occasions, and had received several addresses, and replied to them; he (Mr. Gillmor) had not had the honour of hearing him on those occasions, but he had read the addresses in the newspapers, and was satisfied that he only hinted at the National Policy. There was no duty upon flour, no duty

upon corn, no duty upon meal, promised in any of his addresses there. But there was one thing which he promised in an address 'at St. Andrew's, and that was, that in six months from that time there would not be an idle man, woman, or child in the town of St. Andrew's. This was in reply to an address presented him by the town, when every one assembled to meet him—for wherever those great men went, there were always a good many that sought to bask in their smiles. He had never come down to that yet; he was not very wealthy, but he never yet "Wore the rags of any great man's looks, or fed upon their aftermeals;" and, therefore, as a rule, he generally received their opposition. The hon. the Finance Minister was an old acquaintance of his; about a quarter of a century ago he had the satisfaction of helping him into the first office which he filled. He believed personal good feeling still existed between them, but of late years his hon. friend, in his visits to Charlotte county, had not reciprocated former favours. In 1872 he visited his county, when he (Mr. Gillmor) thought he was sure to win. But, two days before the election, his hon. friend, in gratitude for past favours, made his visit, and the result was that he lost his election by a small majority. Still, he (Mr. Gillmor) made no charge at all against his hon. friend. It would be a pleasure to support him if he could conscientiously do so. He did not intend to weary the House by reading long lists of figures relating to the tariff question. He supposed there was no possibility of changing a vote in this Parliament; no amount of argument, and no amount of reason, or eloquence was going to change one vote upon this question. Two things had been prominent since the beginning of this discussion. In the first place, hon. gentlemen on the Government side had never failed to inform them, on the Opposition side, that they were in a minority. It was unnecessary to tell them so; they were fully conscious of it. But he would rather be in a minority, and acting according to his sense of duty and right, than be in a majority and acting contrary to his convictions. He did not, however, charge hon. members opposite with acting contrary to their convictions in this matter. Another circumstance he had observed

in this discussion was the amount of fulsome flattery, and the capacity to swallow it that had been manifested by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Really in old times they did not bow more obsequiously to Nebuchadnezzar's golden image than hon. gentlemen bowed to his hon. friend the Finance Minister. Every one of them had complimented him, bowing low before him. While listening to them, he had been reminded of the old maxim that flattery is the food of fools. They were not fools, but "now and then even men of wit could condescend to take a bit," and sometimes a very large bit of flattery. He really pitied the hon. the Finance Minister while he saw this going on. He knew it must be disagreeable to him to have every one of them, from the highest to the lowest, from the cleverest to the least clever, feeling it to be their bounden duty to tell him what a remarkable golden calf he had set up for them, in the shape of this tariff. He (Mr. Gillmor) was not opposed to a compliment; he was glad to receive one when it was merited, and sometimes he could swallow quite a large one. But, when they came to give it to a man in such quantities, in such chunks, he thought few men, except his hon. friend, could swallow it. He had listened to every speech that had been made since this discussion commenced. He had listened to the hon. the Finance Minister's statement when he pictured the glowing condition in which the finances of this country were when he left office in 1873, and drew a gloomy picture of their condition when he entered upon his duty now. He (Mr. Gillmor) failed to see how the late Government had made the financial condition of this country at all difficult, when the hon. gentleman came into office the second time. It was very unfair to try to make the country believe that its financial condition had been made worse by his predecessors. He did not believe facts would justify that assertion. How had the late Government made that condition any worse than it would have been if the hon. gentleman himself had been Finance Minister during the last five years? Had the late Government undertaken any financial obligation during their term of office, that would not have been equally under-

taken by the hon. gentleman and his associates if they had been in office? The whole thing was mortgaged long before the late Government came into office. The hon. gentleman complained that his position was difficult owing to the financial obligations of this Dominion. But who undertook them? Who undertook the obligation of building the Intercolonial Railway? And here he would add, he did not find fault so much with the railway, but it was, nevertheless, an incubus on the finances of this country. Government had now to provide more than \$1,000,000 annually, as interest on the cost of building that railway, and another half million to pay its running expenses. Who was to blame for that? Was it the late Finance Minister? No; it was the present Finance Minister and his associates who were responsible for that work. Therefore, if he complained that he had to provide every year for this \$1,500,000, he had no one to blame but himself and his associates. Who undertook the Prince Edward Island Railway, which involved a large expenditure, and entailed an obligation against the Dominion of Canada? No one but the hon. gentleman and his associates. Who undertook the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Railways, that also increased the financial obligation of this country? Who undertook the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals, but his hon. friend and his associates? Who undertook the Welland Canal, but those hon. gentlemen? Who undertook the public works at Ottawa, and the public buildings of the Dominion, but his hon. friend and his associates? Who undertook the building of the Pacific Railway, the most destructive and the most ruinous of all? Who undertook to fix upon this Dominion that incubus of British Columbia, that excrescence of British Columbia, that cancer, financially, of British Columbia, that was eating into our vitals and entailing a heavy financial burden upon the country for all time to come? Who undertook that, but the hon. the Finance Minister and his associates? And why was it undertaken? It was undertaken to meet the political necessities of the hon. gentleman and his associates, and the representation given to that Province in the arrange-

ment was evidence that the whole thing was done to serve their political interests. In this Parliament, British Columbia had six representatives for 10,000 or 15,000 inhabitants. Upon what principle of justice or fair play could such representation be defended? Then his hon. friend stood up and said: "Oh! when I was Finance Minister in 1873, everything was rosy and beautiful; everything was easy; I found it a pleasant task to be Finance Minister then; but now all that is changed." And so the hon. gentleman went on as if his predecessors had fixed all these burdens and all these obligations upon this Dominion. But he and his associates did it themselves, and there was no body to blame for it but themselves if he found it difficult now. It was easy, during the seven years of plenty, when every thing was prosperous, to meet his obligations. It was easy, when the revenue was rolling in, and he had surplus after surplus. But he deserved no credit for that, and if he had continued in power up to the present time he would have deserved no censure for the deficits which arose. He did not think it was fair for the hon. gentleman to charge the late Ministry with being responsible for those deficits. He regretted to see deficits, but what was the nature of these deficits? Had it hurt the people any to let them keep the money in their pockets by not putting more taxation on them? Had it burdened them? He knew it was unpleasant to have deficits, and he wished it were otherwise. He supposed his hon. friends composing the late Government were expecting, from year to year, that there would be an improvement in the business of the country; that importations would be increased, and they were slow to increase the burdens of the people. He admitted now that the deficits might have been stopped, in part at least, by retrenchment, by stopping certain public works; and they might have been stopped by an increase of taxation. He did not know what course the late Government would have adopted if they had remained in power, but he should have advised them not to increase taxation, to cut down expenditure wherever they could, and to economise. He regretted that his hon. friends had not stopped some of this expenditure when

they were in power. It would have been difficult, no doubt, since these public works had been already commenced by the preceding Government, and had to be carried on to completion. They had to expend \$30,000,000 in order to complete the obligations which his hon. friend the present Finance Minister and his associates had entailed upon them. The late Government had undertaken no great public works; everything that could be undertaken to get popularity and political support had been undertaken by their predecessors. The obligations had been incurred, and they had to be carried out by the late Government. They had to do it under very distressing financial circumstances; they had to do it in the midst of a depression of trade, of a falling revenue, and he thought they did it well. During the late election, so far as his own county of Charlotte was concerned, the canvass had been conducted, on the part of his opponents against the late Government, against himself, and not in favour of the National Policy. And that was the way the battle was fought out in the Province generally. They did not present to the people this beautiful National Policy, but, on the contrary, they denied it. He told the people what he thought would be the policy of the Conservative party, judging them from their declarations. He told them they might expect a duty on flour of about 50c. a barrel, and also a duty on cornmeal; and that, in short, in order to carry out their promises, he thought they would introduce a system of Protection. But he did not think that his hon. friend the Finance Minister told them that when he addressed them. They always denied, when he (Mr. Gillmor) met them, that such taxes would be increased; their statement was that they were going to readjust the tariff. The result was that the people gave them a very large majority. As to the public works undertaken by the late Government, he did not know of any considerable extent, except the Chambly Canal, and St. Peter's Canal in Nova Scotia, and the Dufferin breakwater, the largest in New Brunswick. Those were all they had undertaken; therefore, he thought that the Finance Minister could not truly state that the embarrassed condition of the country was due to the late Government.

MR. GILLMOR.

Such talk might gain him, however, the sympathy of the public in his present difficult position. He had got what he worked for; and, if the country was financially depressed, and required a large revenue, he and his associates were the men who brought about that state of things. In saying this he (Mr. Gillmor) knew that nothing he could say—that not the best logic and greatest eloquence—could change a vote on this question. The question of Free-trade and Protection had been laboured to death; the views and statistics exposed to decry Free-trade simply amounted to nothing. The people would judge of the question for themselves. He had listened to able and eloquent arguments last Session, from the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), and, this Session, from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), in favour of Protection; if their premises had been sound, which they were not, their deductions would have been conclusive. But they had not, because unsound, convinced him. He believed Protection was wrong in principle, and no amount of argument or reasons could make it right. It had been proved, by practical experience, incorrect. He knew the effect of Free-trade in Great Britain, and he thought the best evidence that Free-trade was correct was its adoption by the Mother Country, by statesmen who understood the question much better than Canadian Protectionists. Everybody knew that England's advance in wealth, commerce, manufacturing, and trade, since the adoption of Free-trade, had astonished the world. The United States prosperity, of late, had been much talked of; but there was no comparison between it and that of England, which had exported last year \$1,250,000,000 of manufactures—that being about the annual volume of her trade in this department. She sent her manufactures to every country, town, and hamlet on the face of the globe. Protection had not given her that prosperity. In order to succeed in a similar way, Canadians must adopt the principle that would render articles cheaper here than they could be made anywhere else. Talk about Protectionist victories in the United States, because the Americans might send a little cotton to Manchester and hardware to Sheffield, for an experiment, when England

exported to the States twelve million dollars' worth more of her manufactures than they sent to all the world besides? Talk about England being outdone in the markets of the world. It was absurd. It suited hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side to harp upon the topic of American superiority; it would not be strange if, in time, the Americans should be able to compete with Great Britain in some particular manufactured article, but that would not be an argument for her return to Protection. Look on the two systems as regards their effects on United States commerce. How was it that, during a revenue tariff in the United States, they had vessels enough of their own to carry the larger proportion of their imports and exports to and from foreign countries—70 to 90 per cent.? What was the result of Protection? That they carried but 26 per cent. of that trade now; the most money-making part—the carrying trade—having been transferred to foreigners. With regard to the depression, he believed that, though not a great many were rich, there was less real poverty and suffering in the Dominion than in any other country. But, under this tariff, they were going to have no poverty at all. During previous Sessions the idle workmen of Ottawa would come to the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mackenzie) for relief, and, when it was refused, he (Mr. Gillmor) would hear some one in the crowd cry, "Hurrah for Sir John A. Macdonald!" That was the object of such demonstrations, and they had their effect. There was no danger of Great Britain so long as she adhered to Free-trade—nor was there any danger of her return to Protection. She occupied the proudest position in the world; and, though not possessing all the virtues, had the right system of trade, and controlled the commerce of the seas, and, without any desire to parade his loyalty, he said—long might it be so! In commerce

"Others might claim the ocean for a road, England alone could make it her abode."

His notes now brought him to the most unpleasant part of the subject—the effects of the tariff in New Brunswick. He could see some bright spots for Ontario, and the manufacturing districts of Quebec, and for the Pictou portion of Nova

Scotia, but not a spark of light or ray of hope for the Province he represented; her prospect was grinding taxation from first to last, and he was glad the Reformers were not the party inflicting it on New Brunswick. Had he the silver tongue of the Finance Minister—were he a Brutus and Brutus Antony—here an Antony would ruffle up their spirits and put a tongue in every wound, to cry down that accursed tariff. The Finance Minister could smile. He knew his part well. In all the vicissitudes of fortune he never fell except, like the cats, upon his feet. No matter how much taxation New Brunswick groaned under, he was sure to have his purple and fine linen and fare sumptuously every day. Although there were very few people in New Brunswick that wanted food, a good many were glad to get Indian meal. He knew that this tariff meant nothing but taxation to the people of that Province. It had no redeeming feature, and was brought forward by one of the most favoured sons New Brunswick ever had, and who had been exalted, step by step, to his present position. He (Mr. Gillmor) would rather take his spade and hoe, and toil and live the rest of his days in humble poverty with the poorer classes of New Brunswick, than occupy the proud position of Finance Minister, as that hon. gentleman did, and receive the fulsome laudations and flattery of which he had been the recipient, and inflict such a curse on that Province. Call this tariff an elephant! It was more like the beast described in the Scriptures that had seven heads, ten horns, and red Morocco nostrils.

MR. PLUMB: That would be an intemperate beast.

MR. GILLMOR said he saw no redress for New Brunswick, and yet the Finance Minister was largely responsible for bringing her into Confederation. That hon. gentleman's calculations and arguments for that purpose were well known. He (Mr. Gillmor) remembered him telling the people that their Province would be the manufacturing centre of the Dominion; owing to their being on the seaboard, and possessing abundant raw materials and unrivalled water-power. All this they still possessed, but none of the Finance Minister's pre-

dictions had been realised. They had streams in New Brunswick still, which ran as crooked, noisy and shallow as the appeals of that hon. gentleman. He had told the people that, in the Union, their taxation could not exceed \$3 a head in a quarter of a century. But, before he last went out of office, it was up to \$6 a head, and now, with no manufacturing establishments yet, it would, under this tariff, run up to \$9 a head. They could not carry a single constituency in New Brunswick upon this tariff. He had received letters from that Province making strong appeals against the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. There was not an industry in New Brunswick that got any relief from this tariff. It was taxation from end to end. The effect on the lumber trade, which, as hon. gentlemen knew, was one great industry of that Province, would be such as to stop it altogether; and yet the people of New Brunswick were asked to submit to this enormous taxation, in order to build up the North-West and British Columbia. He predicted, to-day, that nine out of every ten who voted for Confederation now wished they were out of the Union. Every prediction that had been made by those who opposed Confederation had been more than fulfilled to the letter. His hon. friend the Finance Minister had not a majority from New Brunswick, but he ought, out of gratitude for what that Province had done for him, to have declined to take part in forcing upon them this obnoxious tariff. He (Mr. Gillmor) did not believe in Protection, and he thought that when the people of his Province came to look at the question properly, they would, to a man, refuse to be coerced into a system that was perfectly ruinous to them. He was glad that his hon. friend the leader of the late Government had not allowed himself to retain power by adopting this Protective system, had not sought the favour of the manufacturer by adopting a policy that would enrich a few at the expense of the rest, and particularly at the expense of the Maritime Provinces. This tariff was oppressive to every industry in the Province of New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman had put a duty on potatoes, when he must have known that, perhaps, not more than 15 or 20

MR. GILLMOR.

bushels of potatoes were imported into that Province annually, and that these were used for seeding purposes. That would not help them in the least, and as an offset they put a tax on everything else. In the county where he resided, last year, more than half of the gang saw mills had been unable to run. If the principle of Protection were right, why had not the hon. gentlemen on the Government side tried it years ago, when they were able to bear it? He thought it most absurd to introduce such a system of taxation, at a time when labouring men had no work, and there was a depression in every branch of industry. In his constituency this tariff was going to be absolutely ruinous. He knew of some manufacturers who had intended to erect grist mills, but when they heard of this tariff they had abandoned the idea. He felt more like weeping over the condition of the country, than talking of it. He did not think that the Finance Minister deserved the credit he claimed for having consulted a great many people on the formation of this tariff. This was the relief this tariff proposed to give, and there were the gentlemen who had been consulted—the last men who ought to be consulted. The Finance Minister should have consulted the workingmen, not the men who had grown rich on the industries of the country. A good deal had been said with regard to the slaughter-market, the imaginary evil which afflicted the country. He (Mr. Gillmor) had lived in Charlotte, a county bordering on Maine, and had never seen a single article of goods slaughtered there. Three sets of harness came in once, but they were understood to have been fraudulently obtained. Suppose the Americans did slaughter their goods in our markets, would not his hon. friend take advantage of that? Would they not buy their cottons, or anything else that the Americans came in to sell them, at prices under cost? He denied that they had done more than their interests compelled them to, and if Protection had done for them what it was credited with, they need not have come here at all. This tariff was going to increase the burdens of New Brunswick to an enormous extent. The increase in New Brunswick, under the new tariff, on the imports of 1878, would be as follows:—

| | Value. | Increase. |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Specific list on which duties were collected, 1878..... | \$218,091 | \$35,335 |
| <i>Ad valorem</i> | 398,425 | 39,998 |
| 25 p. c. list, on which duties were collected, 1878. | 8,255 | 1,640 |
| 17½ p.c., increased to 20, do | 1,327,379 | 33,163 |
| 17½ do. 25, do. | 499,575 | 37,413 |
| 17½ do. 30, do. | 862,179 | 107,377 |
| 17½ do. 35, do | 253,616 | 44,387 |
| Different rates do. | 165,782 | 17,260 |
| Cotton goods, incr'd 16½ p.c. | 646,686 | 101,219 |
| Woollen goods, 18½ p.c. | 1,012,861 | 184,810 |
| Goods increased 10 p.c. | 105,690 | 11,345 |
| Goods increased 5 p.c. | 457,937 | 61,829 |
| Free list..... | 392,431 | 59,182 |
| Coal, 32,565 tons..... | 104,265 | 16,282 |
| Grain..... | 19,769 | 2,536 |
| Flour and meal..... | 532,441 | 52,224 |

114,000 tons Nova Scotia coal, 50c. p.t. 57,000
 300,000 barrels flour, from Canada.... 150,000

\$1,013,000

or a total increase of over one million dollars additional taxation for which the Province got no return. With reference to coal, the idea prevailed that because a country was blessed by Providence with a coal mine, the Government must, at once, make it dearer to the people than if they had not a coal mine. Because we had agricultural facilities, the Government must go to work and enact a tariff that would make everybody's food dearer, and because we had manufacturing facilities, every article of manufacture must be made dearer. He was a little surprised that the hon. member for Pictou seemed to be somewhat dissatisfied. He was disposed to kick against the tariff. There was not the slightest danger of one of the team kicking. They would every one vote for it, their leaders had them well in hand, and

"Could cast them off as a huntsman his pack,
 For they knew when they liked they could whistle them back."

No matter how much they burdened Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the tariff must be accepted there. He was a little amused at the manner in which his Tory friend alongside of him was going to fix up society in the Dominion. He was going to have one-third agriculturists, one-third manufacturers, and one-third doctors and lawyers. He was going to carry on a very profitable trade and get exceedingly rich under that system. It reminded him of two Irish-

men who thought they would make a little trade with whiskey. They bought a keg of it to sell at an approaching fair, but becoming anxious to do a little business amongst themselves, one said to the other, "I will buy five cents worth from you;" the other agreed, and then proposed, with the five cents, to buy an equal amount. So the five cents changed hands until the keg was emptied. He had too many doctors and lawyers in his system. He remembered a sort of cry about people going to the United States. A lawyer came into the Parliament of New Brunswick once and said the country was going to the dogs, everything was going away, that no less than twenty journeymen tailors left New Brunswick that summer. One shrewd listener said, "It is a pity each one had not taken two lawyers on his back." If every labourer that went to the United States would only take a lawyer and a doctor on his back, the country would be a great deal better off. He had never looked on a sicker lot of politicians than that on the other side of this House. The handwriting was on the wall. He could see it plainly inscribed—"Mene, Mene, Tekei, Upharsin," which they could interpret for themselves. As sure as they sat there, their days were numbered, and their kingdom would be taken from them. He felt it and was sorry for some of them, because they could never rise again. Like Nebuchadnezzar, they would be made to eat grass, like the oxen, for the imposition they had practised on the country.

Mr. BUNSTER said the hon. member who had just sat down, stated he wished he had the eloquence of the present Finance Minister. If he had, he would not have undertaken to insult an outlying Province as he had done. There was no hon. member present who did not feel humiliated at hearing language so unbecoming to the dignity of this Parliament, and insulting to the Province of British Columbia, as had been used by the hon. member for Charlotte. When the hon. member said that British Columbia was an excrescence on this Dominion, he showed his ignorance of the geography of this Dominion. If he saw fit to educate himself, he would see that British Col-

umbia was the centre of the empire. As far as the terms between the Dominion and that Province were concerned, it was a matter of regret to the great mass of the people, that owing to the existence in power during the past five years of men of narrow views, incapable of administering properly the affairs of the country, these terms had not been carried out, and the progress of the Dominion in consequence vastly retarded. The people looked to the present Government to make amends for the inability of their predecessors, and to give an impetus to our commerce and prosperity, by hastening the completion of the great bond of communication between British Columbia and the remainder of the Dominion.

MR. FLEMING said he hoped the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster) would keep cool, and not get excited over this matter. He did not suppose any hon. member in the House intentionally wished to insult British Columbia in the slightest degree. No doubt every member had a special interest in his own particular Province, but it was not necessary, or becoming, to jump up on every occasion when that Province was mentioned. He would not, like his hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), compare this tariff to "the beast with the seven heads and ten horns;" he would not even, like his hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), allude to it as "that thing;" he would speak of it and give it the name that had been given it already by one of its sponsors, the hon. the Minister of Public Works. That gentleman, in replying to the hon. member for Centre Huron, and speaking of the tariff of the United States as having made that country so great and prosperous, said that the tariff now being introduced was "only a feeble counterpart" of the American policy. He (Mr. Fleming), therefore, would merely give it the name already bestowed by one of its friends, and call it a "feeble counterpart" of the United States tariff. He thought we should have been able to frame a tariff for ourselves, and not copy the worst features of the American system. Every hon. gentleman—he did not know of a single exception—who had supported this tariff, had, at the same time, lauded the United States as prosperous in the extreme, and

all by reason of the tariff they possessed. If the tariff of the United States had made that country so prosperous, the natural reasoning would be that Canada ought to have a similar tariff, and not a "feeble counterpart." He did not know what promises had been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, in other parts of the country, but he knew, in the part of Ontario where he resided, pamphlets were circulated and speeches were made, in which the authors and speakers condemned the late tariff, because it was a "one-sided tariff," and promised, if their friends got into power, they would set the matter right, and we should have a "reciprocity tariff." He would ask, had this been done? Was not the tariff a one-sided tariff? He did not believe with hon. gentlemen opposite, that the prosperity of the United States was due to their Protective tariff; on the contrary, he maintained that Protection in the United States had been a comparative failure, it had not fulfilled the prediction of its advocates. The home market promised to the farmer and the planter was as far removed from them as ever. The United States tariff was framed for the avowed purpose of making all that was required within the country. In view of this, however, we find them sending raw material 3,000 miles to seek a market, and importing the same material, enhanced in value ten-fold, by means of foreign labour, in direct violation of the very principle of Protection. They found, in 1875-76, there were imported into the United States \$217,600,000 worth of foreign goods that might have been produced in the country; and, at the same time, there were sent to the foreign market raw material to the amount of \$374,000,000, which, according to Protection doctrine, ought to have been consumed in the country; showing that in the United States itself, the tariff, so much admired, had not been a success. Hon. gentlemen frequently, in speaking on this question, alluded with apparent satisfaction to the financial position of the United States, brought about, as they say, by means of Protection. They had been told that that country, after paying off an enormous amount of debt, and carrying on its ordinary affairs, had a large surplus in the Treasury. He would call

MR. BUNSTER.

attention, however, to the fact that, if the United States depended for revenue upon Customs, as we do, they would have a deficit instead of a surplus. The Customs revenue of Canada is \$12,500,000; inland revenue, \$5,000,000. If, therefore, the United States was no more in proportion to its Customs revenue than that of Canada, the income of that country would be a long way behind. In 1859-60 the Customs duties of the United States formed 90 per cent. of the whole revenue; in 1862-63, after the protection policy had been introduced, they were only 55 per cent. The loss of revenue from Customs receipts had affected the United States in the same manner as it had done Canada during the period of office of the late Administration. The United States had a system of internal taxation, of a kind which they, as yet, knew nothing about, but which he believed they would soon know by bitter experience, if the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was carried out. The following figures showed the falling-off in Customs receipts in the United States, from 1872-73 to 1877-78, and also the proportion which the Customs revenue bore to the inland revenue in these years:—

| | <i>Customs Revenue.</i> | <i>Inland Revenue.</i> |
|---------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 1872-73 | ...\$188,000,000 | ...\$113,750,000 |
| 1873-74 | ... 163,000,000 | ... 102,500,000 |
| 1874-75 | ... 157,000,000 | ... 110,000,000 |
| 1875-76 | ... 148,000,000 | ... 116,000,000 |
| 1877-78 | ... 130,000,000 | ... 110,000,000 |

But, supposing Protection was a success in the United States, it did not necessarily follow that it would be suitable for Canada. The circumstances of the two countries were not alike. Our neighbours, possessing every variety of climate, might live apart from the rest of the world, with less injury to themselves than, perhaps, any other country. Such, however, would not be the case with us. Our circumstances were entirely different. If we wanted to see a fair illustration of the workings of Free-trade and Protection, let us look to the colonies of Victoria and New South Wales. There they would see the two systems carried on side by side. Previous to 1871 both Provinces had a revenue tariff. In that year Victoria commenced her Protective policy. New South Wales adhered to her old system of Customs duties,

chiefly levied on imports of tea, coffee, sugar and spirits. In order to show the difference between the tariff of the two countries, he would read a list of the respective duties on a few of the leading articles of import. Agricultural implements—Victoria, 20 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Wearing apparel—Victoria, 20 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Carpeting—Victoria, 10 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Carriages—Victoria, 20 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Chinaware and porcelain—Victoria, 10 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Clocks—Victoria, 10 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Drapery and haberdashery—Victoria, 20 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Furniture—Victoria, 20 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Hardware—Victoria, 20 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Leather—Victoria, 10 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Saddlery and harness—Victoria, 20 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Woollen piece goods—Victoria, 10 per cent.; New South Wales, free. Here were two countries, one was trying the Protection policy, and the other continuing on in a Free-trade course. Hon. gentlemen would say that Victoria would excel the other in commercial prosperity, and that New South Wales would be left completely behind. That would be the certain result if hon. gentlemen's arguments were correct. He claimed that these two colonies were as nearly alike as it was possible to find two countries on the face of the earth. They were close beside each other, and subject to the same climatic and other influences. He recollected, in 1873, listening to the Budget speech of the Finance Minister of the day, the hon. gentleman who now occupies the same position. He recollected the hon. gentleman pointing to certain things as evidences or tests of the prosperity of the country. He (Mr. Fleming) would take the same tests which the hon. gentleman applied to Canada in 1873, and apply them to Victoria and New South Wales. The first would be the respective amount of shipping or tonnage in the two countries. Well, in Victoria, in 1876, with a population of 840,300, they found a tonnage of 1,657,088 tons, equal to two tons per head of the population. In New South Wales, in 1876, with a population of

627,796, a tonnage of 2,127,725, or equal to three and one-third tons per head of the population. In regard to ship-building, they found, in Victoria, in 1871, 24 vessels were built, amounting to 1,762 tons; in New South Wales, in the same year, there were built 91 vessels, with a total of 6,440 tons. In 1875 there were registered in Victoria 53 vessels, with a total of 8,519 tons; in New South Wales there were registered, the same year, 139 vessels, with a total of 16,100 tons; showing the great advance of the Free-trade colony over the Protection colony with regard to shipping. The hon. the Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech in 1873, alluded to the increase of bank deposits of 1873 over 1867, as an evidence of the country's prosperity. He would apply that test to Victoria and New South Wales. He would compare the increased deposits in 1876 in the respective countries over those of 1870, a period of time which gave to Victoria a five-years' trial of the Protective system. In 1870, the bank deposits in Victoria amounted to \$54,495,130; in 1876, they amounted to \$74,250,740, showing an increase of 36 per cent. In New South Wales in 1870, the deposits amounted to \$30,539,995, or \$24,000,000 less than in Victoria. It was, therefore, evident that New South Wales was labouring under a disadvantage at the start. In 1876, they found the bank deposits in New South Wales nearly equal to those of Victoria, being \$73,697,000, or an increase of 141 per cent., a difference in favour of New South Wales over Victoria of 105 per cent. If they took the amount per head of the population in Victoria in 1876, there would be deposits in its banks equal to \$88.36 per head, while in New South Wales, in the same year, there would be sufficient to give \$117.39, to every man, woman, and child in the Province. This showed that the country, with nothing but a revenue tariff, had outstripped the one with a Protective tariff. The present Finance Minister, in 1873, cited the increased imports and exports of the Dominion as an evidence of its prosperity. Let us see how this test would result when applied to the two colonies of which he had spoken. In 1870, Victoria, with a Free-trade tariff, had a total trade, imports and ex-

ports, of \$124,628,855; in 1876, with five years' Protection, of \$149,509,205, being an increase of 20 per cent. In New South Wales, in 1870, the exports and imports amounted to \$78,736,595, \$16,000,000 less than Victoria; but in 1876, clinging foolishly (as hon. gentlemen opposite would say) to her Free-trade policy, the trade of New South Wales was \$133,383,585, being an increase of 70 per cent., beating her sister Province by 20 per cent. The trade of the respective countries per head of population, was in 1876, for Victoria, \$177.12, and for New South Wales, \$212.46. He would now call attention to the finances of the two Provinces. In 1870, under Free-trade, Victoria had a surplus of revenue over expenditure of \$2,300,000; in 1876, after five years' experience of the benefits of Protection, her public accounts showed a deficit of \$1,200,000. New South Wales, on the other hand, with a deficit in 1870 of \$700,000, was able, in 1876, without any change being made in her fiscal policy, to show a surplus of \$1,400,000 of revenue over expenditure. Again, compare the increased revenue of the two countries. The revenue of Victoria increased in six years 40 per cent., while that of New South Wales increased in the same period 102 per cent., or 62 per cent. more than that of Victoria. The revenue per head for Victoria in 1876 was \$25.73, and for New South Wales \$40. These facts were conclusive evidence of the erroneous nature of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that Protection would increase the resources and prosperity of the country. Protection had a tendency to withdraw capital from agriculture and invest it in manufactures; this he found to be the case in Victoria. The quantity of wheat, oats, barley, and maize raised in Victoria, in 1870, was 10,168,000 bushels. In 1876, instead of an increased production corresponding to an increased population, the total amount of these cereals raised, was only 8,130,000 bushels, or 2,000,000 less than the amount raised in 1870, showing the attention of the people had been taken away from agriculture. In New South Wales the case was reversed. In 1870 there were raised in that Province, of those cereals, 3,500,000 bushels, and, in 1876, 5,800,000 bushels—an increase of

65 per cent. If the comparison was made with reference to the increase in stock, it would be found that New South Wales had progressed much faster than her neighbour. In Victoria, in 1870, there were 10,361,000 sheep; in 1876 they had only increased 4 per cent. In New South Wales, in 1870, there were 16,308,000 sheep; in 1876 there were 24,503,000, an increase of 50 per cent., showing that where trade was unrestricted, where capital was allowed to flow in the most profitable channels, without Government interference, those industries best suited to the country would consequently flourish. The people of New South Wales were cultivating the soil, raising larger crops, going more extensively into stock raising, and, as a result, were making more money in the aggregate than the inhabitants of the neighbouring Province. But it might be asked, what about the manufacturing industries of New South Wales. They cannot possibly exist in a country where goods were allowed to come in free of duty, and compete with those of home manufacture. What was the fate of the manufacturer? He would not weary the House by going over figures, but cite a few cases, showing that even in the manufacturing industries New South Wales had been able to hold her own. In 1869, there were ten establishments for the manufacture of agricultural implements in New South Wales; in 1875, there were sixty-one; of wine presses there were 154 in 1869, and 332 in 1875; of sugar manufactories there were 21 in 1869, and 82 in 1875; of sugar refineries, there were none in 1869, two in operation in 1875; breweries, there were 21 in 1869, 32 in 1875; of iron, brass, and copper foundries, there were 33 in 1869, and 45 in 1875; of ship-building establishments, there were 73 in 1869, and 104 in 1875. He might extend the list still further, and show that in those industries suited to the country, New South Wales had been able to hold her own. According to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, New South Wales ought to be a poor country to live in. The people might be able to get goods cheap, but work would be scarce and wages low. Working men would flock over to Victoria, where, no doubt, there would be plenty of work

and good wages. To show that this was not the case, however, he would call the attention of the House to the wages paid in 1877 to mechanics and others in the respective colonies. In Victoria, carpenters were getting \$2.50 a day, in New South Wales, \$2.75; bricklayers, \$2.50 in Victoria, \$3.00 in New South Wales; plasterers, \$2.50 in Victoria, \$2.75 to \$3.00 in the other Province; painters and glaziers, \$2.25 in Victoria, and \$2.25 to \$2.50 in New South Wales; coopers, \$2.50 in Victoria, and \$3.00 to \$3.50 in New South Wales. The only class that seemed to receive smaller wages in New South Wales than in Victoria was farm labourers. This fact showed that Protection had a tendency to draw labour from the farm to the factory, and once diverted was not easily brought back. It was sometimes the case in Ontario, that, in the harvest season, there would be a difficulty in getting hands at \$2.00 a day; yet, in the towns and cities, men were found going about half the time idle. In Victoria, the wages for farm labourers was \$200 to \$300 a year and rations; in New South Wales they were from \$25 to \$75 a year less. With regard to the demand for mechanics in the respective colonies, he would quote from a Melbourne (Victoria) paper of August 10th, 1878, which contains a paragraph to the following effect:—"No prospect of improvement in the building trade at present. * * * House carpenters are short of work. An advertisement for a couple of men for an up-country job attracted fully 10 applicants." In contrast with this, he would quote from a Sydney (New South Wales) paper of August 18th, 1878, which said regarding the building trade there: "All the labour connected with these trades is fully employed, and in some departments scarce." These facts served to show that Protection did not, as its friends pretended it would do, furnish the mechanic with more work and higher wages. He would now say a few words in regard to the financial question. Throughout the length and breadth of this country the changes had been rung on the enormous deficits of the late Government. If the hon. gentlemen believed that the members of the late Administration had personally used the money, they could scarcely have used stronger language. As

had been well said by his hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), the Government had not asked the people for the money, and so the people had it still in their pockets. The debt remained to be paid, it was true, but the people themselves had the money to do it, and there was, therefore, no loss to the country. Time and again we had heard, in sonorous tones, how the present Government had, when in power before, rolled up the surpluses to the amount of millions. He contended, however, that it was not a mark of ability in a Finance Minister to have an enormously large surplus. When that occurred the people were being taxed more heavily than was necessary to carry on the ordinary affairs of the country. The present Finance Minister, in his Budget speech in 1873, gave a glowing description of the state of the finances for the five preceding years, previous to 1872; but if he had looked back fifteen years instead of five, to the condition of Old Canada previous to Confederation, he would not have been able to take so hopeful a view of the future. In 1857, when Hon. Mr. Cayley was Inspector-General of Old Canada, he made a Budget speech which corresponded closely with that made by the present Finance Minister in 1873. Mr. Cayley looked back five or six years, and saw that the country had been prosperous, that money was flowing into the Treasury; but, the very next year, he found that, instead of having a surplus, as he expected, he had a deficit. And when Mr. Galt, now Sir A. T. Galt, became Inspector-General, that gentleman found himself, on account of adverse circumstances, unable fully to get rid of deficits; and here he would remark, that prominent members of the Government had, during the present Session, spoke in the most flattering terms of that gentleman as a statesman. And in doing so he thought they did what was right and proper, as every Canadian felt proud of the eminent abilities of that gentleman. At the same time, he could not help noticing the inconsistency of hon. gentlemen in praising Sir A. T. Galt and denouncing the late Minister of Finance, because a deficit occurred while he was in office. When Sir A. T. Galt managed the finances of Old Canada, he always took into account the state of the crops

and the probability of a good harvest, knowing well that, if the people had not the material to sell, they would not have the power to buy; the lack of ability to purchase would soon tell upon the importations, and a falling off in the importations would be felt by a falling off in the revenue. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, did not think it worth while to take the harvest into account at all. According to them, all that was necessary to insure prosperity to the country was their restoration to power. In 1859, Sir A. T. Galt, after doing his best to make ends meet, found himself at the close of the year with a deficit of \$1,494,744. In 1860, the deficit was \$1,973,989; in 1861, \$1,999,008; and, in 1862, when Sir Alexander Galt left office, he left, also, to his successor, a deficit of \$2,062,331. Hon. gentlemen had spoken of this tariff, which imposes additional taxation, as if a boon had been conferred on the country by its introduction. They, in effect, said that increased taxation would make the country prosperous. He believed that taxation was only an incident to government. If it were possible to carry on all its machinery without expense, the country would be so much the better; but as that could not be done we had to resort to taxation. The great desideratum to be kept in view was the distribution of the burden as equally as possible over the whole people. From what source did the hon. the Finance Minister derive information as to the framing of this tariff? From the representations made to him by certain manufacturers. It was worthy of remark that not a single deputation of all those that had waited on the Finance Minister had come for the purpose of looking after the interests of the consumers. They had their own interests in view, and nothing else. How this tariff was going to affect their own trade, was the question to them. It was utterly impossible from information such as that to frame a tariff that would benefit the whole people. He was certain that the farmers and mechanics would suffer from this tariff, while, doubtless, some of the manufacturers would get rich. The gentlemen of the Opposition had been reproached with uttering contradictory statements that manufacturers would be both enriched and

impoverished. The two statements were easily reconciled; and he would give an illustration how some manufacturers would be benefitted and others would be ruined. When this tariff was being discussed in the country, one manufacturer said: "Well, if we are going to have Protection, I will put an addition to my factory, introduce new machinery, and drive the business with all my might for two or three years, and then sell out." On being asked why he should sell out when he was doing so well, he replied, "Oh, by that time there will be so many in the business that it will not pay." This was the inevitable result of all arrangements by which trade was forced into unnatural channels. He was satisfied that the manufacturers in New South Wales were doing a safer business than those of Victoria; they were getting their raw materials cheaper, and there was no inducement for capital to flow out of its natural channel. He was amused at hearing the hon. the Finance Minister, when making his second Budget speech, express his pity for the working man, and talk of protecting him by putting heavy duties on the cloth he wears. The working man's pants, he said, were out at the knees, because they were made of the cheap cloth which came from abroad. He (Mr. Fleming) would like to know how he was going to protect the working-man in that respect. Was he going to have officers appointed who should regularly inspect all the clothing establishments in the country, and see there was no shoddy in the cloth offered for sale? Was he going to prevent the manufacture of shoddy in this country? The Government of the day professed to be a parental Government. It was not necessary that the people should exercise self-reliance and energy. These qualities were not now essential requisites to success. The Government were going to plan and arrange everything for them. Such a state of things he (Mr. Fleming) did not think would long continue. The natural independence of the people would revolt against it. These periods of depression, which seemed to visit every country after certain intervals, were not without their use. They taught them the danger of speculation and extravagance; they

brought them face to face with the somewhat unpleasant truth, that if they would improve their circumstances they must spend less, and must earn more. By-and-bye matters would take a turn. He (Mr. Fleming) believed this country would prosper as it had done in the past. He had too much faith in the energy, industry and enterprise of the people, to think otherwise. But, if it prospered, it would be in spite of this tariff, and not by reason of it. He was opposed to the passage of the resolutions before the House, because they did not place the burden of taxation equally on the members of the community, and because this tariff would have a tendency to divert capital from those channels where it was bringing, it might be small yet certain, results, and cause it to flow in others, promising larger returns, but of a more uncertain and speculative nature.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. TILLEY: I suggest whether it would not be advisable that this debate should stand an Order of the Day for Monday. I think all will admit it is desirable to close it as soon as possible. It might thus, probably, close on Monday or Tuesday.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is desirable it should close early, as it has already consumed some time. I have no objection that we should proceed with it on Monday. It might be that, at some future stages, discussion might arise on certain subjects.

MR. TILLEY: We can take them up afterwards.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at

Thirty minutes past

Twelve o'clock.

ADDENDUM.

The following remarks of MR. KEELER, made on April 2nd, were accidentally omitted (*vide* page 904):

MR. KEELER said, on the 24th of February last he moved for the return mentioned in this motion. On the 11th

of March the return was brought down, and, although it was a very meagre affair, not giving all the information he expected, it still contained sufficient to show that something very uncommon, to say the least, had taken place. He found that this return showed that in October last, a few days before the late Government went out of power, for reasons best known to themselves, they saw fit to pass an Order in Council transferring these works to the Ontario Government. This Order in Council he would like to see. A copy of the report of the hon. the Minister of Public Works was embodied in the return, recommending that the public works connected with the navigation and descent of timber on the River Trent, called the Newcastle District Works, should be transferred to the Ontario Government upon the terms of their Order in Council of the 4th October, 1878, without any conditions whatever. It seemed to him that this whole proceeding had been in direct violation of the law. By the British North America Act, these works were vested in the Dominion, and, although under the Public Works Act, power was given to the Department to transfer certain works to the Provincial Government, upon condition of the maintenance thereof, he did not think the steps required had been taken in this matter, even supposing the works themselves were of the character mentioned in the Public Works Act. He could not help thinking that this transfer had been accomplished for some secret purpose or motive, and that it was, in some way, mixed up with politics, and connected with the approaching local elections in Ontario. He knew negotiations had taken place between the two Governments, and he suspected that they had reference to those elections. In view of all the circumstances, he asked for a Committee to enquire into the whole matter. The Order in Council to transfer had been made only two days before the resignation of the Government—in fact, three weeks after they were dead, and only waiting their political funeral—and that he considered a highly improper act in any Ministry, and, if such was shown to be the case, he hoped the Order in Council would be revoked at once by the present Government.

MR. KEELER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 7th April, 1879.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 73) To amend the Act 40 Victoria, Chap. 21, to establish a Court of Maritime Jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. McCuaig.)

MR. MACKENZIE : Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government for some papers. He announced, a few evenings ago, that the Government had given certain advice to His Excellency the Governor-General, respecting Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's position, and that His Excellency, without refusing that advice, had determined to refer the matter to the Home Government for advice, as I understood. Then, Sir, if the hon. gentleman was authorised—as, of course, he was—to inform the House of the advice that was given, I think the House ought to be in possession of the Order in Council containing that advice, and also of the date of the Order in Council, which will, of course, be with it, and the date upon which the advice was tendered to His Excellency. I hope there will be no objection to producing these papers, as I see a notice on the paper which will necessitate the discussion of this matter, and it is desirable, and in fact, necessary, that we should be put in possession of this Order in Council and of these dates.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : In answer to the question of the hon. gentleman, I would beg leave to state that the advice tendered by the Cabinet to the Governor-General is not a matter of the Privy Council at all. It is a matter of the Cabinet Council, and such matters are never introduced into Orders in Council.

MR. MACKENZIE : Yes, I am perfectly aware of that ; but, at the same time, the hon. gentleman communicated to the House what the advice was, in

general terms, and the House is entitled to some specific information. If Governor Letellier has been removed, it is not by giving advice to the Governor-General, but by passing an Order in Council stating the reason for such removal. If there is such an order, it should be produced under the circumstances. The hon. gentleman has informed the House that the advice was given, and I want to know when that advice was given.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The hon. gentleman has been too long a Cabinet Minister not to know that communications between the Crown and its advisers are confidential, except so far as permission is given to announce them. I announced all I was permitted to state, the other day. An Order in Council to remove Mr. Cosserat would issue after that advice had been accepted, and not before. Whenever there are any Orders in Council, and they are moved for, they will be sent down.

MR. HOLTON : I presume the object of making the announcement here, was to invite our consideration of the whole subject. That must have been the intention of my right hon. friend in making this announcement here. It is not usual to make any announcement whatever of variance of opinion between the Governor-General and his Ministers. I can recall no instance of such. But the announcement having been made, it must have been made with a public object. Now, we are not in a position to consider the question to which our attention was invited, without being precisely informed of all the steps taken in reference to this matter,—the advice given, the terms of the Order in Council, and so on. There was no urgency for any information upon that subject. It was volunteered by the hon. gentleman, and for what purpose? It could not have been offered for any purpose except that of inviting the attention of the House to the subject-matter of the the hon. gentleman's communication. The House is not in a position to respond to the invitation thus given to it, without the fullest and most precise information as to the steps taken by the Government on their responsibility, in tendering the advice. It, therefore, does appear to me the infor-

mation called for by my hon. friend from Lambton, is quite proper. As to precedents, we have no precedent for the course taken by the hon. gentleman. None whatever. There never has been such an instance in parliamentary government as the hon. gentleman has introduced here. Wherefore, I repeat again, did the hon. gentlemen make this announcement, unless we are to consider the announcement in some way or another? And how can we respond to it without further advice with regard to the steps taken by hon. gentlemen?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The hon. gentleman says the announcement was made without any precedent. I think the hon. gentleman must be relaxing his energy and perseverance in studying constitutional precedents. He would have found them if he had. The hon. gentleman asked when that advice was tendered. It was tendered before the announcement was made to the House. Then the hon. gentleman says it was evidently given for the purpose of giving the House an opportunity of discussing it. I think another hon. member of this House found that out before my hon. friend. I think the hon. member for Bagot came to that conclusion when he put his motion on the notice paper.

MR. DESJARDINS : It is rumoured that agents have been sent to England by the Government to represent their views on the Letellier question. I desire to know if such rumour is true, and if there is anything to sustain it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I am glad my hon. friend has asked that question, because it will prevent my hon. friend from Chateauguay from saving this statement was also unprecedented. I suppose it will not be unprecedented in me to answer in parliamentary form a parliamentary question. I beg leave to state, in reply to the hon. member, that the hon. the Postmaster-General will leave, by the next Canadian steamer, with the consent of the Governor-General, for the purpose of supporting the advice given by the Government for the removal of Lieutenant-Governor Letel-

lier. He may, perhaps, be accompanied by another gentleman. At all events, he goes next Saturday. I need scarcely say that the fact of our holding the positions we do at this moment, shows that the Governor-General did not make that reference against our advice, and the fact of our remaining in office also shows that we hold ourselves responsible for the action of the Governor-General.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am very glad to hear that, for I took the message the other night as one by which it was intended to throw the blame on the Governor-General.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: If the hon. gentleman will read the announcement carefully, he will see no remark that would warrant that apprehension.

MR. MACKENZIE: I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to the remark that led me to that opinion. The hon. gentleman said, in his second speech, that he thought it would have been well if the Governor-General had concurred in that advice.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Of course, we should not have offered that advice if we had not thought it would be well that it should be accepted.

MR. MACKENZIE: But there was a variance of opinion.

MR. ANGLIN said the statement which had been made had led to a series of the most extraordinary attacks upon the Governor-General, who had been held by the people of this country as acting at variance with his Government.

MR. ROBINSON said it was not the first time the hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin), and his party had led attacks against the Governor-General.

MR. MACKENZIE: I never led any attack against a Governor-General.

MR. IVES enquired what course the Government intended to take with regard to the adjournment at Easter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he proposed, with the consent of the House, to adjourn on Thursday night, until 3 o'clock on Tuesday.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion to agree to resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th).

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) said the hon. member for Bothwell, in the very able speech he delivered from his standpoint on this question, the other evening, laid down the general principle that popular government does not imply popular infallibility. There is no doubt that that statement is a correct one, viewed simply as an abstract proposition; but, in the sense in which the hon. gentleman applied it in this debate, I think we may fairly question whether it was entirely applicable. It is quite true that popular government does not imply popular infallibility; but I think I may fairly assume, and I am sure this hon. House will so assume, that, in relation to a question such as that which is now engaging the attention of Parliament, in popular government the decision of the people at the polls must, for the purposes of legislation, be held for the moment, to imply popular infallibility. There are two important questions which we have to consider in order to arrive at a fair conclusion as to this proposition: first, whether this question, which is now engaging the attention of the House, was understood by the people when they gave their verdict on the 17th September last; and, second, whether the particular propositions which have been submitted by the Minister of Finance, are a practical fulfilment of the views and wishes of the people, as they were then recorded. What have been the opportunities which the people have had to understand this question, as it is now presented to us? All through the last Parliament,—I think I may say in every Session of the last Parliament—the question of Free-trade and Protection, as applied to Canada, was discussed. During the last three Sessions it formed a very distinct issue between the two political parties, and at the last Session it became not only a distinct issue between the parties in the House, but it became also a distinct issue as submitted by both parties to the country for its decision. It will be in

the recollection of the House that the late Minister of Finance, in the last Budget Speech which he delivered, admitted that he had to face a very serious deficit, and he stated at that time, that, under ordinary circumstances, he would feel it his duty, as it would be the duty of every Finance Minister placed as he was, to make provision for that deficit. But he did not make provision, and the reason for not doing so was stated by him in terms which admitted of no misunderstanding. His exact words were:—

"All things considered, therefore, I am disposed to advise that we should delay the consideration of the question whether it is desirable to impose any further taxes on the people or not, and I do that for these general reasons."

And then, after giving two or three reasons of a general character, the hon gentleman proceeded :

"And because, which is, perhaps, even more to the purpose, the issue which is about to be presented to the country by the two political parties would involve, if decided against us, so great, so radical a change in our whole fiscal system and our mode of collecting the revenue, that I consider the views of the people should be had on this question."

After quoting from the speech of the right hon. gentleman, then leader of the Opposition, now leader of the Government, and after referring to certain resolutions which were adopted by the Conservative party in public meeting assembled at Toronto, he proceeded :—

"My object at present is neither to comment on that remarkable speech nor on these remarkable resolutions, but to draw your attention to the fact that they involve an absolute contradiction to the policy laid down by this Government."

That was the issue then presented to the people at the last elections, which was discussed in Parliament on the hustings and in the press. The arguments which we have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate were all familiar to us as having been used in those discussions. The people were told Protection meant increased taxation; that it involved the practical severance of our connection with the Mother Country; that it would bring about such a feeling between the United States and this country as would tend seriously to the injury of the Dominion. All the arguments which have been heard during the

debate were heard during those discussions, so that when the people, on the 17th of September, came to decide the great political issue between the two parties, as to whether we should have in Canada a fiscal policy such as that which prevailed in the past, or the policy which came to be known as the National, the Canadian policy, they did so with the full knowledge of all the arguments which could be used on both sides in relation to this question. I take it, therefore, that the people were not taken by surprise. Of course, in this I make no reference to the somewhat original proposition of the hon. member for South Wellington, in his speech a few evenings ago. His argument was that this question was taken up by public men in Parliament; that it was taken up by the leaders of public opinion in the press, by the public men generally of the country, and he put forth the strange doctrine—strange especially coming from the Reform party—that because the leaders of public opinion availed themselves of their power of agitation, for the purpose of educating the public in relation to any particular question, therefore, we must assume that the people are not properly instructed and have not reasonably decided. Why, Sir, all the great reforms that have been achieved in this country and in England, were begun by a few enthusiasts, strong in their convictions, determined to excite the public mind in favour of their own opinions, and who finally succeeded in gathering around them such a following that at last they attained success; and if we were to accept the doctrine of the hon. gentleman who addressed us on Friday night, that because these opinions were formed as the result of agitation by public men, they were not to be accepted as the honest convictions of public sentiment, we should pass a poor compliment on some of the most glorious pages in the history of this country and Great Britain. If, then, the people were thoroughly instructed, if they had the opportunity of deciding this question, with the full knowledge of all its merits and all the objections against it, have the Government fulfilled their promises? I ask, in the next place, whether the particular propositions which have been submitted by the Minister of Finance are

in practical accord with the policy announced by the party when it went to the polls, and the intentions of the country in voting a majority of that party into this Parliament. I know it has been attempted on the other side, by grouping together particular expressions made by public men on the platform, by wresting them from their connection, to prove that this tariff is not in accordance with the policy submitted to the country. But those who heard the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, on the night when the tariff was announced, will realise how completely the policy meets the expectations of the people and fulfils the pledges which were made to them. The hon. member for Centre Huron, the late Finance Minister, following immediately upon the Finance Minister's announcement, used this language:—

"I must remind the hon. gentleman of the manner in which he and his colleagues obtained power. I am willing to admit that, although they have not certainly redeemed all their pledges, although they could not by any possibility redeem them all, they have gone great lengths in particular directions."

That is practically an admission that the policy of the Finance Minister was in accordance with the decision of the people on the 17th of September. Then we had from the hon. member for Lambton, on the same evening, an admission in the same sense. The hon. gentleman was complaining that people outside appeared to know in advance what were to be the particular propositions of the Minister of Finance, and then went on to say:—

"Now, when it is shown that the Finance Minister made known weeks ago his scheme of taxation; then, Sir, in order to get quit of the blame and inconsistency with which he is saddled in this matter, he says the circumstances are different, that every person knew that there was to be a change at present. Well, how did everybody know?—how could it be possible that every person knew? I ask any of the gentlemen here who have traced the history of the hon. gentleman, his leader, and his colleagues, during their whole political life, if anyone of them could be certain of that promise until it was performed. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that I was very sceptical indeed about their intention to bring down the sort of tariff that has been brought down, and I am quite sure that if they had failed to bring it down, I would have been no more disappointed than

I am that they have brought it down. And I believe that is the general feeling throughout the country. Why, Sir, you could not meet a man on the street without his putting the question, 'Well, do you really think they will do anything?' One would say, 'My impression is that they will raise the duty to 20 per cent., and that they will put a special tax upon a few articles, but further than that they will not go.' Well, Sir, it seems they have gone the whole hog."

Although the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) did not expect the Ministry to fulfil their pledges, although the idea of public men carrying out the policy on which they had gone to the polls, seemed to him, arguing from his inner consciousness, to be an impossibility, yet he had to admit that they had gone "the whole hog;" that they had fulfilled their pledges to the country. The most serious charge made against the Government in connection with this tariff, as far as the fulfilment of the policy propounded previous to the election was concerned, was that based upon the telegram sent by the leader of the Government to a gentleman in St. John. We all know the circumstances which gave rise to that telegram; we all know that the present leader of the Government, speaking at a meeting in the West, in the midst of a great rainstorm, made some statements in relation to the tariff, which a reporter, who took no notes, whose journal subsequently admitted that he took no notes, reported from memory in a manner which implied that the right hon. gentleman was in favour of bringing in a tariff of 35 per cent. Everyone knows what a tariff of 35 per cent is. We have had, in the past, a few articles at special rates, and then a large list of unenumerated articles charged at 15, 17½, 20 or 25 per cent., according to our different politics at different periods; and the statement made by the right hon. the Premier, in his telegram to Mr. Boyd, was open to no other interpretation than this: that it was not intended to raise the unenumerated list to 35 per cent. What the right hon. gentleman did uniformly say, both in Parliament and on the hustings, was that the Conservative party proposed to re-adjust the tariff, so that it would, on the one hand, promote the manufacturing and industrial interests of the country, and, on the other hand, give us a suffi-

cient amount of revenue to meet the obligations of the country. The ex-Finance Minister admitted that, whichever party came into power, there would have to be additional taxation to meet the deficit, and the only contradiction made of the impression, which had been created by the report in the *London Advertiser*, was simply that the unenumerated list would not be raised to 35 per cent. The unenumerated list, to-day, was fixed at 20 per cent. The tariff has been readjusted according to the promise made, first in Parliament, next on the hustings, so as to afford sufficient Protection to the industrial interests of this country, and, at the same time, afford the necessary revenue to meet the obligations of the Dominion. What is the principle upon which this tariff is based? To my mind, and I think that is the view generally accepted in relation to it, it is based on the principle that there were certain articles which we had peculiar facilities for manufacturing in Canada, and that in relation to those articles there ought to be such a readjustment of the tariff as would afford them ample protection. I give you one illustration of its operation in this respect, which hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to as an evidence that this tariff is a rich man's tariff and oppressive to the poor. I take the duties on woollen goods. The great competition against which the woollen manufacturers of Canada have to guard, is in the coarser and cheaper classes of imported woollen goods. We have not, nor could we hope to have, if the system of the past five years were to continue, any local market for our ordinary coarse wools, because of the severe competition in that class of goods; and the policy of the Government in so adjusting the tariff by putting on a mixed duty, specific and *ad valorem*, on woollens, is such that, in relation to these coarser and cheaper materials which can be manufactured in the country, there will be an adequate protection to the manufacturer and a market for our Canadian wools. Then there is another illustration, which has also been used in a perverted sense by hon. gentlemen opposite—I refer to the arrangement of the duty on books. Recently in Canada a comparatively large publishing business, as compared with what existed here before, has been

springing up in certain classes of literature, but the great difficulty the publisher had was to be found in the competition to which they were subjected by American publications, and cheaper English publications as well. The Government, therefore, in adopting the principle of putting so much a pound on books instead of an *ad valorem* duty, have based it upon the principle that the material part of a book should be taxed and not the intellectual part. One would imagine, from the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, that this idea of taxing books by weight is entirely new. Why, Sir, as a matter of fact, the only country in the world whose books are taxed on the *ad valorem* principle is the United States; everywhere else they are taxed by weight. In England, before the duty was abolished altogether, the duty was on weight alone. We are told that it will tax unduly the class of literature which goes into the hands of the poorer people, and admit the higher class of books at a comparatively low rate. As to the higher class of literature, I venture to say that the low rate is the special merit of this tariff. The books which are read in Canada, and which cannot be produced in Canada for want of a proper market, are those which are used by literary men, by scholars, by precisely that class of people who are not rich. I regret to say that the rich men of the country are not the men, as a rule, who buy books. The higher class of literature is that which is used by scholars, by men who are naturally poor men, and the true principle in relation to the tariff is to so adjust it that books of this class, whose value lies in their authorship, in their literary character, may be imported at a comparatively low rate. Why should a tax be put on the brains in a book as well as the material form of it? I will read a letter on this subject, written some time ago, by Mr. Stevens, who was the English agent for the Smithsonian institution, and which shows very clearly what is the actual result of such a tariff as the hon. gentleman opposite would be disposed to put on books. Addressing a friend in the United States, he, at the time, living in England, said:

“The present tariff of 10 per cent. acts most strangely and unjustly upon early English

literature, of which we are ever and everlastingly boasting as ours by inheritance. I have paid an import duty of \$75 upon a single volume of Shakespeare, the first folio edition of 1623, originally published at £1, but now, by reason of its extreme rarity, worth £150. What is the market value of such a book, which almost never appears in the market? Is it the published price of £1, or this fictitious and fancy value of £150? I have paid \$20 duty on a small volume of Spencer's tracts, which cost me £40, though originally published for not more than 10s. On the first edition of Milton's *Paradise Lost* I have paid almost as much duty for a single volume as Milton received of Symons, his publisher, for the copyright."

Then this man, this scholar, thoroughly acquainted with books and their influence, goes on to say that "books should pay duty by weight or by volume if at all." These, I admit, are extreme cases, but they illustrate the principle upon which this tariff has been based. I took the trouble, when in Montreal the other day, to go into a book-store and take a number of books from the counter and weigh them, in order that I might fairly understand precisely how the tariff was going to operate. I found an invoice from an American publisher of a lot of the better class of novels just come in, and that the duty on them, under this system, would be $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I found on Harper's Franklin Square Library, a class of books that could be reproduced in Canada with great advantage, a duty of 15 to 20 per cent., giving an absolute protection to the Canadian publisher; on Blackwood's, a copyright work, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and on a few foreign books high in price, just the class of books bought by scholars, which cannot be easily produced here, $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Taking the general lot of books, the general average duty of this Protective tariff was $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. A statement was made by a prominent bookseller in Montreal, a gentleman whose name has been mentioned in one of the newspapers as having recommended this Protective tariff, which I shall read to show how it will operate:—

"Assorted package from New York of miscellaneous books, 10 per cent. Assorted package from Boston, good books, 7.7 per cent.; assorted lot from counter, English books, good, 6.2 per cent.; assorted lot from counter, Routledge's two-shilling novels, 16.2 per cent.; assorted lot from counter, U. S., good books, 7 per cent.; assorted lot from counter, Franklin Library, 22.5 per cent.; as-

sorted lot from counter, fine Bibles, 7.8 per cent.; assorted lot from counter, English, juveniles, 12.6 per cent."

In the case of the Franklin Square Library, the duty by the new tariff will come up to nearly 22 per cent. but the percentage of duty, under the present system, upon books which cannot be produced in this country, because there is no particular market for them, is very low, while upon such as may be produced here it is high enough to induce their publication, and thus afford employment to the papermakers and printers of the country. But we were told by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) the other evening, that there was going to be a serious tax on our Sunday School literature; that the Sunday School papers brought into Canada, would be subjected to a very severe tax, the result being the exclusion of many. Now, it happens that we have, in Canada, some publications of this kind which I think deserve encouragement. The Messrs. Dougall, of Montreal, gentlemen with whose political opinions I do not agree, are entitled to credit for their efforts to publish a good class of such papers. They publish, at this moment, a Sunday School paper called the *Northern Messenger*, issued semi-monthly at 30c. a year. Why should we not have such papers as we now import published in Canada in the same way? Why not have Canadian sentiment prevailing our Sunday School papers, as well as American or English? Why not have Canadian story and feeling encouraged, as well as our Canadian printers and publishers, instead of bringing in such publications for the benefit of the people on the other side of the line? But the effect of the tariff will be an average rate of about 10 per cent., and I find that all who have presented remonstrances against it in the newspapers admit they are willing to have a 10 per cent. *ad valorem* tariff. It will give us about 20 per cent. on the cheaper kind of literature, which may be published here, it will tax as lightly as possible the higher class of literature which cannot be published here, and which we must import, and what I think a very great want, it will make all classes in the country contribute equally on the books imported. I noticed, the other day, in the Ottawa correspondence

MR. WHITE.

of the *Globe*, a very formidable indictment against this particular feature of the tariff, which, I have reason to believe, was prepared by a bookseller in Montreal and handed to the hon. member for Lambton, and by him, in his character of coach to the correspondent of the *Globe*, sent to that paper. Just let me give you a clause from that indictment, to show you how little dependence can be placed on it. I know that that indictment is, as to its main features, utterly disingenuous, but I shall read only the last count:—

“14. The Canadian publisher who issues newspapers or periodicals printed or published in Canada, mails such matter in bulk at 1c. per lb.; the bookseller pays 4c. per lb., giving, bulk for bulk, 75 per cent. in favour of the Canadian publisher, but, actually, the percentage in his favour is much greater, for he pays in bulk what the bookseller pays on each journal. On a number of packages for mail, the other day, the collective postage was 39c.,—they weighed 5lbs. On this the Canadian publisher would pay 5c.”

Now, will any person believe that this is the law of to-day, under the Postal Act brought in by the hon. gentlemen opposite? If it is so terrible an outrage as these gentlemen pretend, they should direct their shafts, not against the present Finance Minister, but against the hon. gentleman who introduced it. There has been, in the past, a practical injustice in connection with this duty on books, and I can understand how those who profited by it should feel deeply grieved at the change now made, in what has been, to a large extent, their business, and practice in this matter. The bookseller was in the habit, like many others, and as still more would have come to be in the habit, had the old tariff continued, of sending lists of subscribers in Canada to English and American agents, and getting books and periodicals sent to those subscribing, through the post-office, not only without paying any duty, but actually with the advantage, in cities, of having the periodicals delivered to their subscribers at the public expense, by the carriers of the post-office. Thus, large invoices have been actually delivered to the people at the expense of the public, the booksellers receiving their 10 per cent. commission from the publishers. The booksellers would like this system to last, for, here-

after, they will not be able to employ the Government as deliverers of their goods, without paying for the service, and the man who gets his lot of books, or papers, or magazines *en bloc*, and pays the Customs duty, will not find his neighbour in competition with him getting his books and papers sent to subscribers paying no duty whatever, and having the city delivery made for him free of cost through the intervention of the Government. There is another principle of this tariff which has commended it very strongly to the merchants, and whose object is to promote our foreign trade. Happily, this tariff restores to us the old principle adopted when Sir Francis Hincks was Finance Minister, giving a premium to direct trade in connection with the tea trade of Canada. I was struck, the other evening, when the ex-Finance Minister was speaking on this subject, with the sneer with which he referred to the tea trade of this country, and with the effort he made to belittle this whole matter by telling us that never more than one ship had come direct to Canada from the tea-producing countries. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the advantage of the whole direct trade of this country depends simply on the fact of whether it comes through the United States or by ship direct to Canada? What was the effect under that system the last year we had the 10 per cent. duty? It was this: Of the importation of tea, 52 per cent. came directly to Canadian merchants, while, last year, only 3 per cent. came direct to the merchants of this country. Is it a matter of no consequence to Canada that the merchants of Toronto and Montreal, or any other place in the country, should become distributors of such products to the people? Let me give you, as the result of this change already, an extract from a letter I received the other day from a gentleman in New York, one who was compelled to leave Montreal in consequence of the change of duties effected by the ex-Finance Minister. That gentleman, I may say, was an old Reformer. I venture to say, that, up to the time that the ex-Minister of Finance drove him and others from the Reform ranks, by the manner in which he dealt with the interests of the country in his tariff, he had never given a vote for the Con-

servatives. Since, however, he and his friends have worked with the Conservative party. Here is what he wrote to me from New York the other day :—

“I notice there is to be some further discussion on the tariff this week. But it is very unlikely any changes will be made, further than some slight modifications of duty on some articles, and the principle of Protection and differential duties adhered to, which may be considered a foregone conclusion. I had just worked into a nice paying commission business, buying for Canadians, and the staples were tea, coffee, and sugar. But all in a moment it is swept away. Nothing could be more complete. I have little to thank either party for in Canada, as far as I am personally concerned. The Liberals withdrew the differential duty on tea, which injured our business, and was partly the cause of my coming here; and now that I have made another business, the Conservatives have given their blow. Still, though their tariff kills my business, I will not go back on Conservative principles, and I do agree with your policy of Protection. It must mean better wages and more money among the masses, and it is useless offering goods at low prices, no matter where they are got, if people have not the money to buy them.”

Now, Sir, this is the result in a single case. The whole distributing trade in relation to tea brought back to Canada, instead of being, as during the last four years, centred in New York. Then, with regard to another article, the trade of which has been advantageous to Canada, the sugar refining industries, this tariff is in the right direction. The conduct of the late Government in relation to this question, is not creditable to them either as statesmen or Canadians. Everyone who was present during the discussion on this subject during the last Parliament, will remember that hon. gentlemen opposite denied, in the first instance, that there was any bounty whatever concealed in the drawback given the American refiner; that was their positive assertion. After a while, when the sugar refinery in Montreal was stopped, and the American Government had no further motive for crushing out that industry here, they reduced the drawback upon the express ground that it concealed a bounty, and then we had the admission on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, that, after all, there was a bounty on American imported sugar, but they urged that we had the advantage of it in getting a cheaper sugar, the bounty, meanwhile, being paid by the

MR. WHITE.

Americans. But while this discussion was going on, these hon. gentlemen allowed a great industry to be destroyed. When charged with this they told us that it was a matter of no consequence whether the sugar was refined in England or in the United States, so long as the people of Canada got cheap sugar, as they incorrectly alleged they were doing. And when, having pointed out that the cause of the great injustice to our Canadian refining interests was, first, the frauds perpetrated by the American refiners, in coloring the sugar; and, next, the bounty given by the American Government, what was suggested by an hon. gentleman opposite, who afterwards became the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Mills)? He deliberately suggested that Canadians ought to follow the example of the American refiners, and defraud the revenue in order that they might carry on their business profitably. Here is the extract from the letter of the hon. member for Bothwell to Mr. G. G. Dustan, of Halifax, on the subject :

“Mr. Jones referred to the experiments carried on at Cologne, but these experiments would not show, according to the amount of refined sugar produced from the raw article, the possibility of obtaining a bounty of 55c. per 100 lbs. I pointed out myself that it was possible, by coloring the sugar, to produce a larger quantity than the reports of the refiners indicated; but this fact seemed to me to be lost sight of in your communications: that our duties being arranged on the same principle of the Dutch Standard, there was an equal possibility of introducing into this country, as an inferior grade, superior raw sugars, by means of coloring, so that in this respect the American refiners could have no advantage over the Canadian importer who refined also.”

There was a deliberate statement from the hon. member for Bothwell, who was a Minister of the Crown at the time (1877), that the refiners of this country should follow the example of the refiners on the other side, and deliberately defraud the revenue, in order to carry on their business. But that hon. gentleman tells us that he thinks it extraordinary the people should object to have cheap sugar, as a result of the bounties paid by foreign countries, and he almost laughs to scorn the idea that any sensible man should take ground of that kind. One would think that this matter had never been discussed anywhere else; one would

imagine that no one of any standing had ever thought of such a thing as that sugars, rendered low by means of bounties, were not any advantage to the country that imported them. But what are the facts? England has been cited here as a great Free-trade country; her statesmen have been mentioned to us as men whose opinions on economic questions ought to be followed, and yet, in the famous Sugar Convention of 1864, to which England was a party, we had this special provision made against the importation of bounty sugar. Article 19, of the convention, read as follows:—

“The high contracting powers reserve to themselves to agree as to the steps to be taken for obtaining the adhesion of the Governments of other countries, to the arrangements of the present convention. In the event of bounties being granted in the said countries on the exportation of refined sugars, the high contracting parties will be at liberty to come to an understanding as to the surtax to be imposed on the importation of refined sugars to and from the said countries.”

Thus, upon the question of bounties there was a deliberate arrangement, made in convention of prominent nations, to which England was a party, to the effect that, so far from the importation of these sugars, rendered cheap by means of bounties paid by foreign countries, being an advantage to the country, they should actually be at liberty to put on a surtax, in order to destroy that advantage, if advantage it was. We know that prominent men in England, men whose opinions on economic questions ought certainly to have as much weight as those of the hon. member for Bothwell—prominent men like Lord Derby, Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Aberdare, Prof. Leoni Levi, Mr. Gladstone, and others—have taken the ground that it is not desirable that industries should be driven out of the country by means of concealed subsidies, in the form of bounties given by foreign countries. I shall not trouble the House by reading extracts from the speeches of all these distinguished gentlemen, but merely give one or two, and the others are in the same sense. Lord Aberdare said:

“Of course it would be to the advantage of this country to reap the benefit of the cheaper productions of other countries. That was the true spirit of Free-trade, but the effect of the large bonuses to the French manufacturers was that they were rapidly destroying the-

fining industry of this country. When it was destroyed, the price of sugar would rise, and he need scarcely say that the result would be rather permanently to increase the price of sugar. It was, therefore, as much the interest of the British consumer as it was of the French taxpayer that these absurd and extravagant bonuses given to the French refiners should cease. The reason they did not cease he was convinced was not that the French Government was not thoroughly persuaded that such a duty was unjust, but because the Protectionist spirit was so strong in France.”

Professor Leoni Levi, one of the most acceptable authorities on political economy of the present day, took a similar view when he said, at a meeting of the Society of Arts:

“Nor can it in the end prove satisfactory even to the consumer in this country to enjoy ordinary cheapness, if, under the operation of such exceptional legislation and a fallacious system of bounties, one by one all the refiners in England and Scotland should be compelled to close their works and so leave the whole British market for refined sugar a complete monopoly for the French refiners.”

That language was precisely the language that might be used in relation to the United States, substituting simply the American refiners for the French. But, Sir, we have had from the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance a statement of the extraordinary price we are going to pay for refining sugar in Canada. In the hon. gentleman's speech, he said:

“Doubtless, it is in the power of this country, by a particular form of taxation, to compel all the sugar used in this country to be refined in it, but has the hon. gentleman the least idea of what the probable cost to the people of this country is going to be? I take his own statement; I take his proposal to tax sugar below No. 14 at ¾c. per pound, and to add an *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent. Assuming, as, I presume, I have the right to do, that No. 14 will be laid down at \$550 a hundred, though, of course, the cost varies much from year to year, and from time to time, nevertheless, it is clear, even if you are to add to the 100,000,000 lbs which we now import, about 10 per cent. as fairly representing the waste accruing in the process of manufacture,—and I may tell the hon. gentleman that this 10 per cent., according to the statement made by some of the most eminent refiners in the trade, would be a very liberal allowance indeed,—you find that the total revenue, supposing that all the sugar we consume is refined here, about 1,980,000 bls., under the tariff that the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce, we would receive \$2,925,000; in other words, if his scheme be successful, and we refine our own sugar in Canada, we will have the satisfaction of know-

ing that for the pleasure of washing our own sugar, for that is all it amounts to, we will have to pay something like \$1,000,000 per annum whether that be taken out of the public Treasury or whether it be taken out of the pockets of the people, without going into the public Treasury, for the gratification of half a dozen influential gentlemen engaged in sugar refining, either in Halifax, Montreal or elsewhere."

Now, Sir, I am not going to repeat the answer, the complete convincing answer, of the hon. the Minister of Finance to that statement; but it seems to me there is another fact which was not referred to, bearing upon what he calls the enormous cost of sugar to this country. In 1878 the whole consumption of sugar in this country reached in round numbers to 109,500,000lb., the total cost for which, to the people of this country, was \$6,186,226, the average duty paid thereon being 42 per cent.; for the year 1876,—as the hon. gentleman will remember the sugar refinery in Montreal closed about the end of that fiscal year,—the home consumption was 114,500,000lb., the cost of which was \$5,073,965, and the average duty on which was 45 per cent., so that the result of closing the refinery, and giving control of the Canadian market to the Americans and their agents in this country, was to compel us to pay \$1,112,261 more for 109,500,000lb. of sugar in 1878 than we paid for 114,500,000lb. in 1876. Not only was that the effect, but it was the effect in spite of this other fact: that the price of sugar at the place of production, in 1878, was less than in 1876. According to Messrs. Connell & Co.'s circular, good dry brown sugar cost in 1876 from 30s. to 30s. 6d., and in 1878 from 21s. to 21s. 6d. So that, taking the difference in price at the place of production, we really paid \$2,000,000 in 1878 more than in 1876, for the privilege of allowing the Americans to wash our sugars, instead of washing them ourselves. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have proceeded on the assumption that that million dollars to which they referred, all goes into the pockets of the refiners. They have taken the ground, for no other inference is fairly deducible from their argument, that this million dollars is simply for the benefit of a few respectable gentlemen engaged in refining in the cities of this

country. I have an authority on that subject, which I venture to say hon. gentlemen opposite will not be disposed to dispute. We all know how frequently, during the last five years, we have heard the name of David A. Wells, cited in this House; we all know that when the hon. gentleman the member for Bothwell obtained a Committee to ascertain the cause of depression in Canada, the first evidence he brought up was not Canadian evidence, but a letter from Mr. David A. Wells, as to the best course to pursue in Canada, in order to remove the depression. Here is what Mr. Wells says in relation to the importance of the sugar refining industry:

"Any exhibit of this great interest which should stop here would, however, be exceedingly incomplete, for, unlike tea and coffee, which are imported in a condition suitable to enter into immediate domestic consumption, nearly all of the immense sugar product of foreign countries, which comes, or rather is permitted to come, under the existing tariff, to the United States, as well as no inconsiderable portion of the domestic product, is wholly unfit to enter into consumption until it has undergone a process of refining or purification. According to the census of 1870, this business of sugar refining, measured by the value of its product, ranked ninth in the order of importance of the so-called manufacturing industries of the country (flouring and grist mill products, sawed lumber, boots and shoes, clothing, cotton goods, woollens and worsteds, carpentering and building, forged and rolled iron taking precedence in the order as enumerated), 4,597 hands being employed with an annual disbursement of \$3,177,298 in wages. But the statistics accepted by the trade in 1878 give to the existing business of sugar refining a much higher place among the industries of the country than was assigned to it by the census relations of 1870, and indicate a present employment of some 10,000 men, and also that before the 1,500,000,000lb. of foreign sugar annually imported into this country enter into consumption, the refiners expend, in order to make the same marketable to the people, an average of one cent per pound, or an aggregate of some \$15,000,000 per annum. And yet, further, that of this grand annual expenditure, a very large proportion accrues to labour of a multiform character, employed in great part directly within the refineries."

Since some 10,000 men are employed in the sugar refining industry in the United States, it is evident that the hon. member for Bothwell was greatly mistaken when he stated that only 266 would suffice to perform that industry in Canada. In this statement of Mr. Wells,

he does not tell us that these \$15,000,000 go into the pockets of the refiners, but he points out that it is expended in the country in the employment of labour, and that it goes directly into the pockets of the people generally. Then, Sir, as to the cost of the sugar, because that, after all, is the strongest point of our friends opposite, I will give them also the evidence of Mr Wells, which I am sure they will not dispute. Mr. Wells says, page 68 of his report:—

“The American sugar refiners, the magnitude and comparative rank of whose industry has been already noticed, claim—and their claim is generally admitted—that they can make refined sugar cheaper than it can at present be produced in Europe, or in any other country; and it is a fact little known to the American public, that if the duties now levied on imported sugars were deducted, the American refiners do now actually sell their product on an average, some 11c. per 100 pounds cheaper than do the refiners of England, which country now permits the importation of all sugars free of duty.”

On this point the Ways and Means Committee of Congress elicited some curious and important testimony, which I will not detain the House by giving; but the statement of Mr. Wells' as to the fact that the effect of sugar refineries in the United States, instead of being to increase the cost of sugar to the consumers has actually been to reduce that cost to them, while distributing a large amount of money among the labouring classes, that statement, I say, is worthy the careful attention of the House. Mr. Wells is a Free-trader. He was the special authority cited by hon. gentlemen opposite for the information of this country during the last five years, and he has no doubt whatever of the importance of maintaining the duties to support sugar refining in the country itself. Here is an extract from his report which will show that to be a fact:—

“The higher the grade of raw sugar imported therefore in the United States, the less work remains to be done upon it here, and the less home labour is employed upon it. On the other hand, the lower the grade of sugar imported, the larger is the field offered for the employment of both domestic capital and labour. An examination of the books of one of the largest and most successful sugar refineries in the United States, shows that the cost of refining, exclusive of interest on capital, is approximately apportioned in the following manner: For labor direct, 30 per cent.; for packages, the materials for which are derived

entirely from the North-Western States, 30 per cent.; fuel, coal, 12 per cent.; bone black, machinery, cartage, &c., 28 per cent. The fifteen hundred millions pounds of sugar annually refined in the United States require the expenditure, at the very least, for refining, of 1c. per pound on the average, or, what is the same thing, \$15,000,000 per annum, which is directly disbursed by the domestic sugar refining interest, on account of labour, materials and capital. A uniform rate of duty on sugar, discriminating against the importation of the lower grades, will needlessly divert this large disbursement into the hands of foreigners; for sugars, as will hereafter be proved, can, under natural conditions, be refined cheaper here than in other countries, and leave to American capital and labour, in its place, the narrow and pitiful field of a partial participation in the business of the transporting from foreign ports of a vast amount of perfected product which legitimately should be produced in the United States, and represent the joint employment of domestic labour and capital.”

I might read other opinions, but I will not detain the House in doing so. These are the views of Mr. Wells on the sugar refining business. He is an authority we all have been taught to revere as of great value on economic questions, and I think we ought, at least, to congratulate the country, and especially gentlemen opposite, on the fact that we have adopted a policy in entire accordance with the views thus presented by Mr. Wells. It will give employment to the labour and the capital in refining sugar in this country which, during the last two or three years, have been employed in the United States. There is one feature about this industry which is almost peculiar to itself, and that is, that, by refining this sugar in Canada, we not only build up important industries in this country, and give employment to capital and labour within the country itself, but we promote trade with those very countries with which it is to the interest of this country that we should have trade. For many years we have had discussions in Canada as to the importance of our West India trade. A former Government sent a commissioner to those countries in order to promote our trade with them. The late Government discussed, I believe, a proposition to subsidise steamers, in order that we might have trade with the West Indies, thus showing that the trade was considered so important as to merit an expenditure from the public Treasury in the subsidising of

steamers; and yet, while thus pretending to be solicitous about this great trade, even to the extent of granting fuller subsidies to promote it, what has been the result of the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued in relation to this foreign sugar trade? In 1876 our imports of sugar were, from Great Britain, 35·95 per cent. of the whole; from the United States, 29·25 per cent.; from the West Indies, 27·94 per cent.; from Brazil, 5·61 per cent.; other countries, 1·25 per cent. For the last half of 1878, under the operations of this policy of having our sugar washed by foreigners instead of doing it ourselves, we imported from Great Britain 27·74 per cent. less than we imported when we had our sugar refinery going on in Montreal; 27·74 was the import from Great Britain; 67·77 per cent. was the import from the United States, while our imports from the West Indies were reduced to 4·34 per cent.; from Brazil reduced to nothing; and from other countries, a diminution to decimal 15 per cent. Well, for the first two months of the present year, owing, I will admit, to exceptional circumstances, and to the determination of some dealers in Canada to get in as much American goods as they could in view of the policy, we had imports from Great Britain 5·96, from the United States 93·34, from the West Indies ·57, and other countries ·13. That was the result of the policy of having our sugar washed by foreigners instead of by ourselves. As to the advantage of the West India trade, I will make one quotation. I make it simply because it is published in the *Journal of Commerce*, which, as everybody knows, is edited by an hon. gentleman whose opinion on the subject is worth a great deal, Sir Francis Hincks. It is as follows:—

“The hope of seeing the Canadian refiners resume operations, cannot be deferred very long, as it is felt to be the duty of the new Government to indemnify the country for the loss of industry the preceding Administration is said to have caused by its leaning towards Free-trade. The reopening of refineries is the reopening of the trade with the West Indies. With sugar as a return freight, the freight out will soon be found. What is the usual cargo of vessels leaving New York, for instance, for a port of Cuba, or of the other islands? Boards, shooks, hay, potatoes, a few coops of poultry, trunks, hardware, cheap fur-

niture, Yankee notions, shoes and crockery, are about the usual run of a cargo. Is there anything in it Canada could not find within its borders, and is not intercourse with other countries an incitement to the discovery of new articles of trade, to the creation of new wants, and, consequently, to the increase of exchanges, conducive to mutual prosperity? The resumption of sugar refining in Canada means, in consequence, the revival of the direct trade with foreign countries.”

Now, Sir, I think, in view of these facts, and that they are facts nobody can doubt, we may fairly congratulate the Government and the country that by the tariff they have introduced, by their determination to give Protection to the refining trade, to the washing of our own sugar, they will build up that important industry in the country, and thus will cause the expenditure of an enormous sum of money among the labouring people and among the various other industries incident to the sugar refining interest in Canada, and will, at the same time, promote the trade with the West Indies, which it has been the policy of all Governments in Canada, including the late Government, though their efforts were rather feeble, to promote. But Sir, in this discussion there has been a disposition, in the illustrations which have been drawn in regard to the United States, to measure the results of Protection simply by the export trade of the country. And here, I may say, in relation to that, that a statement which has been handed to me shows that the statements of the hon. gentlemen opposite have not been altogether accurate. The value of manufactured products exported from the United States has been referred to on the other side as \$75,000,000. From the published reports of the United States Treasury, however, the value of manufactured goods exported in 1878 amounted to \$135,171,921, and in 1877 it amounted to the large sum of \$145,000,000; last year's amount being actually \$60,000,000 in excess of the statement of the hon. gentleman opposite. But in this \$135,000,000, there is not included a number of articles which were employing labour in the country, which may be said to be manufactured goods. Flour, evidently manufactured, for instance, amounted to \$25,126,497, and corn meal to \$1,136,187.

MR. CHARLTON: Will the hon. gentleman allow us to enquire if that \$135,000,000 included lumber?

MR. WHITE: I presume so, but I will give the hon. gentleman figures on that point presently. Manufactured goods which cross the border in cars, of which the Treasury Department has no official return, but are known to the Customs Department of Canada, over \$10,000,000, making together \$36,462,683, and which, added to \$135,171,921, aggregates \$171,634,604, which gives about \$96,000,000 over the statement made by hon. gentlemen on the other side. But, Sir, I venture to say that the disposition to measure results simply by the amount of the export trade, is by no means a fair way of looking at the matter. Take, for instance, the cotton manufactures of the United States. The exports of cotton manufactured goods during the last year were \$11,435,228, and the imports of cotton goods were \$13,457,808. But, Sir, the home production of cotton, which, after all, must be taken into account in illustrating the advantages of the Protective system, which gives employment to the people, employing no less than 875 mills, in which were used 9,539,364 spindles, an average per spindle of 60.46, equal in value to 600,000,000 pounds of manufactured cottons for the home consumption of the country. Surely, Sir, when you come to see the value of the system to the country, it is not fair to assume that you are to judge of the system simply by the quantity that may be exported. England had a tremendous start in the race for the export trade with the United States, but the United States is speedily and gradually overtaking England in the race. Today we find that the manufactured cotton in the United States is equal to one-half the entire production of England, in spite of the enormous foreign market which England has established and continues to control. Take another illustration of this—the iron industry. We have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that three quarters of the blast furnaces of the United States are closed; we have been told that the iron industry in that country has terribly suffered, and that this suffering is chargeable entirely

to the system of Protection that prevails in that country. Now Sir, there is no doubt whatever that there are a large number of blast furnaces out of blast in the United States, but there is no doubt, also, that there are a large number in operation; and, judging by a statement which I saw in the *Globe* last week, these blast furnaces are being revived, and a large number of them that were out of blast, are now in blast and giving full employment. But Sir, what is the reason of those furnaces being out of blast? Was it the system of Protection in that country? No, Sir, the reason was chiefly because of the tremendous shrinkage of values in connection with the iron of the country. In the State of Pennsylvania alone, in the year 1872, there was produced 1,401,497 tons of pig iron, which brought an average of \$49 per ton, or an aggregate of \$66,673,380; while, in 1877, Pennsylvania produced 1,153,356 tons of pig iron, the average price being only \$19, or an aggregate of \$22,000,000; yet, Sir, in spite of this large reduction in price, we find that the production of pig iron in that State is still increasing. In 1877 there was produced 221,349 tons more than in 1876, an increase of more than one-sixth. Another cause is the substitution of steel rails for iron rails. In 1872 the iron rails made in the United States amounted to 950,930 tons, and Bessemer steel rails 91,070, or about 10 per cent., while in 1877 the proportions were actually reversed—iron rails 332,540 tons, steel rails 432,169 tons. Another feature of that, Sir, is that the use of steel rails upon our railroads lessens the quantity required very largely. It has been estimated by those who are acquainted with this question, that the rails required in replacement of tracks upon a road worked to its full capacity is about 70 per cent. less than when steel rails are used than when iron rails are used. Thus we had in that a good illustration of the shrinkage in value. Hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), have good reason to know that steel rails have become reduced in value during the last five years. We find that the average cost of such rails in 1873 was £15 10s., while in 1878 the aver-

age price was under £5 10s. per ton; so that to these things may be attributed, more than the mere question of Protection, the fact that a large number of these blast furnaces are out of blast. What do we find to be the fact in other countries? In Germany, out of twenty leading iron works, only three paid dividends in 1877; in England—that Free-trade country, from which were derived all arguments on the other side of the question—according to Hunt's mineral statistics of the United Kingdom, out of 974 furnaces, only 489 were in blast in 1877; in the United States, out of 716 furnaces, 476 were out of blast in 1876, but that number was reduced to 446 in 1877, and still further in 1878. But, Sir, in relation to the iron industry, whose history in the United States has been cited as one of the evils of Protection, what has been the general result in regard to it? Take the question as affecting the imports and exports of iron and steel manufactures:—From the United States, in 1873, the imports were \$57,333,150, and in 1878 \$9,057,633, or, allowing for the difference in value, it went down from \$57,000,000 to \$25,000,000, giving the imports of 1878 the same value as those of 1873; while the exports in 1873 amounted to \$13,283,239, and, in 1878, to \$15,844,264, or, adopting the same principle of giving these exports the same value as the exports of 1873, there was \$43,000,000 of exported iron manufactured from the United States in 1878. That, Sir, I think, will prove, at any rate, that if, in the United States, the iron industry has flagged, and that some furnaces are out of blast, it is an industry which has promoted a large amount of labour, great expenditure of capital, and a large amount of prosperity in the United States. Then, Sir, there was another illustration which was brought up by gentlemen opposite, to prove to us that the policy on this side of the House is a very bad policy, in relation to the shipping trade, as exemplified by the United States. We are told that they have no shipping; that the result of Protection has been to utterly destroy that great branch of industry. Well, Sir, it is quite true that the percentage of the foreign trade of the United States, carried in American bottoms, is much less

MR. WHITE.

than some years ago; but, Sir, I think we can find, in the conditions of the American war, in the circumstances of the country at the time, a very good reason for the rapid and sudden reduction of the shipping of the United States. In 1860, the tonnage of the United States was 4,485,931 sail, and 867,937 steam, making, in all, 5,353,868. In 1865, just after the war, the total had been reduced to 3,516,788, while in 1878, in spite of Protection, in spite of the fact that the shipping had all been destroyed, as is alleged, in consequence of this system of Protection, they had increased their tonnage to 4,212,765; while in 1878 there was a tonnage of 1,167,687 against 699,950 of steam in 1865. Well, Sir, during the last year there were a great many vessels built in the United States, in spite of the fact that they had Protection, and in spite of the fact that they had not the same system of duties in order to protect this particular industry as those embodied in the tariff of the Finance Minister. In 1878 there were built 532 sailing vessels, with a tonnage of 106,066 tons; 334 steam vessels, with a tonnage of 81,859, and other small vessels, making in all, 1,258 vessels, with a tonnage of 235,593, one-half of which, 634, with a tonnage of 143,804, were for the Atlantic and Gulf coast service. So that, Sir, I think we may fairly assume that, in relation to the branch of industry in the United States to which reference has been made by gentlemen on the other side, as showing a loss by this system of Protection, the actual facts do not indicate that loss to have occurred; but that, on the contrary, the same prosperity exists as in relation to the other industries, especially the iron industry. Another argument used against this system, is, that it will make a number of individuals rich, to the prejudice of others. One would imagine, from hearing the hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is a sin for Canadians to become rich.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: By robbing his neighbours.

MR. WHITE: By robbing his neighbours? Why, Mr. Speaker, one would imagine, from the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me, and who managed, with consummate skill, the

other evening, to insult every community in this country engaged in industrial, commercial or professional pursuits, that the only people who are entitled to consideration at the hands of the country are those who are born with a silver spoon in their mouths, and are able to live upon the earnings of their ancestors. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) cite a number of names from Dun, Wiman's book, as showing how little we ought to do in the direction of Protection, when so much wealth was in the hands of individuals in Canada. Now, Sir, I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman did not fully consider this matter before thus parading names before the country. If he had taken the trouble to look carefully over the list for 1876, for instance, which was a comparatively recent list, and had compared the position of gentlemen there rated with their position to-day, he would have abundant proof of the injurious results of the recent policy of this country. Why, Sir, what were the facts? I do not propose to give names, and I deeply regret the facts I am about to mention. I find that in Dun, Wiman's book in 1876 there were three names rated at the time \$250,000 to \$500,000, one of them with unlimited credit, the other with high credit, one from \$150,000 to \$300,000, two from \$50,000 to \$100,000, four from \$100,000 to \$250,000, all of them with credit high, and every one of them has gone into the Bankruptcy Courts since.

MR. MILLS: Were they manufacturers?

MR. WHITE: Many of them were manufacturers. They were as much manufacturers as the gentlemen whom he named, as for instance were the Messrs. Gault Bros. They were persons engaged in trade, but having interests in manufactures as well. What has been the result of the condition of things during the last two or three years? Every man who knows anything of the commerce of this country, knows that, during the last four or five years, men engaged in commerce have not been making money in Canada; if they have been able to hold their own, it is all they could do, and many of them have passed sleepless nights in their efforts to pull through the

depression, in the hope that we would have a Government that would take into consideration the state of the country, and provide means to revive trade. I venture the opinion that another three years of such a policy as we have had during the past four years, would tell a tale in relation to those gentlemen of high rating which would be a source of extreme sorrow to every well-wisher of his country. Two arguments have been used against this tariff, to which I will briefly refer:— One is, that it is going to excite hostility, and, probably, reprisal, in the United States; and the other that it is opposed to the interests of this country as a colony of the Mother Country. As to the first, I think we may fairly congratulate ourselves that the evidences afforded by the tone of the American press show that the people of the United States are not averse, after all, to our paying them that sincerest flattery, the imitation of their policy. I have failed to see that any newspaper in the United States, whose opinions are of any value as indicating public sentiment, is opposed to our exercising our authority to determine what fiscal policy we will adopt. I have had the privilege, during the last six years, every year of meeting the National Board of Trade of the United States, and I know that the merchants who meet there discuss this question of the Canadian fiscal policy as a matter which belongs entirely to us to determine for ourselves, and, while the merchants of the United States would gladly have, if they could, more intimate relations with us, they quite recognise our right, and many of them our interest, to adopt the policy which will build up the industries of the country. The people of the United States cannot expect us to ask their permission to adopt a policy suitable to our own interests, and that, after all, is what is involved in the argument on this subject. They will accept this policy as they have accepted the past policy, as a matter which concerns us entirely, and their merchants will simply do as they have done in the past: see whether they cannot, with their skill and ingenuity, manage to circumvent our manufacturers and continue to control our markets. A much more serious

matter is the question how it affects us with the Mother Country. I admit at once that, if this question were one which was going to bring about such a disagreement with the Mother Country that the connection would be broken, it would be a cause for serious consideration, and that we might fairly be called upon to pause. Happily, Mr. Speaker, no such issue is presented to us. One would imagine this question had never arisen before. The battle of our right to deal with our own fiscal policy has been fought and won long ago. Let me give you, Mr. Speaker, a short extract from the despatch sent from this country, and accepted by the Imperial Government, which settled for all time the precise relations of this country with the Mother Country, in so far as our fiscal policy is concerned. In 1859, when Mr. Galt, now Sir Alexander Galt, brought in his tariff in the old Legislative Assembly at Toronto, it will be remembered that some of the people of England, notably the members of the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce, took great umbrage at the policy of this country in building up manufactures. They did not hesitate to say that their ground of objection was that a colony of the Empire should not make any effort, whatever, to build up industries of her own. I will read one extract from the representation of the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce to the Duke of Newcastle, on this subject. Referring to the reasons which prompted them to send their petition, they said :

“The reasons may be said to be twofold : First, those arising from a conviction that it is the deliberate policy of the Government of Canada to foster native manufactures by fiscal Protection, and every other means in their power.”

That was the ground of their objection ; they went on to say :

“The merchants and manufacturers of Sheffield have no wish to obtain special exception for themselves, and do not complain that they are called upon to pay the same duty as the Americans or the Germans, neither do they claim to have goods admitted free of duty. All they ask is, that the policy of Protection to native manufactures in Canada should be distinctly discountenanced by Her Majesty's Government, as a system condemned, by reason and experience, as directly contrary to the policy solemnly adopted by the Mother

Country, and calculated to breed disunion and distrust between Great Britain and her colonies.”

Then we had this statement in the despatch sent by the Duke of Newcastle to this country :—

“When the authenticated Act of the Canadian Parliament on this subject arrives, I may, probably, feel that I can take no other course than signifying to you the Queen's assent to it, notwithstanding the objections raised against the law in this country. But I consider it my duty, no less to the colony than to the Mother Country, to express my regret that the experience of England, which has fully proved the injurious effect of the Protection system, and the advantage of low duties upon manufactures, both as regards trade and revenue, should be lost sight of, and that such an Act as the present should have been passed.”

This despatch of the Duke of Newcastle, and the petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Sheffield were referred to the Government, who referred them to Mr. Galt, now Sir Alexander Galt, the Finance Minister, who reported on them, and in his report the following manly doctrine was laid down :—

“Respect for the Imperial Government must always dictate the desire to satisfy them that the policy of this country is neither hastily nor unwisely formed, and that due regard is paid to the interests of the Mother Country as well as of the Province. But the Government of Canada, acting for its Legislature and people, cannot, through those feelings of deference which they owe to the Imperial authorities, in any manner waive or diminish the right of the people of Canada to decide for themselves both as to the mode and extent to which the taxation shall be imposed. The Provincial Ministry are at all times ready to afford explanations in regard to the Acts of the Legislature to which they are party. But, subject to their duty and allegiance to Her Majesty, their responsibility on all general questions of policy must be to the Provincial Parliament, by whose confidence they administer the affairs of the country. And, in the imposition of taxation, it is so plainly necessary that the administration of the people should be in accord, that the former cannot admit responsibility, or require approval beyond that of the Local Legislature. Self-government would be utterly annihilated if the views of the Imperial Government were to be preferred to those of the people of Canada. It is, therefore, the duty of the present Government distinctly to affirm the right of the Canadian Legislature to adjust the taxation of the people in the way they deem best, even if it should unfortunately happen to meet the disapproval of the Imperial Ministry. Her Majesty cannot be advised to disallow such Acts, unless her advisers are prepared to assume

the administration of the affairs of the colony, irrespective of the views of its inhabitants.'"

That was the view taken then, a view which was accepted by the Imperial Government, and which has settled for all time the relations of this country to the Mother Country in regard to her fiscal policy. Was our loyalty undermined by this policy? Did it, in the slightest degree, cause any estrangement of feeling between us? The year after the Prince of Wales visited Canada, and there was, from one end of this country to the other, such an exhibition of spontaneous loyalty as proved that there was no question of estrangement with the Mother Country, but simply a policy of building up Canada, by encouraging her industries and manufactures in such a manner that it would make the colony infinitely more valuable as an ally of the Mother Country. But hon. gentlemen opposite, who have so suddenly become alarmed lest anything should be done here not in accordance with the Imperial Government, have not in the past always exhibited the same anxiety. We know that prominent gentlemen on that side are, at this moment, agitating in favour of a system by which we will be able to make treaties with foreign countries, irrespective of the Home Government—why? Because our interests may sometimes clash with those of the Mother Country. Who does not remember the controversies about the Washington Treaty; the attacks which were made upon the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, because, in a question where not merely the commercial, but the national interests of the Mother Country, were at stake, where the question of peace or war trembled in the balance, where England's position in the councils of European nations, because that was involved in the settlement with the United States, was at stake, these gentlemen, from one end of the country to the other denounced the right hon gentleman because he consented to a policy which, as they said, suited Imperial but not Canadian interests? Can there be any analogy between a policy of this kind, which simply, so far as it affects England at all, affects a few manufacturers there who send their goods to this

country, and a treaty like that of Washington, the settlement of a national dispute between two great Anglo-Saxon communities? And yet these hon. gentlemen, who are now so solicitous for Imperial interests, had no hesitation then to attempt to arouse public sentiment against the right hon. the Premier, because he consented to the Washington Treaty at the instance and in the interests of the Imperial Government, and which the result has proved so far has not been injurious to this country, as they predicted. But we can draw a lesson from the history of our friends on the other side of the line as to the effect of the policy of Protection. Take the increase in their population from 1860 to 1870, the last decennial period of which we have any census, and what do we find? That, while the purely agricultural States, such as Maine and New Hampshire, actually diminished in population, the chief increase was in those particular States where manufacturing industries are carried on. The States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, increased within a fraction of the whole of the rest of the United States, in spite of that gigantic, that wonderful western development, which excited the astonishment of all observers. More than that, we find that in these States, where, according to the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, nothing but misery reigned, nearly one-half of the entire savings of the entire people of the United States was to be found in their savings banks. In Massachusetts according to the latest returns, there was in the savings banks there an aggregate amount of \$244,596,614 by 739,757 depositors. I shall not deal with the figures of the others, but the aggregate of these five States was 1,165,254 depositors with savings to the aggregate amount of \$404,191,205. Of the total in the United States, leaving out the great State of New York, which had a very large number of depositors, and a very large amount of deposits, we find that these five large manufacturing States had 1,165,254 depositors in savings banks, against 490,981 depositors in the rest of the United States, except New York, and that the aggregate amount of the savings in these five States was

\$404,191,205, against \$162,883,162 in all the rest of the United States, except New York. These figures are sufficient evidence that Protection has not brought distress, misery and depression on the people of the United States. There has been a good deal of opposition to this tariff, as naturally there will be to all tariffs. It is undoubtedly open to the objection to which all human contrivances are open: that it is not perfect. But, Sir, is this the only tariff against which opposition has exhibited itself? In 1859, when Mr. Galt brought down his tariff, the Legislative Assembly was flooded with petitions against it from all parts of the country. In 1874, when the hon. gentleman opposite introduced his tariff, he has a painful recollection, I have no doubt, of the amount of opposition that tariff excited in the country. Deputations came here day after day, and there was this difference between deputations which came here then and now, that at that time they went away cursing, now the majority have gone away blessing; they were now, at least, received with courtesy, while I am bound to say that in 1874, taking their own statement, there had been but scant courtesy extended to them. So great was the opposition to that tariff, that the hon. gentleman abandoned it. The tariff adopted a fortnight after the Budget speech of the hon. gentleman had hardly any resemblance to the tariff the hon. gentleman introduced. We all remember the wonderful tariff, by which he was to enable the unlearned merchant to calculate his duty, by making it the sixth part of the value. Well, he forgot all about the unfortunate want of learning on the part of the merchants, and came down with a 17½ per cent. tariff afterwards. So in relation to every feature of that tariff. The tariff actually adopted was entirely different from the tariff brought down. But, Sir, this tariff has met with some opposition. There have been persons outside, in the first place, who have misunderstood it. It is impossible that a complete revolution in our fiscal policy should be presented to Parliament and the country without merchants and manufacturers scanning it, and coming to the conclusion that in some particulars it might affect them.

MR. WHITE.

We have not had many petitions presented to this House, against the tariff question. I am bound to admit that we have had a few petitions against it, but let me see how these petitions have been got up. Let us take the petition against the duty on printing materials. You will remember that some few petitions, on this subject, have been presented by hon. gentlemen opposite. Whence came this spontaneous outburst of indignation on the part of the printers of Canada, against the tariff of my hon. friend? Here is the circular which accompanied the petition, and which was sent to every newspaper man in Canada:

"DEAR SIR,—We send you a copy of a petition against the proposed increase of the tariff upon type and printing materials. Please mail it to your member at Ottawa as speedily as possible, and request him to present it and give his vote and influence in its favour. We intend to publish the opinions of the press from all parts of the Dominion on this important subject in book form. Please send us a copy of the paper containing your comments.

"Yours truly,
(Signed) "MILLER & RICHARDS."

The signers, Messrs. Miller and Richards, Scotch type founders, are tremendously excited lest their business as exporters of type might be affected to the advantage of the Canadian type founders. A good friend of mine in the West sent me this circular, and I cannot help reading what he says at the bottom:—

"I enclose circular just received. I cannot sign it, and hope few of the craft will."

I am very glad to know that very few of the craft have signed it, judging from the number of petitions that have been presented to the House. Let me say here, with reference to the statements which have been made that I am personally interested in the type foundry at Montreal, that they are entirely incorrect; I never had any interest in it to the extent of sixpence; I never was a director even, much less the President, as the *Globe* announced me. At the present moment, no one connected with me is interested in that Company to the extent of a single sixpence, or has had, for the last two years, any interest in the type foundry. But, Sir, it is a great advantage to the printers of this country to have a local foundry, by means of

which they can supply their "sorts" when required, and they are glad, notwithstanding Miller & Richards, to have the duty increased upon this material, which goes into the manufacture of newspapers and books. Now, Sir, I have only a few words to say in conclusion. There is no doubt whatever that the Minister of Finance, who undertakes the duty in Canada of arranging a fiscal policy suited to its various interests, has a very difficult task to perform; there is no doubt whatever that this country, geographically formed as it is, a long country, with special interests, separated from each other by long distances, is not easily governed, especially in relation to fiscal policy, and the protection of its varied interests. But, Sir, will anyone pretend to say this is a reason why public men, or a Government, should do in Canada as hon. gentlemen opposite did when they were office? Are we, on this account, to fold our arms and say: "This is a matter that does not concern us, and, as it is a difficult task, we will not attempt it." Are our coal fields in Nova Scotia to remain undeveloped because, forsooth, it may cost people in the far West something for their coal, and they may be somewhat inconvenienced in not being able to get it from the United States? Are our millers and farmers in the West to be injured because it may cost something more to carry their produce to the Eastern Provinces, when these Eastern Provinces can possibly get their produce from the United States as well? Are we to adopt this miserable sectional policy? As members of this Dominion Parliament, in dealing with questions affecting the whole Dominion, we have no Nova Scotia, we have no New Brunswick, we have no Quebec, we have no Ontario, we are simply Canada as a whole, and the policy which we ought to adopt is the policy which will develop the interests of Canada as a whole. As an illustration of what may be done in relation to the promotion of the interests of one Province by the wants of another, we have the statement by telegraph to-day—I know nothing of it personally—we have the statement that one order has been given for 6,000,000 feet of lumber to the Guelph Lumber Company for shipment to Manitoba. Doubtless the duty on this

article has had something to do with giving us the market for ourselves. I have no doubt the hon. member for South Wellington, who, I believe, is President of that Company, will be glad, even though it may be legalised robbery, to avail himself of the additional profit this new field will open up to him. We want Canadians to feel that we cannot develop one part of the country without all parts being advantaged by it. We have great resources, in the field, in the mine, in the fisheries and in the forest, and if we determine that we will have no sectionalism, that we will develop those resources wherever we may find them, and make the interests of one part of the country tributary to the advantage of another, I venture to say we may look forward with some hope to the future of this young Dominion. And, in the future, as we are reaping the fruits of this wiser policy, we will be able to congratulate ourselves, looking back to this day, that we had, at the time of a great commercial crisis in Canada, public men with nerve enough to present this issue to the people, and a people with sense and wisdom enough to give power to those who have had the courage to carry it out.

MR. BAIN said the Budget speech delivered to the House by the Finance Minister, on this occasion, was one that merited the most careful consideration of the House. Heretofore, our tariff changes had been, to a great extent, regulated on what might be called the revenue principle, but on this occasion they were invited to consider a tariff that abandoned "Incidental Protection," and was a complete revolution in our system, and avowedly imposed taxes on the community for the purpose of aiding specific industries and promoting the growth of domestic manufactures. While the National Policy was yet undeveloped, it was described by the right hon. leader of the Government as a "judicious readjustment of the tariff, which will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing, and other interests of the Dominion, * * * so as to develop an active interprovincial trade; and, moving in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade." It

was with this "broad and comprehensive platform," to use the language of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that hon. gentlemen opposite went to the country at the general elections, with results so satisfactory to them—a platform so broad and so comprehensive that, when the right hon. leader of the House spoke to the people of Strathroy last summer about imposing duties in the interest of the manufacturer, such as the Finance Minister had announced in his Budget speech, it was highly acceptable at the time and place to his audience, but, when the news reached the Maritime Provinces, it spread dismay amongst his friends there. Hon. gentlemen talked about the great benefits this tariff was going to bring to the country by the development of our resources, and, when they, on that side, ventured to question this affirmation, hon. gentlemen said: "You are unpatriotic; you are not dealing with the general interests of the country; you are looking at local interests," and cried out "Parish politics." He would venture to say, that there was not a business man who did not look at this tariff as affecting his specific interest. He proposed to glance at the illustrations hon. gentlemen had used in various parts of the country in advocating this broad and comprehensive tariff. His constituents had pronounced against the policy, and he would be false to his principles if he did not raise his voice against the way in which this tariff had been adjusted. When first brought down, this tariff was presented as a perfect panacea for our troubles. A week or two afterwards they were treated to a second Budget, and a second dose of amendments was brought down. After the first Budget was brought down, deputations, representing every conceivable interest, waited upon the hon. the Finance Minister, complaining that the tariff did not exactly suit them. Under these circumstances, it was rather cool for hon. gentlemen to get up and tell them in the House that this tariff was satisfactory to the community. What did those deputations come here for if it was not for the purpose of obtaining amendments to the tariff? He maintained that they had a right to examine this tariff in detail, because he did not know

of such a thing as a country being prosperous as a whole, unless the specific interests were prosperous. It was the duty of a Government to give to all classes fair facilities for carrying on their business, and, when hon. gentlemen said it was frivolous to discuss specific interests, they strangely forgot the statements they had made to the House and the country. He would review a few of the statements made by hon. gentlemen in reference to some specific items. The hon. the Finance Minister, when he made his statement, made a strong argument in behalf of his predecessor when addressing the House in connection with the difficulties encountered from the reduction of income on our imports. He stated that, in consequence of the shrinkage in values of goods imported of from 33½ per cent. to 40 per cent., the imports failed to bring in that proportion the usual amount of income to the Treasury. That was a consideration often lost sight of in charging the deficits to the mismanagement of the late Finance Minister. They found that, when hon. gentlemen opposite formerly administered the affairs of the country, it was a time of great expenditure on public works. Then the Government of the Province of Ontario, to which he belonged, made large grants for the purpose of aiding local railways and other public works. Municipalities interested in railways also gave bonuses, varying from \$50,000 to \$300,000, to be expended in their construction. They pledged their income, for the next 20 years, to repay these bonuses which were thus spent in a few years, and which amounted to many millions of dollars in the aggregate. This expenditure did not stimulate alone the local industries of the country. It affected materially the imports of the country, which was more important, and the whole commerce of the country was stimulated in consequence of this excessive expenditure. Our imports and revenue were steadily increasing in consequence, but before the hon. gentleman left office the tide had turned. He remembered the hon. the Finance Minister, in the first Budget speech of that hon. gentleman, which he (Mr. Bain) had the pleasure of listening to in 1873. He told the House that the position of affairs was

such that, although they did not propose to increase the public burdens then, yet in another year they anticipated having to place additional taxes on the country. Why? Because our imports were falling off, not on account of the then Government's mismanagement, but because these abnormal expenditures on public works were falling off. While he (Mr. Bain) thought the late Finance Minister might have imposed additional taxation for the purpose of meeting our liabilities—because no one maintained, on his side of the House, that they should not meet their legitimate current liabilities—yet, if he had been economical in the direction of imposing taxes, hon. gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches had shown very little care in that respect. He could not see how our farmers and the workingmen were to be benefitted by this tariff. But he was about to refer to the circumstances that led to the increase of duty upon tea two years ago, when the hon. gentlemen opposite made such violent attacks on the Government. The circumstances would be fresh in the recollection of members who were in the House at that time. Our coal oil interests were controlled by a ring, to the serious detriment of the consumers, which the Government remedied by abolishing the Excise and reducing the Customs duty on American coal oil, thus forfeiting considerable revenue, but making a saving to this country at a very moderate estimate of at least \$800,000 per annum upon coal oil, which was extensively consumed in even the poorest family. He thought it was not unfair in the Finance Minister coming to the House on that occasion and saying that, as they were losing a certain amount of revenue, they were, on the other hand, effecting a clear saving of a very much larger sum to the public, and asking the assumption of this additional burden in lieu of the one just removed, and which it would only partially replace. How did the hon. gentlemen opposite deal with that matter? Did they patriotically come to the ex-Finance Minister, as they now asked the Opposition to do, and say to him they would aid him in that enterprise? Not a bit of it. Sir John A. Macdonald moved, on that occasion, as follows:—

“That the said resolution be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions that they shall have power to substitute for the said duties on tea some tax that, while bringing to the Treasury an equivalent amount of revenue, will, at the same time, aid the various industries of the country.”

Sir John described it as “a tax on the consumer and upon everybody, whether farmer, agriculturist, mechanic, manufacturer or merchant; everybody who drank tea was made liable for the increase of the tax on tea of two cents per pound.” The hon. the Minister of Public Works, in his usual vigorous style, said: “The rich man did not need to use tea to the same extent as the poor man, who used tea because it enabled him in a cheap way to obtain the nourishment necessary for his life and health,” and attacked the Government for the mode of levying the duty, and closed his address by assuring the House that it would drive parties who otherwise would be unable to indulge in “the cup that cheers but not inebriates” to partake of an article more stimulating, but of a less expensive character. Mr. Pope, of Compton, said: “This tax was going to be a heavy burden on the country. Printers drank tea, labourers drank tea, steamboat men drank tea. There were a thousand other things on which a tax might have been levied. Protection to our industries might have been granted, and the country relieved from this tax on tea.” Mr. Pope, of Prince Edward Island, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, said: “As regarded the tea question, it was well known the more wealthy classes took coffee for breakfast, dined late, and, perhaps, took another cup of coffee; whereas, the middle and labouring classes had tea three times a day; consequently the greater part of this increased tax would fall upon those least able to bear it.” Such were the sympathetic utterances of hon. gentlemen on this question when in Opposition, and for the purpose of deepening that impression, and to show the labouring man how anxious they were to protect his interest—because they then began to show some concern for the working man—he would refer to the speech of the right hon. the present leader of the House, at Hamilton, in 1877. What did he then say to a large

mass meeting of electors? In speaking of this very question, with respect to the late Finance Minister, he remarked—and he quoted from that organ of truth, the *Hamilton Spectator* :

"Then he put an additional duty upon tea. He (Sir John) argued against that. He pointed out that it was an article which we could not produce, and which we must import from a foreign country, and, therefore, every duty paid upon tea, fell upon the consumer. This was an article, in his opinion, on which there should be no duty."

No doubt the idea they wished to impress was that, in taking the duty off tea, coffee, sugar, and other articles which Canadians could not produce, and on which, therefore, the duties must inevitably be paid by the consumer, and imposing them on articles that they could manufacture, they would thus stimulate Canadian industries, and develop our great national resources. Only last summer, during the election campaign, the right hon. the leader of the House addressed a large meeting of workmen in the Amphitheatre, Toronto, in which the *Mail* reported him as saying :

"Suppose then we put a duty on your cottons, woollens, and manufactures in iron, leather, and wood, which you can manufacture, you will find, at the end of the year, that you have saved as much by the taking off duties on tea, coffee, and sugar, and so on, as you have paid more by the putting of the duties on cotton, leather, iron, wood, and woollen manufactures, and you will see that, during the year, you have paid no more taxes."

Such were the promises of the leader of the present Government in describing the policy he proposed to bring down. He distinctly promised the workmen of the West that he would give them a free breakfast table; and, if his statements meant anything, they meant that he was opposed to increased taxation, and only advocated increased duties on manufactured goods, taking them off the necessaries of life. Now, had that promise been carried out in the present tariff? Was the tea duty abolished? They found the Finance Minister claiming that he would lose some \$90,000 on the gross duties imposed on the imports of tea, but, in addition, he had imposed a discriminating duty of 10 per cent. against tea coming from the United States, for the purpose of stimulating the trade of this country direct with the countries producing that article, and building up their commerce

MR. BAIN.

by way of Montreal. The hon. gentleman from Cardwell quoted some authority in respect to that matter, and pointed to the time when they had over 50 per cent. of the trade in tea by the Montreal route. On looking to the returns of the single year of 1873, which they never failed to quote, when they took the duties off tea altogether, what did they find? Not that they removed them in the interest of the country, but because the Americans took the duty off tea in their country, and the Canadian Government only followed them to prevent smuggling along the frontier. The 10 per cent. discriminating duty was imposed on all tea coming from the United States, thereby intending to promote a direct trade with the tea producing countries; but, on referring to the Trade and Navigation Returns of that year, he found that, while the general import trade was stimulated so that nearly double the normal quantity of tea required for consumption was imported, only a little over one-fifth of it was brought direct from tea growing countries, and the market was overloaded, and many Montreal merchants ruined; and he would venture to predict that the consumers' tea would not be one iota cheaper under the recent change, while the Finance Minister expected a loss of revenue, and their western small tea dealers would find their facilities for buying in small lots in the cheapest market by it taken away, while the consumer, instead of having this article free, as promised, would still pay over half a million of dollars per annum to the Treasury on teas alone, and, if the Government policy was a success in this item, a large bonus to merchants in Montreal.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. BAIN said, when the House rose, he was speaking on the question of tea duties; he pointed out that the effect of the changes made in the tariff on tea could be only in the interests of a very limited class of importers at Montreal, while the great mass of the community would still have to carry as many burdens as ever on that article of universal

consumption, and that one of the planks of the Conservative party, in dealing with this question in the west, was, the idea that the workingman and general consumer should be relieved of the burdens upon articles of necessary daily use. But, so far from that result, he had learned from the returns of the imports that the current of that trade would continue to flow across the American continent, and that a large portion would still find its way in bond through the United States, notwithstanding this 10 per cent. duty imposed in favour of the merchants of Montreal. Another plank of the Conservative platform in the West related to the sugar question. The right hon. gentleman, in addressing the workingmen of Toronto, in the Amphitheatre, previous to the elections, stated that he proposed to remove the duties from sugars as well as tea by readjusting the taxation. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), this afternoon dealt with the sugar question, and, if there was one question more than another that had been discussed, in season and out of season, by hon. gentlemen opposite, it was the statement that the late Government, by its unfair and unjust policy in levying the sugar duties, had destroyed Canadian refining interests. The hon. member for Cardwell reiterated that statement this afternoon. He (Mr. Bain) did not propose to advance any contrary statement of his own, but to refer to a statement of a gentleman which he thought hon. gentlemen opposite would not deny, none of them, probably, doubting his competency in the matter. Mr. George E. Drummond, of the firm of Redpath & Co., of Montreal, had appeared before a Committee of the House in 1876, for the purpose of investigating into the position of our industries. Among other matters that came within their purview was sugar refining. Mr. Drummond stated that they commenced the business in 1854, and had sunk in plant about \$600,000, and that their capacity while refining, on full time, was about 100 tons per day; that for the purpose of operating those works effectively to that capacity, they employed, under their own roof, about 300 men, and gave employment, altogether, to about 375 or 400 hands, and about 60 horses. It did

occur to him (Mr. Bain), that when hon. gentlemen opposite talked about the advantage to this country of employing a large number in sugar refining, that they considerably over-estimated the amount of labour connected therewith. When addressing the Committee in 1876, when the Reformers had only been in office some two years and a-half, Mr. Drummond stated that their machinery, used in producing hard, loaf, or lump sugar, had been idle, and totally unused since 1870, and that five floors of their main building, 160 by 160, were empty; and, on a rough estimate, from \$50,000 to \$60,000 worth of plant was lying idle in consequence, and that this was not because they found the manufacture of other refined sugars more profitable, but because our tariff discriminated against the refining of such sugars; and, after informing the Government of the fact, and requesting them to make a change to meet it, they were compelled to abandon this branch of their trade, which they would otherwise very willingly have continued. He (Mr. Bain) thought it was patent, then, that the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches were responsible for the state of things that had diverted Mr. Drummond and colleagues from refining loaf sugar to the yellow grades, to which they were then confined. He stated that from \$50,000 to \$60,000 of plant, on a rough estimate, exclusive of buildings, had been thrown idle. Under those circumstances it was preposterous for hon. gentlemen opposite to tell the House that the gentlemen who preceded them in the Government were responsible for extinguishing the refining trade. Years before his hon. friends, now in Opposition, had assumed office, Mr. Drummond had gone to hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches, and now so extremely anxious about the refining interests, and represented that his firm had their machinery idle, the pressure being so great that they were unable to refine without actual loss. Were they so anxious then to build up the refining interests? Not a bit of it. They allowed that machinery to remain idle and useless for years, and the buildings to go to decay, and now charged their successors, at present in Opposition, with being the blameable parties in this matter. In speaking before that Committee as to

the effect of subsequent changes in the tariff made by the late Government, what did they find Mr. Drummond saying? They were speaking then as to the average percentage of duties that were imposed upon refined sugar, and upon a coarser grade of raw sugar imported for refining purposes. In referring to the difference of percentages imposed by the Government, Mr. Drummond said :

"That, in consequence of the remission by the Government, the duties on imported raw sugar came down to 43½ per cent. We were still at a disadvantage, but not so marked as before, and it was a great relief to us. Had the remission not been made, we would have closed the refinery last April."

In the statement of Mr. Drummond, in reference to this interest, he stated distinctly that the gentlemen opposite declined to give him the smallest item of encouragement. He said, further, that if the gentlemen now in Opposition had not somewhat modified the duties on raw grades, in 1875, to the refiners, he would have been compelled to close his refinery sooner than he did. In face of these facts, it did not lie in the mouths of gentlemen opposite to charge their predecessors with having caused the destruction of the sugar refining interest in Montreal. On the same occasion there was a gentleman, a member of the firm of Bailey & Bunting, of Clifton, who also gave evidence. He was asked by a member of the Committee in regard to the scale of duties then being imposed, and how they operated as between the refiner and the importer, and Mr. Bunting replied :

"I think, as regards raw sugar, with the present scale, the refiner enters his for a less *ad valorem* rate than the grocer. This, I think, is particularly so since the Order in Council of April last, reducing the duty on refining grades by 25c. per hundred pounds."

Mr Bunting stated that he considered the Government of the day had made a concession on behalf of the refiners, but owing to the fact that the American refiner was able to put his hand into the American Treasury and take out his drawbacks to the probable extent of 37½c. per 100lb., over the duty he paid, it operated unfairly to our refiners. This same gentleman was further asked what would be the effect on the refining interest if the sugar duties were abolished altogether, and replied :

MR. BAIN.

"Then I do not think we would have any refiners in Canada that is, if the people should insist on getting pure sugar. I do not think sugar refining indigenous to Canada. Sugars can be refined in the United States and on the Clyde for less money than in Canada."

And to a question by Mr Platt—"If the sugar refiner had more protection, would not the consumer get a poorer article?", Mr. Bunting replied : "I doubt it very much." The hon. gentleman who, he understood, now represented the county of Welland here, and was, till quite recently, the proprietor of the *Mail* newspaper, here stated that he did not consider sugar refining indigenous to Canada. He (Mr. Bain) did not profess to be an expert in the minutiae of the various grades of sugar and the particular mode in which the duty was levied, but there were two or three plain propositions in connection with this matter. In the first place, duties on the higher grades of sugar, such as we might expect the refiner to present to us for consumption, had been increased about 10 per cent.; on the lower grades, such as the refiner used, there had been an increase of only 5 per cent.; and for the purpose of encouraging the direct trade with those countries producing sugar, the import of the raw article for refining purposes had been encouraged by removing the duty from the boxes or cases in which it was imported. Now they had the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister that he expected a loss in revenue of something like \$263,000 in sugar, and he further stated that once refining was in full operation there would be a clean gain to the consumer of \$77,000. He (Mr. Bain) did not know much about these statements, but one thing he did know, and the poorest woman of the country knew, that the effect of this tariff had been to advance the price of sugar to the consumer. Everybody that went to the store after the advent of this new tariff found that they had to take from one to two pounds of sugar less for a dollar than before, and he thought by this time next year it would no longer be a matter of dispute as to who paid the duty. He remembered that, in the platform laid down by those hon. gentlemen in the West, the workmen were to get free tea and cheap sugar, yet the hon. the Finance Minister still expected to take about

\$2,500,000 out of the consumer for sugar duties and \$500,000 for tea duties, and he could not help thinking hon. gentlemen were a little too fast when they said they were fulfilling their pledges by bringing down this tariff. Instead of there being a readjustment he would like to ask where they had readjusted except for the purpose of heaping on greater duties. There was not a single manufacturing industry that had not secured increased duties in one shape or another. Everybody's interests had been consulted except the consumer's. No one looked at the special interest of the agricultural and labouring population of this country. Among the various deputations that visited Ottawa, and they had been many, for the purpose of admiring the Finance Minister, no one came down to say a word on behalf of the farmer; no one came on behalf of the labouring man who consumed these articles upon which duties were imposed. When he listened to his hon. friend from Cardwell talking in the interests of the sugar refiners, which was a Montreal industry, and the book trade in which that city was also interested, talking also about that type foundry of which his brother was vice-president, it did seem to him (Mr. Bain) as if that hon. gentleman's sympathies were confined to Montreal interests, and that he had altogether forgotten that he was the representative of a western agricultural constituency. Regarding the Montreal type foundry, he (Mr. Bain) had heard it said the other day, by a practical printer, that the type turned out from that foundry was much inferior to the type imported, and that this foundry to be protected had a monopoly. The hon. gentleman (Mr. White) had not a word to say on behalf of the farmer until near the close of his speech, when he was running up periods about the grand things this policy was going to do in developing our manufacturing, agricultural, mining and commercial resources. He (Mr. Bain) remembered when the famous Boyd telegram was reproduced throughout the West, that the *Mail* came out with flaming characters, and headed their paragraph "An untruth," and said:

"As to a 35 per cent. tariff, no interest in the country has ever called for duties so high. To propose to give more than is required,

is such arrant nonsense that even Grit journals might refrain from fathering it on Sir John."

But the first thing they saw in this tariff, and this was only a sample, for the purpose of helping the unfortunate working-man, was a 35 per cent. duty on his furniture, at least 35 per cent. on his woollen goods, and from 30 to 45 per cent. on his cottons; and yet they told the country, last summer, that a 35 per cent. tariff was never dreamed of. He would like to ask if that telegram did not somewhat influence electors in St. John, when they were told that a readjustment, and not an increased tariff was meant? Was there a single gentleman on that side of the House from the western constituencies, who, if a dissolution was to take place to-day, would go back with as cheerful a countenance to defend this tariff as he applauded it in this House? They had been taunted with being the mere political fag end of a party in the country, but he would like to ask what member of this House would dare to face the country in support of this tariff? The other day, his hon. friend from Hamilton described the dark and lowering clouds that hung over the Opposition side of the House as the Budget speech was made, but he ventured to say there was not an hon. gentleman amongst them that would not go down with a long face if he had to go back to the country and advocate this tariff to-morrow. What did they tell the workmen in Hamilton when this question was being discussed; when the representative of the manufacturing association travelled from Dan to Beersheba, amongst the western constituencies, in behalf of this grand Protective scheme? He quoted from the *Mail* newspaper. Mr. Frazer, the Secretary of that association, stated at a public political meeting, in the interest of the present city members: "That a cry had been raised that a duty on coal would raise the price of coal to the poor man, while the fact was that it was anthracite coal which was used in stoves. That class of coal was not produced in Canada, and no one proposed to put a duty on that class of coal we did not produce." But he found, in this tariff, that the poor man's anthracite was taxed 50c. a ton. He would like to ask those hon. gentle-

men how this was fulfilling the promise they made to that long line of workmen who went to them to see how soon they were to get the employment that had been promised them when the Conservatives came into power. No sooner were the elections over, and they felt themselves seated in power, than their chief organ in Toronto, followed by all the others in the country, began to drop this cry about the immediate advantage of this grand Protective system. They began to say that it would take a long time for this depression to be removed. The hon. the Minister of Public Works told the people in the East that in three days time, he could frame a tariff that would straighten up all these troubles in the poor man's interest; but, when they got into office, their organs began to tell the poor man that it would take a long time to fix these things up, and they would have to wait and starve one or two years more. He would refer to the tone in which his hon. friend the Finance Minister dealt with this question when addressing the electors of St. John, in his famous speech of the 26th of July, in reference to this tariff. He would quote from the *Mail*, which, he presumed, hon. gentlemen opposite considered good authority. Mr. Tilley said:

"I am now going to touch on a delicate question, and I am well aware that I will be held responsible in Parliament for any expression of opinion I may now give. If I had been in Parliament I would not have voted for increasing the duty on non-enumerated articles from 15 per cent. to 17½. The Government supporters have been spreading the report, all through the Dominion, that the policy of Sir John Macdonald, and his followers, is to increase the taxes of the country. It has been stated that Sir John even named the rate to which he proposed to increase the tariff, as 35 per cent. No such idea ever entered into his head, or any of his followers. The tariff is always governed by the necessities of the country. It requires about \$13,000,000 yearly from Customs, and \$5,000,000 from Excise, to carry on the ordinary public service of the country. How best and most judiciously to levy this is the question for the Government of the day to consider. I do not think this amount is equitably levied at present, and, therefore, I am in favour of a readjustment of the tariff, which will render the tax equitable to all classes of the people throughout the Dominion. We want no increased taxation, but we do want the tax properly imposed. The duty on non-enumerated articles should stand at 15 per cent."

MR. BAIN.

He would ask any hon. gentleman in this House, who had an honest respect for his country, to say if this was a fulfilment of these statements made by the hon. the Minister of Finance? It sounded strange for the gentleman who brought down this tariff to say to the electorate of St. John that they suffered from this duty of 15 per cent. being increased to 17½, yet this new tariff increased the same unenumerated list from 17½ to 20 per cent. Again, the hon. gentleman said that the late tariff was not an equitable distribution of taxation. He (Mr. Bain) would like to know if this was what he called readjustment, and if it was not more correctly called increased taxation? He would like to know if the people of the Maritime Provinces would be willing to accept it as a fulfilment of the statements of the hon. the Finance Minister, and whether, if this tariff had been down, he would have secured his majority of nine in the election contest. He would also quote from the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in the House, in 1877, when the increased duties on tea and malt were up for discussion. Mr. Pope (Prince Edward Island) said:

"He, however, must say he was what was termed a Free-trader as he believed were most people in the Maritime Provinces. He thought that 17½ per cent., with the cost of importation, amounting to five per cent. more, was sufficient Protection to Canadian manufactures. A revenue must be raised, and if, under a Protective policy, the duty on many articles was to be reduced to favour the manufacturer, the amount of such reduction would have to be made up on other articles, these additional duties would have to be paid by the general consumer, the agriculturist and others receiving no compensation in return, while the manufacturers would be placed in a position to form rings or monopolies, and demand much more for their goods than the same description would cost if imported, under a fair revenue tariff, from England or the United States. While he was prepared to vote against all amendments and resolutions which favoured Protection, he felt equally bound to vote against the increase of duties proposed by the Government as bearing particularly hard on the working and poor man, at a time of great depression such as now existed, when he felt the Government should relieve the labouring class, instead of putting increased burdens upon them."

He did not know how this sounded to the supporters of this tariff in the House, but, if the hon. Minister had been

in his county, the Protectionists would not have looked upon him as an exponent of their sentiments, and they would certainly have called him a "Grit," and by what mental process he had succeeded in satisfying himself that this tariff was the exponent of these principles it would be interesting to find out. He thought that looking at the tariff, as it stood, the manufacturing interests might be fairly left to take care of themselves. He would now consider the position in which the agriculturists of the country would be placed by this tariff. He found that, under the last census, in 1871, agriculturists formed almost one-half of the gross population of the Dominion, and that the manufacturing population, and those connected with them consisted of not much more than twenty per cent., or considerably less than half the agricultural population, and he thought that, in view of their number and importance, the agriculturists had a right to be considered. He wanted to consider the tariff as it affected them, and to glance at the burdens placed upon them, and upon the labouring and professional classes, for the benefit of the manufacturing interests alone. The principles of Protection were not under discussion at present, but he was referring to the relative amount of protection given to the farmer under this tariff. It provided for a system of drawbacks, or a return of the duty paid by manufacturers on material used by them in goods that they exported from the country to enable them to place their wares as cheaply as possible in open competition with the world. But how was it with the farmer? He had now to look to a foreign market for the sale of a surplus of all his produce each year, except, perhaps, the items of Indian corn and pork, of which there was no surplus, and, while buying at Protection rates what he consumed, he had to sell in competition against the whole world. Let them look at some of the duties he paid on what he bought, as well as at those that he (Mr. Bain) maintained were purely ornamental on what he had to sell. For the benefit of the manufacturer he had to pay a duty of 35 per cent. on cotton. If he wanted to buy a common table or chair, he had to pay 35 per cent. for the special benefit of the cabinet-maker. If, under this

tariff, he wanted to buy a clock, the clock manufacturer received 35 per cent. on it. Tea and sugar were also taxed, just as if he had not those other burdens to carry; he not only contributed to the revenue as much as he did formerly, but he was expected to contribute an additional slice for the benefit of certain interests in Montreal and other places where tea importers and sugar refiners existed. In that respect alone the change that had been made was detrimental to the agriculturist. Take crockery ware, taxed 25 to 30 per cent.; take the iron goods he used to an increased extent every year, or agricultural implements, he found that the latter were taxed 25 per cent. If he wanted a piece of common bar iron he had to pay 17½ per cent., and 30 per cent. if he wanted some bolts, rivets or anything else of that class that he required in daily use. He had to pay 30 per cent. for the benefit of the manufacturer of horse shoes and horse nails. And the same on the articles that his blacksmith used. His blacksmith's materials were taxed in every conceivable way, which must end in more expense to the farmer in increased prices. If he took a notion to warm himself with anthracite coal, he had to pay a tax of 50c. per ton. From the time that he came into the world until he went into the last casket, these taxes followed him, and even under the soil he was not exempt, as he found 35 per cent. placed on coffins. What compensation was given him for all this? What had been placed on the articles he produced by which he would be able to secure increased prices? They were told that the farmer was to get an equivalent in the shape of Protective duties on his products. They heard wonderful lectures read to them last Session, and in the country since, by hon. gentlemen opposite, on the gross injustice of that one-sided tariff which this took the place of, and was to take from the American farmer so much tribute to our Treasury off his produce coming into Canada. They had been told that millions of dollars were contributed to the American revenue by the taxation imposed by them on our agricultural products. They had been told that all this had been allowed to go on by the gentleman now on the Opposition side, who

lately held the reins of power, without any attempt to remedy it. He would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite, in a short review which he proposed to give of the duties they had imposed of the leading agricultural products coming into Canada, and the quantities as compared with our exports of surplus, what chance there was for farmers getting any compensation for the heavy burden of taxes imposed on everything they consumed, for the benefit of a small section of the community; because these taxes were avowedly imposed, not for the purposes of revenue, but to stimulate these manufacturing industries. Yet what did they find the hon. gentlemen opposite doing? He found them imposing 15c. a bushel on barley coming into Canada, and they said that was Protection to the farmer. He would show what good that would be to the farmer. Last year there were exported 7,880,000 bushels of barley and malt, and imported 304,000 bushels, of which we re-exported 275,000 bushels, so that really there was less than 30,000 bushels of barley imported into the Dominion for consumption. Then take the article of oats. Last year there were 2,340,000 bushels of oats and 1,920,000 bushels additional in the shape of oatmeal exported from the Dominion, while we imported 2,162,000 bushels of oats, and 25,030 bushels in the shape of oatmeal. He contended that these figures proved that, if we shut out every pound of American oats, we would still have a surplus to place upon a foreign market, and of what use could the duty of 10c. per bushel be to the producer. Again, take the article of peas, upon which they had been kindly favoured with a duty of 10c. per bushel. Last year we had exported 2,420,000 bushels and imported only 8,500 bushels, and yet they called this Protection to the Canadian farmer. What could be the use of 10c. per bushel on peas? In speaking of the oatmeal trade with Great Britain, which had grown to be a large one, and consumed a great deal of oats, he remembered, last summer, a prominent Conservative in his county, who consumed a large quantity of American oats at his mill in this trade, used to tell his farmer friends that a duty on American oats would be a clear gain to them, pointing to his own large

consumption of the article, which a duty would compel him to replace by Canadian oats. These farmers would now find that, under this tariff, that gentleman need not purchase a single bushel of Canadian oats for that trade, unless they were still prepared to take the same price as he could introduce American oats for, as he would grind in bond, and use American oats just as formerly. But then there was a duty of 7½c. per bushel on American corn, and that was Protection to the Canadian farmer, as we consumed last year about 3,400,000 bushels of it, besides what we re-exported. Who stood at the Finance Minister's elbow in the interest of the farmer, when this tariff was arranged? How was it that the United States tariff of 15c. on barley, 10c. on oats, and 10c. on peas per bushel was duplicated in all those cases where we had a surplus to sell? And, as soon as he came to corn, of which we did not produce a surplus, instead of putting on 10c. again, as the Americans did, he stopped at 7½c. Was this done in the interest of the farmers, or was some other interest consulted? This duty was only purely ornamental, as our coarse grains, that corn competed with, were higher in price than that article after this duty was placed on it, and the only effect it could have was to increase the price of corn to the consumer, without causing a single bushel of our coarse grains to be used in place of it. Again, 15c. per bushel was placed on wheat, and 50c. per barrel on flour, to enable our millers to compete against the American miller in the markets of the Maritime Provinces. Last year 263,304 barrels of American flour were imported into Quebec and those Provinces, but, after deducting from our exports of Canadian wheat and flour all the American article that was consumed in the Dominion, we still had a surplus, that we sold on the world's markets, of 3,600,000 bushels. These figures proved conclusively that, whether the miller benefitted by the duty on flour or not, the duty on wheat and flour could be of no benefit to the farmer. Again, he would look at the matter of animals. How had they protected the farmer in this respect? They used to have a tariff of 10 per cent. on animals coming into Canada, and this the Government had increased to 20 per

cent. How much revenue were they likely to get by that? He found that, last year, we imported 5,116 head of cattle, and exported 29,900. Now, supposing the additional duty prevented the importation of the 5,116, he would like to know how they were to be benefitted in regard to the 29,900? Last year we imported 1,510 horses, and exported 14,000. In what manner would this duty benefit the farmer in this respect? The number of sheep imported was 10,500, whilst we exported 250,000. In what way would the tariff benefit the farmer in this regard? But there was the article of wool, which came off the backs of those sheep. Last year we imported 5,600,000lb. of wool, and exported 2,400,000lb. We imported 306,000lb. more of the fine grades of wool from Africa, and nearly all of the former quantity came from the United States. Hon. gentlemen were so anxious to retaliate upon just now. He supposed they would tell them that the Dominion was not adapted to the production of fine wool. He, as a practical farmer, maintained that, if they gave the farmer an inducement to raise fine wool, they could do so, just as well as they could in Vermont, which was the home of the American merino sheep. We had a climate parallel with that of Vermont, and all the Canadian farmer wanted was encouragement. At present, if the farmer tried to raise fine wool, he had to compete with the American, who, hon. gentlemen said, was thoroughly protected. There was another feature in connection with this matter he wanted to refer to. The hon. the Finance Minister had told them, in speaking of the protection given to the poor man, of the bad class of cheap woollen goods that were imported into this country. He had spoken of them as being so bad that, if a poor man went out in a rain-storm he came back with the knees out of his pants. He (Mr. Bain) saw that, among the various industries being paraded in the Ministerial journals as promoted in this country under the tariff, was a shoddy factory at St. Catharines. Certainly, this factory was not being started for the purpose of giving the poor man a first-class article, but for the purpose of obtaining an increased profit from the poor man. That was a fair sample of

the tariff as applied to the poor man all round. What was the position of the farmer under this tariff? He was taxed from 30 to 35 per cent., for the benefit of the manufacturers, on the woollen goods he must purchase, while American wool was allowed to compete against his duty free, while he had not received any protection, whatever, on his wool, and this was protection to the farmer. The duty of 50c. a barrel on flour, if it would be of any earthly use at all, would enable the millers to combine and send up the price of flour 50c. a barrel in the Maritime Provinces, while, in the western Provinces, the price of wheat would be regulated, as before, by the values on the Liverpool market. Did the hon. gentlemen mean to say that, on account of the duty of 40c. a barrel on cornmeal, the western farmer would get that much more for his corn? He found that we exported 655 bushels of corn of Canadian growth last year, and he would like to know how far that would go to make up the 196,000 barrels of corn meal consumed in the Maritime Provinces. The result of this duty would be that the farmer would not secure one cent more for his corn, but, if he wanted to buy corn for any purpose, he would have to pay the duty. This time next year there would be no dispute as to who paid the duty on corn. Hon. gentlemen told agriculturists that they would give them a home market for their productions, by which they would be able to realise better prices for their produce. He, however, maintained that the time would never come in Canada, any more than in the United States, when a high Protective tariff would give the Canadian farmer a home market for his products. He would refer to the position in which a Protective tariff had placed the American farmer. Hon. gentlemen claimed that their Protective tariff had been of great benefit to the American agriculturist, and that it had provided him with a home market. He proposed to look at the United States exports, in order to ascertain how large a market they had given the farmer. There was exported from the United States, last year, raw cotton of the value of \$179,000,000; manufactured cotton \$11,435,000. At the same time they imported manufactured cotton of the value of \$14,398,000.

The cotton producer was a farmer to all intents and purposes, and they taxed his cotton goods from 33 per cent. to 65 per cent. in order to give him a home market. What was the result? He sold \$179,000,000 worth of cotton not on the United States, but on the world's markets. After seventeen years' Protection the manufacturers were not able to export as much cotton goods as they imported, and had made no attempt to consume their home-grown crop of raw cotton. He desired to point out, in addition to that, it took them the whole seventeen years during which they had had a high Protective tariff to reach that period when their exports of finished cotton goods were as high as they were in 1860, when they had a revenue tariff. The exportations of general agricultural products last year were Indian corn, \$48,600,000; flour, \$25,000,000; wheat, \$96,000,000 worth. He would like to submit this simple proposition to hon. gentlemen opposite, who claimed that a Protective tariff gave the farmers a home market for their produce: how high they would have to build the Chinese wall referred to before they could get a sufficiently large manufacturing population in the United States to consume the products they now exported? He maintained that it was utter nonsense for hon. gentlemen to tell them that the Americans had stood up for this tariff, and that they were in favor of Protection to-day. Only last year, when this tariff was before Congress, there was a strong effort made to modify these duties. But the manufacturers were in force at Washington, and they employed every argument they could in favour of the existing tariff, and, if report said true, substantial arguments were employed as well as verbal ones. Notwithstanding this, they only preserved that precious tariff by ten votes. Yet hon. gentlemen told them that Americans were delighted with this tariff. The *Louisville Courier-Journal*, speaking of the American agricultural interests, said:

"What earthly benefit do our farmers derive from a Protective tariff? During the six years ending June 30, 1878, the domestic exports of this country amounted to \$4,029,117,889, of which \$3,148,453,323 consisted of agricultural products. That is 80 per cent. of the exports. Our manufacturers, for whose exclusive benefit a Protective tariff has been in operation for sixteen or seventeen

years, figure in the exports to the extent of 20 per cent. only. That is all Protection has done for the country in the way of export trade. In the way of burdening the people with heavy taxation, and shutting out foreign trade, it has done a tremendous work, and it is time that the farmers were enquiring why they shall be heavily taxed for everything they use of American manufactured articles, for the benefit of a few special interests which contribute a very small percentage of the foreign business of the country."

He thought that every farmer in this country that looked at this matter from an independent standpoint would endorse that statement. Under these circumstances, he maintained that American precedent did not encourage Canadian farmers to endorse the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. They were told that this tariff was to be retaliatory in its operation, to secure from the Americans reciprocity of trade; and there was in it a clause inserted that if the Americans should reduce or abolish their tariff on Canadian natural products, this Government would act in a similar manner, and there would be a mutual free interchange of goods between both countries. The Finance Minister expected to levy \$250,000 upon American agricultural products under this tariff, and \$25,000 additional from the increased duty on hams and shoulders, which was placed at 2c. per lb., and 10 per cent. additional on live hogs. But a glance at the Trade and Navigation Returns would show that again the farmer's interest had not been consulted in arranging this tariff here. The gross value of the live hogs, bacon and hams imported into the Dominion last year, and upon which the duty was increased, amounted to \$336,000, while the pork and lard, which remained as before, was valued at \$850,000, and paid a duty of \$125,000, while all the duty realised from the former items was only \$40,000, and the total increased income from duties imposed on American agricultural products coming into the Dominion was only placed at \$275,000, while the Finance Minister admitted taking out of the farmers' pockets alone, by the general rise under this tariff, nearly \$1,000,000 of expected revenue. He would ask the hon. member from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), who had, heretofore, advocated the

MR. BAIN.

farmers' interests in this house, and supported this tariff, if his estimate of the money taken out of the farmers was correct, when they were likely to secure reciprocity under this tariff. Only last Session, that gentleman spoke as follows:—

"The injustice of the present tariff system would be seen when it was considered that, in order to get \$12,000,000 worth of these products into the United States markets, the Canadian exporters had had to pay nearly \$4,000,000 into the Treasury of that country, while the exporters of the United States sent products to the value of nearly twice the amount into Canada, and only contributed \$263,935 to the Treasury of this country. Had the Americans paid the same rate for the privilege of obtaining a market in Canada as they charged to Canadian exporters, they would have contributed something like \$6,000,000 to the Treasury of this country, in place of only \$263,935."

He presumed the hon. gentleman knew about this transaction, because ever since he had been in this House he had set himself up as the champion of the farmers' interests, and on one or two occasions he secured a Special Committee to consider those interests. But, he said, the Americans had taken nearly \$4,000,000 a year out of the pockets of Canadian farmers, for getting our goods into their country, and the Finance Minister expected to get \$275,000 under this tariff, off American products coming into this country. How long would it take before the Americans would feel forced, by that process, to abolish that tariff, if these results were the only ones that followed? He thought the Americans could stand a good deal of this sort of retaliatory punishment. It was idle to talk after that fashion, if the hon. gentleman's statements were correct. This was not the first time this matter had been tried in connection with the American trade. When the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated in 1866, the right hon. the Premier was then in the Administration, and retaliatory duties were imposed on American goods, in addition to which, one or two years later, they inaugurated what they called the "National Policy," which was heralded forth in the same manner as the present one, and extended those duties to a few other articles. After a year or two that retaliatory tariff was abolished, because, as the right hon. gentleman

said, it was formed to operate unfairly to a large section of our Dominion—the Maritime Provinces. The very gentlemen who imposed this war tariff against the Americans, came down at the end of less than a year, and abolished that Protective system, because it did not protect worth a cent. They consigned the National Policy then to an early grave, and it was only resorted to when it was found necessary to trump up something to secure popular attention, and get themselves back from the shades of Opposition into office, and secure place and power. The enormous advantage to the American Union had been pointed out, gained by the employment of labour through the development of their iron industries, and this had been used as a pretext for the imposition of a heavy burden of \$2 per ton placed upon pig iron, the raw material used in so many of our manufacturing industries. The last returns from the United States showed that one half of their furnaces were idle, and their rolling-mills were not producing more than one-third of their capacity. It was only recently that the American Secretary of State remarked that Pennsylvania alone had \$100,000,000 worth of capital lying idle in consequence of the depression that industry suffered. He would like to ask where were the labouring men who were making that industry valuable on the American soil? To-day hundreds of them, through no fault of their own, were left without employment under the operation of this system. If that particular industry had not been stimulated by a high Protective tariff, these men would have engaged in other industries, or they would have tilled the soil, and to-day would have been independent. They should consider whether this tariff was, in its nature, likely to develop the best interests of the largest number of the community. He felt it was framed in the interests of a small section. When the United States, after seventeen years of a high Protective tariff, were only able to give employment to 20 per cent. of their population in manufacturing and mining pursuits, and their agricultural population had to seek outside markets for a large proportion of their products; when they remembered that we were placed in the same position, with a large unoccupied terri-

tory of fertile prairie in the North-West, that would yet be the home of millions, they should consider whether they were not unfairly taxing the agricultural population for the benefit of a few; they should ask themselves whither were they drifting. They were entering on a system fraught with danger to the country in the near future. He had faith in the industry, the energy, the perseverance, the frugality of our people to progress in spite of unfavourable circumstances, just as the Americans had grown in spite of the load which, by their enormous tariff, they had placed upon them. The worst that was predicted to the electors in the west had been more than fulfilled in this tariff, which was not a fair exponent of that elastic system presented to the electorate on the 17th September last. It would be found detrimental to our connection with the Mother Country. Their friends opposite endeavoured to make a point against the Opposition as being too sensitive about Imperial connection. The time had gone past when that could be thrown against the Reform or any party in this country. He failed to see any merit in setting up a man of straw for the purpose of knocking him down. Our people were loyal to their country and the Crown; but he asked whether the policy of the Government or of the Opposition was most likely to strengthen the bond of connection between this and the Mother Country. Look at the position of Great Britain. He remembered that to-day, in that vast territory of British India, they had reduced their tariff on certain cotton goods, through the pressure of the Imperial authorities, to open a better market for England's manufactures, and relieve the pressure on her starving operatives, thereby sacrificing a revenue of some £200,000 sterling to benefit the Mother Country. The Mother Country had opened her markets to us; had discriminated in our favour in the cattle trade against the Americans; had given us every facility to sell to them our surplus agricultural products, duty free; but if they were to adopt the policy we were inaugurating, to place a tax on Canadian beef, cheese, butter, flour and wheat, would not that be disastrous to our best interests? Come what might, come

MR. BAIN.

what would, in expressing these opinions he felt he was only expressing the sentiment that would ultimately be acknowledged as likely to promote the best and most substantial interests of our country. He maintained that there should be accord between our policy and that of the glorious Empire of which it was our pride and boast that we formed a part, and that we should preserve between the Mother Country and this Dominion that sympathy, in policy and action, which was the best guarantee for the permanent welfare and prosperity of all classes in the Dominion; and, while he respected the opinions of gentlemen opposite, he felt that he should be false to his own strongest convictions, false to the constituency that had honoured him with their confidence as their representative in this House, and false to the best and truest interests of his country, if he failed to raise his voice against the system of taxation about to be inaugurated by the hon. gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said he did not intend to enter into the merits of Free-trade and Protection, which had been discussed so long before the people, and which had been decided by their verdict, given at the polls some six months ago. But, during this discussion, many foreign elements had been introduced by hon. gentlemen. His only object was to reply to some of the charges which had been brought forward, and to place the Province of British Columbia in a proper position before the people of this country. He could not well be silent, after hearing the violent, the malignant and traitorous speech, delivered on Friday by the political Jeremiah, weeping for his country, the vain-glorious egotist, who came here to represent Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), and tried to force his opinions down the throats of hon. gentlemen of this House. He insulted, for hours, the members of this House, by his vile, blasphemous ribaldry. He commenced by stating that he deprecated the indulging of recrimination among hon. members. He had not gone far before he forgot his text. In the bitterness distilled from the depth of his heart, he came forward, as he never failed to

do, and cast the most slanderous charges against British Columbia. This was not the first time he did so. Two years ago he fulminated the same clap-trap charges against that Province. British Columbia seemed to be his great bugbear. He (Mr. Thompson) advised him to let British Columbia and her representatives take care of its own and their own interests. If he gloried in exhibiting himself in this House in the character of a buffoon, all his abuse and vulgarity could have no effect. In spite of all the discouragement that had been thrown on the Province during the last eight years, British Columbia would yet shine as a star of the first magnitude in the constellation of the Dominion; and what might be said against it by members of the calibre of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), would recoil on their own heads. He had reiterated the charge made two years ago, that British Columbia, with, as he said, of a population of 10,000 or 15,000, had six representatives in this House. He would like to know who constituted him a census enumerator for that Province. Let him turn to the statistics and see the revenue she contributed to the Dominion; let him look to the map and see the enormous territory those paltry 10,000 or 15,000 people inhabited, their exports and imports, and their deposits in their savings banks. If he had a spark of feeling left in his narrow-minded soul, he would at once acknowledge that, leaving out of consideration the rights conferred by solemn treaties, British Columbia, with her resources and small population, with her revenue and vast extent of territory, was as well entitled to six members as New Brunswick to sixteen. They contributed to the revenue one-third of the amount paid by New Brunswick, while the percentage of the cost of collecting it was much less. They had no people there glad to subsist on cornmeal, like the constituents of the hon. member for Charlotte. They possessed within their own boundaries inexhaustible mineral resources, gold, silver, copper, iron, marble, and coal, besides their magnificent forests, before whose giant trees, the growth of centuries, the puny trees of New Brunswick might bow their heads in shame; their magnificent rivers, stocked with splendid

salmon, of which they exported nearly \$1,000,000 worth last year; besides their fertile lands, capable of raising crops not only for their own use, but sufficient to create an export trade, and their grand hills, whose pasturage could maintain 100,000 herds, and give them scope to roam at liberty, all the year round. Those were some of the advantages British Columbia offered, and which were not possessed by those Provinces which set themselves up as her superiors. Occupying, as she did, hundreds of miles of the shores of the Pacific, she was the necessary adjunct of this Dominion, if it ever should occupy, as we hoped, some day, an important position in the family of nations. If that was to be the future destiny of the Dominion, it was necessary that British Columbia should be maintained as one of the important links of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, crossing from ocean to ocean. The member for Charlotte taunted British Columbia with being a cancer and excrescence. Were hon. members to sit still and listen to such opprobrious epithets, and hear members from one Province heaping recriminations and abuse upon the representatives of another? The hon. members for Northumberland and St. John had stated that New Brunswick was taxed much higher than any other Province, being at the rate of \$6 or \$7 per head; but he denied that New Brunswick was the heaviest taxed Province; British Columbia was taxed doubly, or trebly, in proportion. Her people did not complain of that, cheerfully recognising that, if public works were to be carried out, if the Pacific Railway was to be built, and canals were to be enlarged, money must be found for those needful works—for works not only within that Province but the others. In connection with this, he would read a telegram received to-day, giving a resolution introduced by a member of the Columbia Legislature:

“That this House is of opinion that the tariff of Customs duties now about to be enforced will be injurious to the interests of this Province unless the building of the Canada Pacific Railway is immediately commenced in this Province, and vigorously carried on; that it is unjust to require that an increase of taxation to provide for the construction of public works and for the protection of industries which, without direct railway communication,

cannot possibly serve them, should be borne by the people of British Columbia."

This was the light in which their people looked at the present tariff, and his (Mr. Thompson's) sentiments were similar. He and every man in British Columbia was willing to increase the tariff to whatever amount was requisite to carry on and complete all the great public works of the country; all they asked was a fair return for the taxation contributed, and for the equitable distribution of the expenditure throughout the Dominion. For the information of hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick, who talked so much about their taxation, he would say that the imports of British Columbia for the last six months of 1878 were about \$1,300,000, and the exports \$1,800,000, showing an excess of \$500,000. Those returns, he thought, showed she was the most solvent Province of the Dominion, and could stand alone were all support removed. He did not think any other Province could make such a display, as regarded the difference between exports and imports. Her revenue from Customs and Excise, for the year ending 30th June, 1878, amounted to \$451,815. They had no correct census, however. The hon. member for Charlotte had been pleased to take one from his own imagination, giving British Columbia from 10,000 or 15,000 people. But, if they had 50,000, which he thought was more than they actually had, the taxation per head would be \$9.03; if 20,000, which was in the proper neighbourhood of the facts, it would be \$22.59; if 15,000, \$30.12; or, for 10,000, \$45.18 per head. Let them see where those corn-eating people came forward and paid \$45, or even \$20, per head; or where they were willing to put their hands in their pockets and pay taxes like the people of British Columbia towards public works. If only a cancer or excrescence could pay at that rate, it would be well for the Dominion if more of them were grown, and, if they could be spread from the east to the west, the Dominion could soon stop increasing the taxation. He believed that every true Canadian, who valued his country more than clap-trap of party, would be willing to assist in carrying out the National Policy which was to build us up among the nations of

Mr. THOMPSON.

the earth. He believed the hon. gentlemen now administering the affairs of state, had sufficient prescience to provide for the great wants of this country and the development of its promising resources. He hoped that the hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick would yet see the day when, after the wedding of the Atlantic and the Pacific with a ring of iron more indissoluble than a ring of gold, their people would confess that the setting sun, as he sank to his evening rest in the waters of the Pacific, had shone on as fair and as prosperous a land as that gilt by his rays when he rose from his couch in the waters of the Atlantic.

MR. BURPEE (Sunbury) said that, referring to what the member for Cariboo had just taken exception to in the remark made the other night by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), he (Mr. Burpee) thought the latter gentleman had been misunderstood. He had not desired to speak against British Columbia, but to set out that the bargain with that Province involved the construction of the Pacific Railway, which would entail serious financial consequences upon the Dominion. He (Mr. Burpee) was aware that British Columbia was possessed of resources of wealth which might be of advantage to the Dominion. But he thought the annexation of that Province at the time was premature, and imposed a burden upon the Dominion greater than it should be called upon to bear. The union, with its concomitant, the building of the Pacific Railway, was an undertaking of so gigantic a nature that it must entail financial complications and might bring on national disaster and bankruptcy. He thought that the British Government were as well calculated and better able to govern British Columbia than was the Dominion for some time to come, but, if we had to take British Columbia into the union, the British Government should, he held, have contributed to the building of the road. Referring to the question now before the House, which had been discussed at such length, and with so much ability, from every standpoint, as to be quite exhausted, it was not to be supposed that he would be able

to throw much new light on the subject, but it would not be out of place for him to deal with the burdens which the new tariff would impose on Canada, particularly with the case of New Brunswick, which had been placed in an exceptional position by the tariff. Notwithstanding the strictures of the member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who had deprecated the course of viewing this matter from a sectional standpoint, he (Mr. Burpee) would, in the interest of his constituents, refer to the matter in this way, holding, as he did, that they had been treated exceptionally hard. It was a fact that New Brunswick, like British Columbia, paid more Customs dues, in proportion to her population than other portions of the Dominion, and must, therefore, pay a larger portion of the increase now about to be levied. It was perfectly right for the people and the representatives of that Province to object to it on that account. But there were other reasons of a more general nature against this measure. He believed it to be a tariff framed in the interest of the few as against the many—framed in the interests of the manufacturers, who were the only class consulted. He maintained that the lumberman, the farmer, the shipbuilder, the great mass of the consumers should have been consulted. He objected to it, further, on the ground that high and differential duties would direct our trade out of its natural into artificial channels. They had long had a local trade—called the Bay of Fundy trade—between New Brunswick, the western part of Nova Scotia, and the seaports of the American Atlantic coast. The sections of the Dominion referred to had certain products of a bulky and perishable nature, such as sawn lumber, piles, hoop-poles, staves, laths, gypsum, Albertite coal, hay, potatoes, sheeps' pelts, and other articles which could not be profitably sent to any other market. When New Brunswick went into Confederation, it was a stipulation that they should have facilities for intercolonial trade. They were to have facilities for sending their products to the West, and for getting their products in return. The Intercolonial Railway was promised them for a commercial route. The Bay Verte Canal was also promised them to facilitate that trade. The ar-

ticles he had mentioned were bulky, and some of them perishable, and could not be sent the long distance of 500 or 600 miles around Nova Scotia, with profit to the Upper Provinces. But the fact is that the Intercolonial Railway had been built by a military, instead of a commercial, route, and he held that, on this, faith had been broken with the people of the city and valley of the St. John, and this was the first and one of the heaviest blows that had been struck at the prosperity of that city and the surrounding counties. The Bay Verte Canal had not been built at all, and the want of facilities for trade with the Upper Provinces compelled them to look for a market for the products he had named, as before, to the seaports of the American coast. They were prohibited, by this tariff, from bringing coal, flour, tea, molasses and other articles they might require from the Americans. In this trade they frequently bartered their products, for convenience and profit, in American ports. It became not only a matter of convenience and profit to the exporters, but was also required for return freights, which—ballast being required—was brought at nearly nominal rates. As an instance of low rates, he mentioned that flour had been brought from New York to St. John in this way at from 10c. to 12c. per barrel. He must say he did think it extremely hard that the Finance Minister, by this tariff, should crush out this trade, so important to St. John and a large portion of the Province. He had before stated that the Province of New Brunswick paid more than a fair share of Dominion taxation. This tariff would increase the indirect tax of the people there about one-third. But, if they got any compensating advantages, it would not be so bad. The hon. member for Cariboo had said, if the people of British Columbia got the Pacific Railway, they would stand any amount of taxation. But New Brunswick was expected to pay this large additional tax, and get nothing in return. He believed they would pay \$800,000 additional to what they had paid before. This statement could be easily proved. He would not give the House any figures that he did not believe. He had a full statement in his hand establishing this, which he would

not read, as it might be tedious at that hour, but it was a fact that could be verified, that they would pay \$800,000 at least, taking last year's importations as a basis. But it had been said they would not, under the new tariff, import so much. He maintained, if they did not, they would pay an enhanced price on all goods manufactured here which they consumed, so that, so far from the figures given being too high, they would pay, in all, more than a \$1,000,000 additional, only about one-third of which would go into the Treasury; the balance would go to enrich the already wealthy manufacturer. But it had been said that there was a reduction upon some items. There was a reduction of about 2c. per gallon on molasses, of which they in New Brunswick had imported, last year, about 9,560,000 gallons, in which the reduction would amount to, say \$19,000. Then they were told there was a reduction on tea. They imported for consumption about 1,136,000lb. of tea into New Brunswick. He computed that the reduction upon black tea was only about half-a-cent per pound. The member for King's had stated, the other night, that the reduction was 2c. per pound. A member for Prince Edward Island had reiterated that statement, and for fear the statement so reiterated might be accepted by the country for a fact, he took exception to it. The computation was a very simple one. The duty now imposed was 2c. per lb. and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. The average value of black tea imported into New Brunswick was 22½c., upon which the 10 per cent. would be 2¼c., which, added to 2c. specific, made 4¼c., as against 5c. per lb. under the old tariff. But a portion of our teas would be imported from the United States, and would pay the differential duty of 20 per cent., so that he could not, for the life of him, see that the reduction would be more than between one-half and three-fourths of a cent. per pound. Adding the amount of the reduction on tea and molasses together, it would give only \$24,600. And for the \$800,000 or a million that they should be required to pay additional, this \$24,000 would be all they would receive directly. Taking the article of sugar, it would be found that the increased duty on this article alone would be more than the reduction on molasses

MR. BURPEE.

and tea together. The principal industries of New Brunswick were farming, lumbering, fishing, and shipbuilding. These occupations gave employment to seven-eighths of the people, all of whom must bear these heavy burdens for the sake of one-eighth that might be benefitted. It was, admittedly, a sound maxim of political economy to seek the greatest good of the greatest number of the people. The Government, by this tariff, had done gross violence to this principle. He proposed to consider some of the industrial interests separately. Take the lumber interest, which must be largely burdened by the new tariff. It was not protected at all, and it was not in the power of the Minister of Finance, with all his ingenuity, to give it protection. It was a most important industry, and made their principal export in New Brunswick. They exported some 400,000,000 superficial feet, and the value of another 100,000,000 in short lumber, making altogether 500,000,000. Upon the prosperity of this industry largely depended the prosperity of all other industries in New Brunswick. When the lumber business was prosperous, farmers got better prices for their products, manufacturers got larger sales for their goods, and all classes were benefitted. He maintained that the lumbermen had been very badly dealt with. They did not and could not protect this interest, but by enhancing the price of articles of supply had greatly burdened it. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) had given to the House a statement very carefully prepared, which showed the cost of production would be increased 60c. per thousand superficial feet. It was true this had been questioned by the member for Renfrew, who did not give the details of his calculation, as he (Mr. Burpee) would have been very glad if he had done. He had some experience in the lumbering business, and had gone carefully over the figures of the member for Queen's, and he believed them mainly correct. They had been based upon the calculations of the Government with reference to enhanced prices. For instance, in the article of oats, on which the Government had placed a duty of 10c. per bushel, the member for Queen's had added 5c. per bushel to the cost of oats for lumbering

purposes. He did not believe the duty would add anything to the price of oats, and there were a few other items in the same category that he might take exception to. He would take a moderate view, and had no doubt the five hundred millions annually produced would cost a quarter of a million dollars more than now, instead of the \$300,000, as estimated by the member for Queen's. This tariff gave a severe blow to the lumbering industry, and he held that no consideration could justify the Government in thus ignoring that important business. He would next consider for a moment how the tariff would affect the farming interest, which gave employment to half, or rather more than half, of the population of New Brunswick. They must pay half of those increased duties. They would pay, at least, \$400,000 additional taxation under this tariff—he believed they would pay more than that, but put it at \$400,000, and what equivalent would they get for this enormous burden? It had been said they had the benefit of Protection to hops, lard, bacon, hams, preserved meats, animals, horses, potatoes, other vegetables, barley, oats, peas, and beans. He would not include flour, of which they in New Brunswick imported largely, and had none to export. The whole amount of duty to be derived from these articles he had enumerated, according to the returns of last year, would be only \$9,337. This was the whole direct benefit. It might be said there was some indirect benefit. He admitted that, in the article of vegetables and green crops, that it would be of some benefit to the parties supplying their markets with these commodities. On these articles, some \$2,024 would be collected, taking the returns of last year as a basis, and might act in some respects as protection to farmers to that extent. About 10c. per bushel duty had been placed upon potatoes. They did not import potatoes at all, while, last year, they exported 50,000 bushels, and the present year still more, so that the duty upon potatoes was of no benefit at all. They loaded a large number of vessels, he thought about twenty, last year, for American ports, which were their only market for that article, and the profit of that trade depended, to a considerable extent, upon a return freight being had for these vessels. The tariff, by its dif-

ferential duties, would injure that trade and actually lessen the price of potatoes to the New Brunswick farmer to the extent that they would be affected by not receiving that return freight, and thus, instead of benefitting him, in regard to that production, by the duty, it would do him an injury. Take wool, which was admitted duty free. It had been contended that they had to import a certain amount of a superior quality, which they did not grow. Vermont produced the finest quality of wool. Their climate and soil were equally as good as Vermont to produce that article, and, if sufficiently encouraged, would do so. He contended that the Government, while protecting other industries, had shown criminal negligence in not protecting this. Hides were also admitted free. Theirs was largely a grazing country, and they produced a great quantity of hides in consequence. Was there any protection for this production? No; and in this he held the Government were again criminally negligent. Eggs were also admitted free. They had a large annual production in this line, and yet no protection was given. Then there was butter and cheese, on which the duty remained the same as before. No additional protection was afforded, though the people of New Brunswick imported last year 1,911lb. of butter, and 5,716lb. of cheese, and the people of that Province could produce these articles, as well as pork, for which no additional duty was provided. So far as the lumberman and the farmer were concerned, there was no compensation for their additional taxation; really and in effect no compensation, and he, as one of the representatives from New Brunswick, protested most strongly against it. He confessed he was not in favour of a high Protective duty. The old tariff was a Protective one to the extent of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which, with the cost of importation, would make 20 to 21 per cent., which, he held, afforded sufficient protection to our manufacturers, which their previous prosperity fully demonstrated. High protective duties were sure to be burdensome to some branch of industry. They could not protect all; in fact, they could protect but a few. The consumer's interest should have been considered, which had

not been the case, and the omission must have a detrimental effect. If all industries were protected alike it would have the effect of raising the cost of everything consumed by all, and increasing the cost of living alike to all, and so would amount to no Protection at all. If they did not protect all, the duties must operate unfairly on those industries which were not so protected. He held, if this tariff were carried out, it must injure the country by making it a dear country to live in, and would retard the progress, not only of the Maritime Provinces, but would retard the settlement of our great North-West. We had now an advantage over the United States, because the cost of living was cheaper here, and he wished we could remain so without enhancing the prices to consumers. Under no other circumstances could we compete with the United States. A great deal had been said about the result of Protection in that country. The fact was, if there was any nation that could afford to set up a fiscal Chinese wall, the United States could. They had every variety of soil, climate and productions. They could produce almost everything they required, and had within themselves all the commodities they needed, having a great advantage over Canada in this respect. Besides, their population was ten to one of ours. It was well known that to manufacture cheaply we must manufacture largely, and we had not a market large enough to encourage extensive manufactures. There were some industries in which one large factory would supply the whole Dominion. Under a high Protective system in both countries, our neighbours would have decidedly and entirely the advantage over us, and we could not compete with them, and yet our manufacturers with these advantages had been more prosperous under our low tariff than those of the United States under their high Protective tariff. It was to the interest of the large mass of consumers to buy wherever they chose without any trammels. Having made our money, we should be permitted to get as much as possible for it. He could not, for the life of him, outside of a political reason, understand why this tariff had been inaugurated. It was said that, if it did not prove satisfactory, we could change it.

MR. BURPEE.

But it was well known that nothing was more injurious to business than this constant tinkering with the tariff. The manufacturers of the country required a settled tariff upon which they could base their calculations. Without a permanent tariff, they would not run the risk of making large investments for manufacturing purposes. But it had been said the people desired this tariff, and that the question had been settled by them on the 17th September last. He entirely dissented from this. It had been shown, and the fact was, that they were not consulted. In one part of the Dominion, gentlemen opposite had favoured Protection when before the electors, and in another Free-trade. If the Liberal candidates mentioned in New Brunswick the probability of the gentlemen opposite introducing Protection, it was at once denied, as in the telegram to Mr. Boyd. In Prince Edward Island, as in New Brunswick, the candidates of gentlemen opposite had talked Free-trade. Had they done otherwise, had a single one of them, or all of them, come out as advocates of such Protection as was now proposed, not a single Conservative would have been returned to Parliament from that section. But not one of them dared to do so. He (Mr. Burpee) did, in fact, believe that the duties on flour and coal would be re-enacted, and had told his constituents so, but he did not venture to say that they would dare to propose the present rates of duties. He did not think the Finance Minister would have the nerve to propose it or be a party to it. They had been told before Confederation that a revenue of thirteen millions would be sufficient for all purposes of the Confederation for twenty-five years to come. He (Mr. Burpee) recollected very well listening to a speech delivered by the Finance Minister in his (Mr. Burpee's) own neighbourhood, in which that gentleman grew eloquent over the statement that thirteen millions would be sufficient, and went on to state that \$2.75 per head would be all they would have to pay to the Federal Government. He told them there was no danger of their being swamped by the larger Provinces. He had then stated that, in the Dominion, on all questions of a moral

character, the Maritime Provinces would have the support of Ontario, while on all questions affecting fiscal arrangements the Maritime interests would run parallel with Quebec, and they would have the support of that Province, and that in any case they would be in the majority and hold the balance of power. He (Mr. Burpee) had not believed he would ever see the day when the Finance Minister would bring in a tariff to tax them \$9 per head instead of \$2.75, and would be selected to lead the Conservatives of Ontario to assail and destroy the best interests of New Brunswick, which he had assured them were safe by the combinations he had so eloquently portrayed. He (Mr. Burpee) regretted, as a Confederate, the dissatisfaction that must take place by the action of the Government when inaugurating this most outrageous tariff, in the face of the assertions to the contrary made by the Finance Minister. He believed the people of Canada were as loyal as any under British rule, not excepting England itself, and he regretted the present tariff would be found to loosen the bonds between the Dominion and the Mother Country. The fact that some of the Provinces, as he had shown, had been dealt with in a manner exceptionally hard, must create dissatisfaction and discontent, and would, he feared, create a desire for political union with their nearest neighbours, as the only means of getting a market for their products shut out by the tariff, and for which they had no other market. He exceedingly regretted that the effect of these considerations, and the fact that the tariff of Canada and that of the United States were likely to approach so near each other, together with the high duties the Government proposed placing upon British manufactures, would be to loosen the bond with the parent State. This he should deeply deplore, and for this the present Government would be responsible, if it should be, as he feared it would be, promoted by the present tariff.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have listened, Sir, with the greatest possible interest to the debate which has taken place upon this most important subject, and I have observed that at least one-half of the speeches, probably more, of those deliv-

ered on the Ministerial side, have commenced with taunting gentlemen on this side of the House on the paucity of their numbers. They have boasted unceasingly on the other side of the House of the victory they achieved at the polls on the 17th September, and they speak as though it was a degradation to be beaten at the polls. Now, I would inform hon. gentlemen that I would rather a thousand times be beaten in the defence of a just principle, than be successful in the defence of a wrong principle. We have been told by several members who have spoken that, if we had conceded more or less to what was, it appears, a popular delusion, we might, at this moment, be still governing the country. I would rather, Sir, sit in Opposition, defending the principles I believe to be just and truly national in their character, than sit on the Ministerial benches, under the auspices of a Protective policy. I shall never, while I live, consent to place myself in a position which will necessitate on my part the defence of a policy which I believe to be extremely injurious to the prosperity of the country. Hon. gentlemen have spoken and spoken long on the inconsistency betrayed by some of my hon. friends behind me. They have pointed with great glee to the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver), and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who have, on some occasion or other, years ago, advocated what was more or less a Protective policy. Well, suppose they had. I think no hon. member ought to be charged with inconsistency simply because he changed his opinions. When we cease to change our opinions on political subjects we cease to be proper subjects for deliberative assemblies. When we cease to change our views on the great questions of our political kaleidoscope, we cease to be fit for the position we now occupy as representatives of the people in Parliament. Why, Sir, what is the object of our constant debate in this House and out of it? Is it not to endeavour to convince each other? Do hon. gentlemen take the position given to the Scotchman, when he said that he, for his part, was open to conviction, but he would like to see the man who could convince him? Do hon. gentlemen believe that there was any inconsistency in Sir Robert Peel, who was at one time a

Protectionist, and ultimately almost the colleague of Mr. Cobden, in the advocacy of those great principles, which brought such glory and success to his own brief reign as Premier, and to the nation at large, his successors and inheritors of his promises and pledges? Now, Sir, no one at this time would think for a moment of impugning the honesty of Sir Robert Peel. No one can help admiring the greatness of the soul which enabled him to sacrifice his party predilections and prospects, in order that he might advance the new principles he had embraced. No one can read, without a feeling of shame stealing over him, and a blush of shame mantling his face, of the treatment the great statesman received at the hands of the Tory party in England because he thus preferred principle to party, and gave up his whole intelligence, the whole strength of his mind, towards perfecting those great principles which he brought into action as a political force. Does any man in England, does any member of the English Parliament, however humble, ever taunt Mr. Gladstone with inconsistency, though Mr. Gladstone, in his younger days, was a member of the Conservative party; although, in his best days, he was a member of the Conservative Government; although he was, at one time, the champion of an ultra system of Established Churchism? Does any one taunt him with inconsistency now, because he is one of the great leaders of the Liberal party? No one dreams of dishonestly on the part of Mr. Gladstone. No one can be accused of dishonesty and inconsistency because he has fairly and honestly changed his views and political position. Such is the position of my friends behind me. They honestly advocated, years ago, a greater or less measure of Protection for certain interests. They, at this moment, advocate a complete system of Free-trade, so far as the necessities of this country will permit that to be enforced. There is a real reason to object to the consistency of hon. gentlemen who profess two views at the same time. I have listened, with amazement, to the accusations made against the hon. the Finance Minister concerning his pledges during the

elections. If ever a man pledged himself in this world to his constituents, and to a country, not to have a system of Protection inaugurated if he came in power, that hon. gentleman did. Why, Sir, he accused my hon. friend beside me with imposing a duty of 10 per cent. on machinery in 1874. He opposed, he said, the imposition of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., in addition to the 15 per cent., enacted in 1874. He told his auditors that, if he had been present, he would have opposed that imposition of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. And yet, the hon. gentleman comes here himself and imposes an additional $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on unenumerated articles. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) endeavoured to construe a telegram from the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government to Mr. Boyd of St. John, as only meaning that they had no intention of increasing the duties on unenumerated articles. Does that telegram, like the handwriting on the wall at Babylon, require an interpreter, and is that interpreter the hon. member for Cardwell? It is said that was the interpretation put upon the message, when the message states, in the most explicit language that can be used, that it was not proposed to have any increase in the tariff, but simply a readjustment of duties. And yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman who sets beside him, when he had this telegram in his possession, declared that, if he had been here in 1874, when an increase of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was made, he would have opposed it, although he had in secret contemplation, at that time, an average duty of 35 per cent., and an increase in regard to the unenumerated list from $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 20 per cent. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but he will not laugh when he has to go back to his constituents, and hears denounced the treachery to his own views. I use that word in a political sense. Yet these are the parties who accuse my hon. friends of inconsistency. Can anyone be more inconsistent than hon. gentlemen leading the House. Those of them from the Lower Provinces advocated a Free-trade policy. I was myself denounced in the Tory papers in Prince Edward Island as a Protectionist, and Mr. Pope, one of the candidates for Queen's County, was pointed to as one of the champion Free-traders of the Dominion. I come to

other parts of the Dominion, and I find myself denounced as being an ultra Free-trader, determined to destroy even the Protection that the manufacturers had at the time when this tariff was brought into operation. Now, I have no hesitation in avowing my own views to be what I have stated in almost every speech. I am from principle, and I believe it a right principle, a Free-trader. I believe that nothing can more promote the prosperity of a country, that nothing can more tend to humanise the entire surface of this earth than a Free-trade system among all nations. I believe we should have everything as free as possible; that every man should be free to purchase where he can on the best terms, and to sell where he can do so most advantageously. But, on the other hand, while I am in favour of the most extensive Free-trade, the removal of every possible restriction, I have always said that, circumstanced as we are in this country, and probably in all countries, it is utterly impossible in practice to carry out that Free-trade system.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am glad to find hon. gentlemen agree with me in some matters. I have seen the day when an enunciation of these views would have met with complete approval, and, were it not that they consider other views necessary to party success, it would be so at this moment. But I stated my views very fully in January, 1874, in the city of Hamilton; again in 1877, in Brampton, in the county of Peel, and in these two speeches hon. gentlemen will find, if they please, a complete exposure of my own views in this matter. I said, in Hamilton, in addition to what I said here to-night, that not only did I consider it would be absolutely necessary to maintain a system for collecting revenue by imposing duties on imports, but I was not prepared to consider, even if the circumstances of the country would demand it, any sudden reduction of duties, even if we could afford it, because I felt that, if, under a steady tariff of 14, 15, or 17 per cent., carefully considered at the time it was enacted by Parliament, we had created industries, created manufactures,

giving an opportunity or temptation, or both, to capitalists, to engage in manufactures, I did not think, and I do not now think, Parliament would be justified in interfering rashly with the condition of such manufactures. These were my views at that time, and they are my views now. I know that there is an indisposition on the part of the public generally, in every country, to pay direct taxation, and at first it might, perhaps, be somewhat difficult to obtain the machinery for levying direct taxation, except at a cost which would, perhaps, exceed that of levying indirect taxation. We were, therefore, placed in this position at the last general election, when we took our stand upon the justice and honesty of having a tariff for revenue only. Hon. gentlemen opposite took their stand upon what? The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) cited a part of my speech on the evening of the opening of the Budget debate to show that I considered that they had redeemed all their promises. I never said so, Sir. What I said was, that, in reference to the Protective policy advanced by some gentlemen opposite, they had gone the whole length they had promised. I say so now. I say that they have even exceeded what was anticipated by the Protectionists of the country. But the promises were not all made for Protection. The hon. the Finance Minister promised there should be no additional taxation, except for revenue purposes. The hon. gentleman accused the late Minister of having exacted too large a rate of duty upon imports, and he led, by all the speeches made, according to the testimony of every member from New Brunswick who has spoken, at every meeting which the hon. gentleman attended, the people to believe that these taxes would not be imposed. The Minister of Public Works, in one or two meetings in Nova Scotia, did certainly say there would be a duty imposed on coal. It suited him to say that there, although, in the West, he said he was for a duty on flour, out of pure benevolence for the Ontario farmer. In Cape Breton, he said that Mr. Mackenzie proved conclusively that a duty on flour would not increase the price of it, and that, for once, he was right. I am glad the hon. gentleman believed I was right. But how did he attempt to deceive the western farmers by

the opposite opinion? How was it that, at *Whitby*, and other places, he expressed an entirely different opinion? I cannot, at the moment, lay my finger upon his speeches, but I certainly understood always that he was in favour of making good to the people of the West, by a duty on flour, what he has taken from them by a duty on coal. It is impossible that all these pledges could have been fulfilled. If the pledges to the Eastern Provinces were that they should not have a Protective policy, then the Government has violated its promises to them. I admit, however, they did succeed in pleasing the Protectionists of the West, and that the hon. the Premier has really carried out what he said to the people of *Hamilton*: "You can all come," he said, "and state what your interests require, and we will give it you." They all did come, from *Dan to Beersheba*, and some came too late. One man from *Hamilton* said he had increased Protection upon his productions of 20 per cent. instead of $17\frac{1}{2}$, but that the iron he used was raised from 10 per cent. to 17 per cent., thus leaving him worse than before. But, said the Finance Minister, we will reduce the kind of iron you use to $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which will leave you so much better. Another man came who made clocks which were proved to be worthless. The hon. gentleman asks, how much do you want? Thirty-five per cent. Well, we will give it to you. The furniture manufacturer obtained precisely the same duty. Everyone came in his turn and obtained what he desired. Well, this being the policy of the Government in the West, they have carried it out; but, not being the policy in the East, they have not been able to carry it out there, but have led the people to believe, in a few counties in *Nova Scotia*, and a few members from *Prince Edward Island*, that an era of prosperity will dawn for them in some mysterious manner which is unexplainable. My hon. friend behind me, who spoke last, referred to the impossibility of protecting every person, because there was no royal road to wealth. No Government, be it ever so able, can prepare a Statute in this House, pass it, and, obtaining the signature of the Governor-General to it, make people rich by legislation. Why, what

MR. MACKENZIE.

is wealth? Wealth is the product of labour; it can be nothing else. The merchants who sell goods are not producing any wealth; they are mere brokers, who stand between the manufacturers and the consumers. The hon. member for *Cardwell* (Mr. White) referred to the vast number of failures that took place in *Canada* during the last few years, but these failures were almost entirely of a class who bought goods without anything to pay for them. I am sure the member for *West Montreal* knows that well, and so does every other wholesale merchant in the country. I venture to say that the failures which have taken place in *Canada* have contained a smaller proportion of manufacturers than of any other class embraced in the operation of the Insolvent Law. Further, that the manufacturers of this country have been the most prosperous classes during the last four years.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell): Six out of the nine I mentioned are manufacturers.

MR. MACKENZIE: Nine were mentioned. I could mention 109, and not one of them a manufacturer. But, I know manufacturers who failed in the city of *Montreal*, and so does the hon. member for *Cardwell*, who did not fail because of any losses in their business as manufacturers. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that one or two of the failures that I noticed, particularly in the boot and shoe trade, were on account of the lack of Protection. No; it was because they embarked their capital in other illegitimate objects and neglected their manufacturing business. One of these gentlemen who failed, and who did a very large business, perhaps the largest business in the city, was at one time a supporter of mine, and, while he held Protectionist views, he told me frankly that he had all the Protection he desired under the old tariff, that more Protection was, in his opinion, useless, so far as business was concerned. We have only to look at the consumption in the country, according to the late census, of boots and shoes, at the quantity of boots and shoes exported and imported, and it will be seen that it is almost entirely in our own hands, that the importation was a mere trifle, and equalled by our exports. These failures were

not to be attributed to any trade cause, but to the inability of the parties to conduct their business, or to the illegitimate investment of means which ought to have been used for the transaction of their particular business. This is so clear to any person who will calmly look over the matter, that I cannot conceive the possibility of anyone denying it. Take the agricultural implements manufacturers: We happen to have a member of this House largely engaged in that business, and, in my own neighbourhood, there are a number of manufacturers who carry on most extensive works, and we know that the most extensive of them announced last year, in this House, by letters to members of this House, that they had made dividends ranging from 10 per cent. to 28 per cent. There has not been, up to this time, a more flourishing business in the world, than the business of manufacturing agricultural implements. Then, what about our stove foundries? Some of the gentlemen engaged in that business have been the most rabid Protectionists, and have not hesitated, for years back, to ask a higher Protection than they possessed, in order that they might make large profits, and give the public a poor article. In 1874, they endeavoured to obtain an advantage from us, when we were revising the tariff, to some extent. I knew pretty well the history of that trade; I knew that, up to the time of the breaking out of the war in the United States, few stoves, comparatively, were made in Canada, but the high prices that then ruled in the United States gave our manufacturers an opportunity which they soon took advantage of. Then, with the high prices in the States, and our own duty added, it made an absolute Protection up to the years 1872-73. In 1873-74 a considerable number of stoves were imported from the United States, and, instead of our manufacturers endeavouring to perfect their machinery, they came here clamouring at our doors for a duty of 25 per cent., in order that they might continue to make wretched articles and make the consumer pay the value of first-class articles. We refused to accede to this demand, and the result was that they set to work and, having a healthy competition before them, long before the hon. gentlemen opposite came

into power, stoves were made in Canada as good as those made anywhere in the United States, and these stoves abundantly supplied the wants of all Canadian families without the additional Protection deemed in 1874 as essential to the prosperity of these manufacturers. I mention these branches as indicating that there was no real want of Protection; that it was simply with them as with the boot and shoemakers, as with the cabinet makers, the cotton manufacturers,—not that they were not getting a fair return for their money, but simply the inordinate greed which always characterises men who live upon Protectionist principles. They wanted to make the labour of every man tributary to their greed, not to live on the products of their own hands and brains. We know of some stockholders in cotton mills, who, some years ago, bought the stock at 70, which is now worth 135. The direct tendency of every kind of legislation of a Protective character is to establish class interests. I can see, on looking across the House, where the class interests touch. I can observe on various countenances where the stock resides. I have had the strongest possible feeling against the class interests which have existed in the Mother Country for ages, and it is one of the reasons why I consider Canada free, Canada as it has been, as it is yet in many respects, in spite of the legislation forced upon the country by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is for these reasons that I preferred to have my home where there were no class interests possible; but, while in Great Britain there are class interests which have been almost sanctified by time, a great landed hereditary aristocracy legislating for the country, a great Established Church, which for centuries has held sway over the moral instincts of the people—while those class instincts have something about them which is grand and reverend, and commend themselves, at all events, to one's imagination, if not to one's judgment; is there anything more sordid than the class interests created by men who have means and money, grasping with avidity the labour of the fellow-workers of the country? That is the most odious of all class interests. It is one of the most melancholy exhibitions of legislative folly to find the

Canadian Legislature, deliberately putting the necks of the people under the yoke of those combinations and rings. I recollect well, though I was but young at the time, that Richard Cobden was laughed at when he brought those principles, which I now humbly advocate, before the British Parliament, when the fine gentlemen, in the House of Commons, put their glasses to their eyes, and asked who this fellow was. That "fellow" made his name familiar in every home in England, to be revered in the humble homes of the workingman, to be feared in the palaces of the great, who were instrumental for ages in keeping down the spirit of the people, taxing inordinately all the necessaries of life, and, therefore, crushing the very life and soul out of the people of Great Britain. Richard Cobden's day came, and no name is at this moment more revered in Great Britain, by Tory and Whig alike, than the name of the great anti-Protectionist, Richard Cobden, who brought such glory to his country. I do not at all fear that the time will not speedily come in Canada when the legislation, with which we are now threatened, will be repudiated as a legislation retrograde in its character, as a reactionary measure, which can only be instrumental in doing evil to our country. These are my opinions. I know I am addressing many hon. gentlemen, who honestly and conscientiously believe that a Protectionist policy is essential to the prosperity of the country. I can honour such men, although I believe their policy to be a sadly mistaken one; but there are no words which I can use, within Parliamentary bounds, that can express sufficiently my abhorrence of those who are advocating a Protectionist policy for the sake of personal and sordid interests; for the sake of retaining political power; because I believe that political power is only to be sought for when it is the means, in the hands of those who possess it, of carrying into practice by it the views of sound, economical, human, benevolent legislation. We are told by hon gentlemen opposite, in a sneering way, that we have on this side of the House much to say in favour of the workingman—that we take great care of him. Well, we do. Why should we not? Hon. gentlemen opposite say they will find him labour.

MR. MACKENZIE.

Yes, they will. They will find him labour as the Protectionists in the United States find labour for their workmen.

MR. TILLEY: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear." He knows well that the Protective system in the United States, while it gave labour for a time after its enactment, afterwards deprived the workingmen of labour. He must know that while the wages of men rose during the Protective era 60 per cent., the prices of all the commodities consumed by them and their families rose 92 per cent., so that the workingman, with nominally higher wages, had less purchasing power in them, by 32 per cent., than during the Free-trade era. How could the position of the workingman be otherwise? The man who stands at the corner, or has a broker's shop, and shaves notes, does not create wealth; nor does the professional class, though they are necessary to fill a niche in our social and political fabric. It is the men who toil, who make the grass and corn to grow in the fields—who produce all that our forests, mines and fields supply—who only produce wealth; and if those men have to pay such increased prices for every article they purchase, how can their wealth be promoted? There is another thing to be considered with reference to the working classes. Some of my friends behind and around me pointed out that there was no Protection proposed for them; that the competition in labour is a very serious matter. I notice that for the last two or three weeks there has been a sort of chronic system of strikes on the Welland Canal, because of the excessive supply of labour. Yet those men came from the United States to compete with our men. They have no labour in Buffalo, New York, or other places in that Protection-fed country, and, therefore, come over to Canada. I believe that one-third of the men on our public works come from the United States. How is this to be remedied? Are our workmen to be compelled to pay higher prices for everything, and to receive no protection for their labour, at the hands of our Protectionist Government? It may be said the Government cannot possibly protect the

labourer, and that we cannot prevent people coming into the country. I believe that is true. I do not ask them to protect the labourer, because I know it is impossible. But I do say that they have no right to delude the workman with the impression that they can create an abundance of labour, unless they are able to shut out those who come in to obtain that labour. Another thing enters very largely into this part of our economics. We know that, during the last years of the construction of these public buildings in which we meet, many English workmen came out in the spring, worked here all summer, and went back to the Old Country and worked there all winter. The truth is that the great conveniences now offered to every man from every part to reach every other part, travelling, have equalised precisely the wages of labour, and brought the entire population of the world nearer to each other; and we know, besides, that there is a very great difference in the condition of labour. This measure is what the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Tilley) the other day called it, a revolutionary measure, and yet he has not considered fairly and fully the various questions which enter into our domestic life as a nation. I allude to the wonderful productive power of machinery, compared to what it was some years ago. A well known author makes these remarks upon this subject:

"Labour-saving machinery has tended to dispense with manual labour, as well as to put the production of goods far ahead of the consumption; in other words, to manufacture more than can be used. In 1838, two hundred and thirty-one operatives were required to do the work in the Boot cotton mill at Lowell, Mass. By working 76½ hours per week they were enabled to work the machinery to its full capacity. In 1876, by the aid of improved machinery, ninety persons, working only 60 hours per week, were able to manufacture a larger number of yards of cloth. In this instance one person does the work of more than three persons, the time being estimated by hours. Statements made in regard to other kinds of manufacturing show almost as great a reduction of labourers. Only half as many men were required to manufacture the boots and shoes sold in the United States in 1876, as were needed to manufacture them in 1860. ▲ A similar statement in relation to the manufacture of stoves was given at a convention of stove-makers held in St. Louis last season. In the manufacture of straw goods, three hun-

dred hands do the work that required a thousand hands only a few years ago. It appears certain that one farmer can produce more corn and grain by the aid of machines than two men could thirty years ago. Since the establishment of co-operative dairies, it is plain that one person can make as much butter and cheese as ten could when the work was done by hand. One street-sweeping machine does the work of a hundred men, while one nail machine performs the labour of a thousand. Every grain elevator erected causes a hundred grain-shovellers to be discharged, while a steam drill renders useless the work of a hundred hand-drills. And even in railway construction the steam shovel, and methods of "dumping" gravel have caused a large reduction in the number of labourers formerly necessary for such services."

I mention these simply as specimens of what may be instanced in almost every branch of human labour. Now, the discussion on the part of hon. gentlemen on the other side has gone on on the assumption that the scarcity of work in many of our cities and towns was owing solely to a want of Protection to our manufacturers, when they must be aware, from such statements of fact as I have read, that a very large proportion, if not the whole of the idle men in Canada, though there are not many idle compared with the number employed, are idle because of the vast improvement of machinery which renders their labour unnecessary.

MR. ROCHESTER: Our manufactures are closed.

MR. MACKENZIE: Now I believe the proper course to pursue is the one I have invariably indicated, and that we ought not, on any account, to put our revenue tariff so high as to make the duties seriously Protective, because so sure as this is done the various evils I have pointed out will be certain to follow, and there is nothing, in my opinion, more characteristic of a free and enlightened age than perfect freedom to buy and sell where it suits best. We would always be able to find the means of meeting the national necessities, and whatever is levied upon the people beyond the amount required to meet the national expenditure is merely taken from the labouring classes: the farmer, mechanic, and labourer in the lumber woods, and all other producers, and deposited in the pockets of some men who

had been rich enough to obtain control over their labour. There are, and have been, for a long time, as hon. gentlemen are aware, a class of people who have advocated the co-operative system as the one which alone could produce perfect justice to all mankind. That is, as I believe, utterly impracticable. We must continue to depend upon men of superior brains, or who have had money left them, or obtained means to give an impetus to labour, starting large manufactories and employing the workmen; and we will find that the most intelligent, persevering man, will gradually acquire some ascendancy over his fellows, in the matter of wealth. I do not, for a moment, believe that it would be wise for any legislation to interfere with that natural order of things, or that we can, or ought, by a general law, distribute the property of the country to individuals. Many writers of eminence have advocated something of that kind, but it would be one of the worst species of legislation possible, and I only mention it to ridicule it. But what is the difference between the legislation which would, in so many words declare it to be right and just that, as the Almighty had never given a patent of land to any human being, no human being had an absolute title to it, and a law that on its face declares it is enacted for the purpose of promoting certain individual interests? Protection means simply advantages to a special class, and certain individuals, or nothing. If the entire people, as the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) observed, are to be protected, then you are so much the poorer, by the cost of affording that Protection, which can only raise prices all over; it would make no man better or worse. The fact is that this legislation is avowedly sought for, and the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government knows that, by parties who seek to obtain an advantage over their fellows. Why did the hon. gentleman not, in response to a question at Hamilton, tell us that he would endeavour to arrange the tariff to satisfy all the manufacturers? Was it the people that asked this question—the multitude of faces there assembled? No; it was at the very most, 20 or 30 manufacturers, in a city of 30,000 people. I do not

MR. MACKENZIE.

wonder if some of my friends speak with something like anger and contempt of the intelligence of people led away by such sophistries. I do not wonder at such an expression of opinion, nor would I hesitate to tell them that I am amazed at the lack of intelligence manifested in approving of a policy avowedly adopted to enrich a certain class at the expense of the rest. But that leads me for a moment to digress, and say that, after all, the majority on their side was exceedingly small. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been boasting that they represent an immense majority. I do not believe it. I think that, when they came into this House, they represented a very small majority; I believe they represent now a very small minority of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to think, also, that, because they boast of representing a majority, we, in Opposition, were bound to give effect to the voice of those people. Well, they have a singular conception of the duties and obligations of a deliberative assembly who imagine that a minority is bound always to give effect to the views of the majority. The very object for which we were elected was to oppose the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Do not think we have been addressing the House from night to night with reference to hon. gentlemen opposite alone; we speak to the country. We do not dream for a moment that there are many on the Ministerial side who will listen to the voice of reason, reason we ever so wisely; but we do hope, believe and know, that the arguments we are addressing to them will reach a much wider audience, and produce a more salutary effect on an audience where they will be most influential when the day of trial comes. At all events, hon. gentlemen opposite may depend on it, we are not to be led away from what we conceive to be the path of duty, by any such boast of a majority. It is possible we may take the wrong views of human life, prosperity, and misery, but, whether right or wrong, we believe them conscientiously, and will endeavour to give them effect, so far as our voices extend, for, unfortunately, our votes will have little to do with the matter. I recollect that during the campaign the present Minister of Public

Works, speaking in a remote part of the country, where no opposition to him would be allowed, cited the example of England as one that eminently favoured Protection, and contrasted her position with ours to show the beneficial effects of the Protective system. At Sydney (Cape Breton) he spoke as follows:—

“You know that down to 1842, she (England) had one of the highest tariffs in the world. You know that under that tariff she developed her coal and iron, and all the other industries of the country, until she became mistress of the manufacturing industries of the world.”

I have been told that the hon. gentleman has in his office—but it has not been presented to the House that I am aware of—a petition from a Rev. Doctor of Divinity, who is owner of a coal mine in Cape Breton, and who speaks in the petition of the defeat of the late Government as an act of Providence. I suppose it was by such an interpretation of providential action that he obtained his degree. But the hon. the Minister of Public Works, must have forgotten his reading, or else he persistently shut his eyes to the condition of England from 1839 to 1845. I am sure that, if he read the ordinary histories of the period, he would have come to a very different conclusion. My hon. friend near me (Mr. Guthrie) gave us some figures, but I could give an acre of them almost, to show how the manufactures of England were cramped by the Protective policy up to that time. I could show that in various classes of goods, on all the leading goods manufactured in England for the three years of 1872, 1873 and 1874, she presented a production and an export five or six times greater than for the years 1841, 1842 and 1843. The production of white and plain cottons, for instance, rose from about 432,000,000 yards, to 2,500,000,000 yards, and so with everything else. But what was the social condition of the country during that period? The hon. member for South Wellington read, the other night, a graphic extract from English history. I might read, also, from one or two writers on that point. Macaulay said:

“So visible was the misery of the manufacturing towns, that a man of sensibility could hardly bear to pass through them. Everywhere he found filth and nakedness, and plaint-

ive voices, and wasted forms and haggard faces. Politicians who had never been thought alarmists, began to tremble for the very foundations of society. First, the mills were put on short time. Then they ceased to work at all. Then went to pledge, the scanty property of the artisan; first his little luxuries, then his comforts, then his necessities. The hovels were stripped till they were as bare as the hovel of the dog-ribbed Indian. Alone, amidst the general misery, the shop with the three golden balls prospered, and was crammed from cellar to garret with the clocks and the tables, and the kettles, and the bibles of the poor. I remember well the effect which was produced in London by the unwonted sight of huge pieces of cannon which were going northward to overawe the starving population of Lancashire.”

I might read extracts for hours, showing the fearful state of the country, at the very period the hon. the Minister of Public Works mentions as being the acme of England's prosperity under the Protective system. At that very time it was the home of all human misery, the people were dying by starvation, the entire property of the country was in danger, a social and political revolution seemed an immediate prospect, and yet a Minister of the Crown in Canada put himself in the position of referring to this disastrous period, induced by Protection, as an illustration of the beneficial and benevolent features of the Protective system. The truth is, there could be no illustration more unfortunate for the hon. gentleman to adopt. And yet, we are asked deliberately now to pursue a retrograde policy, to adopt this reactionary measure, to go from what was a fair revenue tariff, and a just and equitable system of taxation, to one which will impose a serious burden of taxation upon the many, for the benefit of the few. The United States, from statistics in my possession, show this: That from 1870, up to the present time, there has not only been no increase in the national wealth, but there is an absolute decline of some three billions of dollars in the national wealth. It is estimated by the Cincinnati *Commercial*, a well-informed paper, that the national wealth in 1880, at the next census, will be very much less than it was in 1870, and this loss is attributed to the faults of the commercial system which governed the business transactions of that country during this period. Increased taxation must, of necessity, produce distress among the poor, and that is

what this tariff does upon every article of household consumption. In regard to flour, the hon. member for Cumberland agrees with me that the expense will not be any greater for flour in general, because we produce more than we consume; although, I may state, in passing on that subject, that my view has been presented on several occasions, as to the effect of the duty on flour. Suppose a duty were imposed that would enable you to go to the Lower Provinces where they raise no grain worth mentioning, it would only act in this way: the fishermen of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have a large trade with New York, Portland, Boston, and other towns of the United States; they sell their fish and bring back flour, carrying it some times for the small price of 10c. or 15c. per barrel, sometimes even as ballast. If we were to impose a duty of 25c. or 50c. on flour, it would destroy these people's trade in time, which amounts probably to 40,000 or 50,000 barrels per year. Our millers might get an advantage, and if it were spread over the millers of the whole country would benefit them, perhaps, one-ninth per cent. per barrel, on the flour made in Canada. We have seen how the expenses of a household will be increased in the consumption of crockery, which is taxed on the average 30 per cent. more, on all provisions which are taxed more, as well as on hardwares and other articles. We have seen an invoice of blankets presented to this House, which showed that on a four dollar blanket over a dollar was expended to pay duties; that on that invoice of 118 blankets, there were duties to the extent of \$115, whereas, under the former tariff, the duties would be only \$45. Upon all classes of woollen goods, linens and cottons worn by the inmates of every house, there is a certain increase; how much that will average every family, I do not know, and do not venture upon a calculation. Gentlemen who have fixed incomes have made calculations, and they have told me that in their case it would amount to \$250 per annum more. On a lower class of our workmen and labourers, I imagine it cannot amount to less than from \$30 to \$50 per family. And this increased taxation will reach to those classes, it

will affect them chiefly, and yet we are told this has been done for the sake of accomplishing the object that hon. gentlemen have in view, of benefitting a few at the expense of the many. The distribution of wealth by legislation is an evil which cannot be too strongly resisted. The hon. the Minister of Finance said, the other night, speaking of the prospects of obtaining a sounder system of legislation in the United States, that he had now something to offer; that if this tariff was in operation something could be done; that he could present a temptation, in other words, to the United States. Well, it puts me in mind of an anecdote related of President Lincoln. He was like all new governors, troubled very much by office-seekers, and I believe hon. gentlemen opposite know what it is to find office-seekers besieging their doors whenever they come out. During his presidency, Mr. Lincoln had the misfortune to fall ill of the small-pox, and he then told his friend, Colfax, to send down all the office-seekers, for he now had something he could give them. The hon. the Minister of Finance has nothing to give any person, after his tariff is in operation for a short time, but something which will be worse to all the population than even the small-pox. The hon. gentleman knows very well that his Protectionist theory is one that will inevitably produce a great amount of misery. He must be aware, from the history of other countries, that it can be productive of nothing else. Everything conceivable is here taxed, reminding one of the remark made by Dean Swift to an English lady, who was speaking to him of the air of Ireland, and said it appeared to be exceedingly pleasant, healthy and refreshing. "Have the goodness, madam," said the Dean, "not to mention it in England, or they will be sure to tax it." The hon. gentleman has endeavoured to stretch out his arm so as to reach every conceivable object of taxation. He has endeavoured, in many instances, while giving manufacturers Protection, so to arrange it that the articles which they consume as raw materials shall be heavily taxed. The fact is that, while giving protection to some manufacturers to the extent, in some cases, of only 5 to 15 per cent., it raises the price of everything they pro-

duce. It is quite clear that, if the blacksmith is to pay 12 per cent. more for his iron, if the carriage maker is to pay 12 per cent. more for his iron, it is impossible for them and the implement makers to sell their products to the farmers at the rates they are now selling them at; so that the result will be an inevitable increase in the range of prices to every one who has to purchase, and all this is to be done in order to benefit some special classes. Now, the theory upon which hon. gentlemen go to a great extent is this: they want Canada for the Canadians; they want that Canada shall produce everything that Canada consumes. They imagine that it impoverishes a people to go into a neighbouring country and purchase something at half the price they can obtain it in their own. They imagine that, if we have a large amount of imports, such as we have coming from the United States free of duty, it is a real calamity to this country—else why the constant repetition of the complaint that all this amount of goods coming into Canada enters into competition with our own products? We all know, and every man on the other side of this House knows, that it is impossible, except in the article of Indian corn, to produce any effect in the prices of grain by imposing an amount of duty. As to the duty on wheat, you may as well make it 5c. as 15c.,—you may as well make it 60c., because it will produce no effect whatever. It is a mere delusion in order to coax the farmer into the belief that he is to be benefited by this taxation. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government seems to be rather cheerful at present. I would like to ask him, as he has cheered derisively, whether he believes that this 15c. is to raise the price of the farmer's wheat by 15c.? Does the hon. gentleman believe that?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The supporters of my hon. friend from New Brunswick and Lower Canada, all say so.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will not venture to say so himself.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I will tell you what I think by-and-bye.

MR. MACKENZIE: What I want to say is this: that, if the hon. gentleman believes that, by putting a 15c. duty upon wheat in his tariff, he is going to give that much more to the farmers, why does he stop at 15c.? Why not give them 20c.? Why not give them \$1? He is pursuing a delusive and deceptive course if he thinks that, by the legislation he proposes, he is going to fulfil his promises to the people. He must know that. I give the hon. gentleman credit for too much intelligence to believe, for a moment, that he can raise the price of commodities of which we produce more than we consume, by imposing a duty on the same article from abroad. But I say more. The United States have a country essentially different from ours. They have a great variety of soil and climate, and everything that tends to produce a variety in the products necessary to the maintenance of human life. They contain within themselves almost all the elements of national life. But even there they find it impossible to shut out the commerce of the world by a light Protective tariff. We are proposing, in our country, nearly all the inhabitable part of which is between the 45th and 58th degree of latitude, to have everything produced that is produced in the largest and most extensive countries in the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that there is a positive danger in foreign trade, and that our people, who are enterprising, and who go to Chicago to purchase grain or pork and ship it through the country to Europe, ought to be restrained from indulging in such trade, because we ought to produce all that ourselves. No Canadian shall be allowed to trade with any outside country, no matter if he makes a great deal of money by it. Why not have the shipping of the Lower Provinces confined to the shipping trade of Canada? Why, Sir, those people have ships enough to carry, I suppose, at least twenty times the trade of their own country, but these ships are profitably engaged in carrying on foreign traffic with other nations. A vast number of them are engaged in the trade of the United States, because the United States, through their Protective system, are not able to compete with them in the carrying trade of the world. But hon. gentlemen opposite propose to

put a stop to all this. They will stop this illicit, this illegitimate traffic, whereby our people make money by buying goods from the Americans and selling them to Europeans. They will have Canada for the Canadians, and nothing else. But do they mean to say that they will be able to keep all Canadian trade and all Canadian manufactures for themselves, and, at the same time, do the trading and manufacturing for other places in the world? Do they expect that any trade can be carried on where the people only sell? Why, we would soon reduce ourselves to the state of a savage nation, because a nation that does not buy and sell with its neighbours is in the condition of not being able to do so, and in a condition of barbarism on account of the laws which prevent its people from buying and selling. That is the position to which hon. gentlemen seem to desire to reduce us. It seems that it is a most degrading thing to depend upon producing largely agricultural products. I believe there is nothing more honourable than farming to a person in any condition of life. I believe there is nothing that could be done that would so promote the prosperity of Canada, as to give one-tenth of the attention to agriculture which is given at this moment to manufactures. I believe we could, by producing more largely agricultural products, bring more wealth to the country than we shall by building up sickly manufactures by means of spurious legislation, and that our people would be much more safe in depending upon the production of agricultural articles extensively, than they would by starting one or two petty manufactures in every little town or village. I stated a little while ago that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to consider special interests. The First Minister had promised to consider the interests of the manufacturers, according to their demand. I am told what which, if it be true, will illustrate this, and show how special classes and individuals have been protected. I have been told that a very extensive stove manufacturer, believing that there would be an increased duty put upon the articles which he consumes, purchased a three-years' supply, under the 17½ per cent. tariff. This article was mica; but, having paid on these three

MR. MACKENZIE.

years' supply of mica 17½ per cent. duty in advance, he wakes up next morning to find that mica was on the free list. I watched the errata or corrections of hon. gentlemen opposite for this particular article, and I find that mica, which was on the free list at first, is now placed among unenumerated articles on the 20 per cent list, in order to protect a friend who had purchased a three-years' supply under the 17½ per cent. duty. The story may be true or not, but there is one thing certain, that the position of mica is changed, at any rate.

MR. TILLEY: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE: And we must get the reasons for that. Now, I have risen to-night chiefly for the purpose of placing my views on record, or rather, of placing the views held on this side of the House on record, in the shape of an amendment to the resolution of the hon. gentleman. I have indicated my views as far as time would permit me, I trust, by fair argument, to show that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is wrong. If this policy should prove right, and I should live long enough to find that it is right, I should be the first to acknowledge it. But, Sir, I believe that this is humanly impossible. Nothing but a miracle could make that policy a success. I believe it is contrary to the laws of nature, and that it is contrary to the beneficence of the Maker of the world. It is contrary to all just laws, human and divine, which tend to ameliorate the condition of man, and show the beneficence that all Legislatures should show to their people. I believe that anything that restricts personal freedom of action, further than is necessary to obtain a rate of duty to meet the exigencies of the country, is wholly indefensible. I cannot conceive that it is possible for any combination of circumstances so to arrange matters in the future that the policy conceived in wrong, and carried out in injustice, can ever be a success to any nation that adopts it. It has been alleged that the depression of trade which has existed in Canada for some years, has been the natural fruit of the late tariff—of the failure to protect the native industries of the country. If this were the case, why did the depression overtake alike the countries that have a Protective

system, and those having a revenue tariff system? How was it that in the United States the depression was more serious than anywhere else? I believe that that depression would have overtaken the United States, to some extent, even if they had had only a revenue tariff. I am not acting the part of a demagogue by assuming that the entire depression of trade there is due to their system of fiscal legislation, but I believe that it seriously aggravated the distress common to all the great nations of the world. I believe that the depression of trade in Canada was less felt than in any country in the world; that, at this moment, in the United States, in England, in Germany and in France, there is much greater scarcity of employment, and, consequently, of the commodities of life, with the great mass of the people, than there is with us; and, therefore, that the depression which we have passed through, and which, after all, has not been so serious as some through which we have passed formerly, is but an indication of the general stagnation of trade over the world, and is the result, to some extent, of over-production, caused by the marvellous accumulative power of productive machinery, to which I referred a few moments ago, and that is one of the problems, though it is not cognate to this part of the discussion, that statesmen in the future have to look to. They are to consider where, if the manufacturing interests are promoted, by a devotion of the national money to them, as has been done in the United States, and as is threatened to be done here, a market is to be found for the products of the manufactories. I believe that it will be found impossible to find that market, and, if this were possible, that the nations that now control, to the largest extent, the materials necessary for the manufacture of most of the articles consumed in domestic life, and in the produce of agricultural industry, will have the best of the race. I am quite sure of this: that, while, at this moment, we are able, under the late tariff, or have been able, to ship many articles to Australia, some to New Zealand, and a few articles to the Cape of Good Hope, and other distant parts, before this tariff is two years in operation, all such exports will cease, and that

we will not be able to hold any foreign trade. We may hold our own market, we have that almost entirely now. To produce any wealth, we must sell the products of our manufactures to other countries. How could we, if every nation adopts the same policy that we do? What will be the result? If it is right with us, it is right with others that have at present the admission of many articles to England free. Suppose that England were to adopt your policy, and say, England for Englishmen, let Canadians and the colonies shift for themselves; suppose that England were to say so, Sir, where are we to look for any market? Suppose that all Britain's colonies were to say so, where are we to look for markets? But the fact is, that many of the colonies, or all of them I believe, except Victoria, are following, at the present time, in the wake of the Mother Country, and those colonies that maintain a proper system of legislation, are the colonies that will be able to produce cheapest, and command the market of their neighbours, while our legislation, necessarily—no one can deny it—makes manufactures dearer. Every manufactured article will necessarily rise in price, because that is the very object of the legislation which we are now imposing on the country, and, when this is done, you cannot send your manufactures anywhere.

MR. ROCHESTER: No.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon member for Carleton says no. I say no also, in a certain sense, as I have said elsewhere; I know that it will produce a period of calamity. There will be a temporary flush of prosperity to the manufacturers, but for a very short time indeed, but then the natural effect of this unhealthy competition is stimulated by a system of bounties, for this is a system of bounties—nay, I would a thousand times rather pay each manufacturer a certain amount in bounty than take money out of the people in the way it will be taken out under this policy, in order, as some hon. gentlemen say, to promote the prosperity of the country—and, when unhealthy competition is stimulated by these false means, we will find that the manufacturers will break down, and they will be glad to sell manufactured articles, for the time, at any-

thing they can obtain, and then, Sir, there will be a general reflux of feeling throughout the whole country, as there is at this moment throughout the United States, and the belief that the plan which was adopted was unhealthy and improper, and there will be a return to that sound system of legislation which, I grieve to say, we are departing from. There are many anomalies in this tariff that I would like to discuss, but cannot well do so to-night, though I propose to do so when we are discussing the several items. I shall be able to show the extraordinary hardship that is imposed upon the country in connection with the protection of some very trifling manufactures. The whole country will be made to pay exorbitantly for manufactures that can scarcely be said to have an existence. Some of my friends have stated that the legislation now being sought by the Government, in this House, is one that is inimical to our present political connection with Great Britain. Now, I would not like to use any expressions of that kind which would even tend toward the belief that anything could injure the relation which I look upon as essential and material to our prosperity, and which, from a sentimental point of view, I have a very strong attachment to, personally; but, Sir, I would not be true to my duty as a representative of the people, if I did not state here my firm conviction that the departure from what may be called the policy of the Empire is one which must, to a greater or less extent, prejudicially affect our relations with the Mother Country. There are those who have accused some of my friends of having asserted that we had no right to legislate in this direction, because it was contrary to the policy of Great Britain. They have stated nothing of that kind. I do not say anything of that kind, and so strongly do I feel in favour of the national rights of Canada, that, if I believed that the Imperial Government desired to impose upon us any system, however just, contrary to our own will and inclinations, I should be the first and the last to resist it. But Britain imposes no such obligations, nor does she, for a moment, deny the perfect right of Canada to adopt such a system of legislation, in her fiscal arrangements, as she may require.

MR. MACKENZIE.

Canada, I believe, may suit her own interests, but, for all that, I would be very sorry, indeed, to find that the Canadians, the Canadian House of Commons, the Canadian Legislature, in short, would lightly treat the question of the desire to maintain the closest possible commercial relations with that country upon which we are politically dependent. I may say that no Canadian, who is a true patriot, would wish to depart from that policy, unless he deemed it a measure of absolute necessity for the preservation of our national life; and, while I yield to no man in my desire for colonial independence, tempered by that wise system of administration which now prevails in Great Britain, so different from what it was a century ago, I say, Sir, that anyone who looks lightly upon that, looks lightly, indeed, upon the prosperity of his own country. I believe that it is of the utmost importance to the prosperity of England's colonies, and, ultimately, to the prosperity of England herself, that there should be an unanimity of feeling in all the colonies of the Empire, with which this world is girdled; and I believe that the cause of human freedom depends much, in the darker places of the world, upon that unity of the great British family which exercises, at present, so great an influence in the destinies of the world. Sir, I looked, during the war, during that internecine war which prevailed in the United States for some years, a short time ago, with alarm and apprehension upon the possibility of the failure, on the part of the North, to conquer that rebellion, and re-unite that great people as one powerful nation. I have no sympathy with Republican political institutions, but I have the closest possible sympathies with the cause of human freedom, which was involved with the cause of popular institutions in that contest, and I looked with joy upon the glorified end and consummation of that war, when the nation rose again under nobler and happier auspices, when the slave was set free, and when all the tyranny of domestic, as well as of general nature, was at an end, as I believed that the United States would then march on, hand in hand, to promote the interests of other nations not so happily situated as they already were themselves. For this reason, I believe that it is ex-

ceedingly important that this great colony of Britain should maintain the same system of commercial legislation that Britain enjoys, and I look with the greatest possible regret, and with the deepest sorrow upon the promotion of any legislation which will depart from that line which has proved so beneficial to Britain, which is so consonant with all our ideas of human freedom and progression, and the adoption of a retrograde policy of a reactionary kind, which proved so disastrous to Britain, which proved so disastrous to the United States, and which is, in my opinion, contrary, as I stated before, to all the divine laws, and to that sentiment which we cherish in this country, that all men are born equal, and are entitled to human happiness, unrestrained by legislative enactment. I now, Sir, propose to place in your hands an amendment which will embody the views that I have endeavoured feebly to express in the few remarks that I have made to-night. I place this amendment in the record of our Journals, as a formal protest on the part of the Liberal party of Canada against the policy which the present Administration has inaugurated. I have endeavoured, I trust, to discuss the subject free from anything that can

produce any personal recriminations, and, if I have spoken warmly and earnestly, it is because I have felt that nothing has ever occurred in the history of Canada so fraught with disaster as is the measure now before the House, submitted by the Government. I propose, Sir, to move in amendment :

“ That the said resolutions be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, That, while this House is prepared to make ample provision for the requirements of the public service, and the maintenance of the public credit, it regards the scheme now under consideration as calculated to distribute unequally, and therefore unjustly, the burdens of taxation; to divert capital from its natural and most profitable employment; to benefit special classes at the expense of the whole community; tends towards rendering futile the costly and persistent efforts of the country to secure a share of the immense and growing carrying trade of this continent; and to create an antagonism between the commercial policy of the Empire and that of Canada that might lead to consequences deeply to be deplored.”

MR. CARON moved the adjournment. of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Fifteen minutes past
Twelve o'clock.

INDEX.

SESSION 1879.

1. In the *general* sections of the Index, the *names* in italics and parenthesis, after the subject, denote the *movers*.

2. In the *personal* sections, the *motions*, etc., under any member's name, which are in italics and parenthesis, are those which emanate from that member. Where the word "on" is used, without italics or parenthesis, it denotes a speech upon another's motion.

3. Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used, as the following:—Adj., Adjourn; Amt., Amendment; Ans., Answer; Appt., Appointment; Ass., Assurance; Asst., Assent; B., Bill; Cap., Capital; Civ. Serv., Civil Service; Clk., Clerk; Com., Committee; Conc., Concurrence; Cont., Contract; Controvd., Controverted; Cor., Correspondence; Dep., Deputy; Dischgd., Discharged; Dism., Dismissal; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; H., House; H. E., His Excellency; H. M., Her Majesty; Incorp., Incorporation; Inc., Income; Ins., Insurance; Instrns., Instructions; M., Motion, Moved; Mess., Message; Neg., Negated; Ord., Order; O.C., Order in Council; P.A., Public Accounts; Pap., Papers; Pet., Petition; Priv., Privilege; Proced., Procedure; Propd., Proposed; P.W., Public Works; Q., Ques., Question; R., River; Rep., Report; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sess., Sessional; Tend., Tenders; W., Whole House; Withdn., Withdrawn; W. & M., Ways and Means; Y., Yeas; N., Nays.

1^o, 2^o, 3^o, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading.

*, Without discussion.

Accidents on Railways, 1878.

M. for Rets. (*Mr. Fleming*), 129.

Address in Answer to His Excellency's Speech.

M. (*Mr. Brecken*) 6; seconded (*Mr. Tassé*) 12; Debate, 16; agreed to, 24; H. E.'s reply, 88.

Admiralty Lands (Mr. McDonald's B.)

See "Ordnance Lands."

"Advertiser," London, statement.

Respecting vote, correction (*Mr. Coughlin*) 1754.

Alaska Boundary.

M. for Pap. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 230.

Albert Railway, N.B.

Postal car for, Ques. (*Mr. Rogers*) 489.

Alice, the Princess, death of.

Mess. from Sen., 48; Address concurred in, 59; Mess. H. M.'s reply, 1397.

Allan Mail Contract.

Halifax and Queenstown, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Daly*) 673.

ALLISON, Mr.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 163.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 402.

ALLISON, Mr.—Con.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1349-50; (Cheese), 1425.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights & Measures), 1725.

American Canals and Hudson River.

Canadian navigation of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Currier*), 185.

American Vessels, Canadian Registration of.

M. for Pets. (*Mr. Valin*), 180.

American Wrecking Tug.

Seizure of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*), 119; Resumed Debate, 680; M. agreed to, 684.

American Wrecking, etc., in Canadian Waters.

M. for Cor. since 1874 (*Mr. Stephenson*), 1405.

Amet Island Breakwater, N.S.

M. for all Pap. respecting (*Mr. McKay*) 657.

Andover, N.B., Bridge at.

M. for Pap. respecting (*Mr. Connell*) 653.

ANGLIN, Mr.

Dismissals, Officials of House (*M. for Pap.*), 29, 39, 40.

Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat, on Ques. Priv., 44.

ANGLIN, Mr.—Con.

Debates, Reporting, Tenders, on Ret. of, 59 ;
on M. to ratify cont., 94.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M.
for Cor., 150, 159.
American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for
Pap., 182.
Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 224.
Election Petitions, N.B., on M. for Ret., 233.
Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for
Res., 391, 406 ; on Vote (*Q. of Ord.*), 408 ;
on Premier's Statements, 1028.
Courrier du Canada, on Mr. Huntington's
Explanations, 616.
Mitchell & Co., Supplies by, on M. for Pap.
(*Q. of Ord.*), 661.
Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (Mr.
Fortin) ; on 2° (*Q. of Proceed.*), 825.
Betting and Pool-selling B. 38 (Mr. Robert-
son) ; on M. into Com. of W., 845.
Controv'd. Elections Act. Amt. B. 4 (Mr.
McCarthy) ; on 2°, 851.
Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) ; on
2°, 940, 941.
Census and Statistics B. 67 (Mr. Pope) in
Com. of W., 1234-6.
B. C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr.
McDonald), on M. into Com. of W., 1289.
Trade Marks B. 82 (Mr. Pope), in Com. of
W., 1292.
Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler)
on 2° and *Q. of Proceed.*, 1387.
N.B. claims against Dom., on M. for Cor.,
1401.
B.C. Penitentiary, construction of, on M. for
Pap., 1409.
Memorial, Free Trade Assn., Eng., on *Q. of
Proceed.*, 1412.
Truro and Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (Mr.
Tupper) on 3°, 1504-5-8.
Tariff.—W. & M., in Com., Res. passing
en bloc, on *Q. of Proceed.*, 474-5 ; on 2°,
financial statement called for, 510 ; on
Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1165, 1189-90 ; on
Mr. Tilley's explan., 1304 ; on Ques., 1317.
On Res. 11, on 2° (Books, etc.) 1341 ; (Book-
binders' materials) 1345 ; (Butter) 1416 ;
(Carriages, etc.) 1420 ; (Cotton Sheetings,
etc.) 1438 ; (Fruits) 1443 ; (Furniture)
1444 ; (India-rubber goods) 1446 ; (Tin
plates) 1450. On Mr. Domville's personal
explan., 1455. On Mr. Tilley's personal
explan., 1457-9. On Res. 11, on 2°—
(Opium) 1470-71 ; (Plaster of Paris) 1474 ;
(Printing Presses) 1474-6 ; (Wines) 1478 ;
(Sugars) 1487-8 ; (Vegetables) 1510.
Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. Mc-
Carthy) on M. into Com., 1574.
Divorce in Ont., on Mr. Hooper's proposed
B., 1696.
Petroleum Inspection B. 104 (Mr. Baby) on
Res., 1697.
Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on
Res., 1701.
Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville)
on M. for 3° and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1768.
Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (Mr.
Tilley), on Res., 1786.
N.B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. Mc-
Donald), on Res., 1789-92.

ANGLIN, Mr.—Con.

P. E. I. County Ct. Judges B. 110 (Mr.
McDonald), on 2°, 1795.
Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87
(Mr. Baby), in Com., 1847.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr.
Tupper), on Res., 1946.
Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase of B.
119 (Mr. Tupper), Res., on Conc., 1997.
Supply.—Estimates: Legislation (Commons,
Speaker's Arrears, and Dep. Clk.), 1541 ;
(Sess. Clks.), 1543 ; Immigration (Salaries),
1544-5 ; (Mennonites), 1549. Pub. Works,
Cap. (Pacific Ry.), 1645 ; Pub. Works, Inc.
(Buildings, N.B.), 1663 ; (Harbours, etc.,
N.B.), 1666-7 ; Ocean and R. Service
(Subsidies, Campbellton and Gaspé),
1674-5 ; Collection of Revenues (Customs),
1691-4 ; (Weights & Measures), 1719-20.
Supplementary Estimates, 1879-80 : In-
dians, 1854 ; Legislation (Sess.
Clerks), 1856.
Conc. : (Intercolonial Ry.) 1867, 1873 ;
(Mr. Piché's gratuity) 1873-5.
Animals, Diseases (Mr. Pope's B.) See
"Contagious Diseases."
**Anticosti and Magdalen Islands Telegraph
Subsidy B. No. 111 (Mr. Tupper).**
Res. in Com. of W. and reported*, 1796 ; B.
introduced, 1796 ; 1° and 2°*, 1799 ; 3°*,
1806. (42 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
Appointments.—See "Civ. Serv." and
"House" for general questions, and the
names or places referred to, for special cases.
Arbitration, Ontario Boundary.
Cost of, M. for Ret. (Mr. Stephenson), 67.
Arbitrators' Awards, Pub. Works.
Appeals from, Legislation, Ques. (Mr. Cock-
burn, W. Northd.) 66.
Arbitrators (Mr. Cockburn's B.) See
"Official Arbitrators."
Arisaig Pier, N. S.
Improvement of, Ques. (Mr. McIsaac)
827.
ARKELL, Mr.
Election Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey), on 2°,
(Amt.) 6 months' "hoist," 853.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Macken-
zie's Amt., 1127.
Arms, Carrying of (Mr. McDonald's B.)
See "Crime, etc., Act."
Assignees, Official, Quebec.
Moneys paid by, M. for Ret. (Mr. Valin)
919.
Assiniboine River, Land Claims.
Of Prof. O'Donoghue, M. for Ret. (Mr. Mc-
Carthy) 1763.
Assomption River, Bridge over.
Construction of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Hurteau)
844.
Assomption River, Deepening of.
Intention, Ques. (Mr. Hurteau) 563 ; M. for
Cor., 671.

Atlantic & N. W. Ry. Co. Incomp. B. No. 56 (*Mr. Colby*).

1^o*, 562; 2^o*, 629; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 924. (42 Vic., c. 65)

Australian Exhibition.

Moore, S. J., claim of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Hooper*), 240.

Average Adjusters at Shipping Ports.

Intention to Appoint, Ques. (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*), 491.

BABY, Mr.

Inland Revenue Reports and appendices, (*presented*) 26.

Weights and Measures Inspectors (*Ans.*) 71.

Tobacco, Canadian, duties on (*Ans.*) 74.

Saw-logs, Measurement (*Ans.*) 111.

Bills of Exchange, etc., Acts Consolidation (*B.* 31, 1^o*) 189; in Com. of W., 1237.

Weights and Measures Acts Consolidation (*B.* 87, *Res. in Com. and* 1^o) 1500; in Com., 1841-2-3-6-7-8.

Petroleum Inspection (*B.* 104, *Res in Com. and* 1^o) 1696-7; (*B.* 117, 1^o; 2^o and 3^o*) 1980.

Supply—Estimates: Legislation (Commons, Dep. Clk.) 1541; Collection of Revenue (Excise, culling) 1717-18; (Weights and Meas.) 1718, 1725.

BAIN, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 1045; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1349; (Sugars) 1489.

P.E.I. claim, Fishery Award, (*Ques.*) 1756.

Supply—Estimates: Immigration, 1546.

BAKER, Mr.

Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*), on 2^o, 165.

Quebec Judges' Salaries (*Ques.*) 562.

Baker & Co., Fort Benton, payments to.

Mounted Police Service, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*), 837.

Bank, Consolidated (*Mr. Gaul's and Mr. Tulley's B.s.*) See "Consolidated Bank."**Bankruptcy Bills**—See "Insolvency."**Banks, Building Societies, &c.**

Affairs of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gill*) 671.

Banks, Inspection of.

Measures for, Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 223.

Banks and Banking Acts Amt. B. No. 71 (*Mr. Tulley*).

1^o*, 1003; 2^o and referred to Sel. Com. on Banking, etc., *, 1535; Com. of W., reported and 3^o*, 1804. (42 Vic., c. 75.)

BANNERMAN, Mr.

Tariff—Res. of Com. W. & M., on 2^o, 641.

Banque Jacques Cartier (*Mr. Girouard's B.*) See "Jacques Cartier."**Bank, Hemlock**—See "Hemlock."**Barnaby River, Miramichi.**

Salmon Fry for, Ques. (*Mr. Snowball*) 826.

Battleford and Selkirk Telegraph.

Contracts, etc., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Schultz*) 830.

Bayfield, N.S., Breakwater.

Completion of, Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 1550.

Bay St. Paul, Wharf.

Continuation of Work, Ques. (*Mr. Perreault*) 490.

Beaubien, Thomas, St. Flavie.

Land claims of, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 491.

Beauharnois Canal.

Employés, appointments, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 63; Enlargement, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 140; Site and building, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 188.

BÉCHARD, Mr.

Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 80.

Tariff—W. & M. Res. on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1095.

Indemnities Reduction (*B.* 95, 1^o*), 1533.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 219.

Insolvency Laws Repeal (*B.* 15, 1^o*) 107; on 2^o, 1575-7; in Com., 1775; 3^o M., 1783.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 1609; (*Amt.*) Res. for unconditional Repeal, 1610, 1621.

Weights and Meas. Laws Consol. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1842.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1634.

Beet-root Sugar, Excise duty on.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Skinner*) 1397.

Bellechasse Controverted Election.

Judge's Report, 1784.

Belleville, Timber Tolls at (33 Vic., c. 46) Repeal B. No. 49 (*Mr. McCuaig*).

1^o*, 488; Com. of W. and reported, 1885; 3^o*, 1885; Fees remitted, 1982. (42 Vic., c. 51.)

Belrath P. O., Melbourne Township.

Suspension of, Ques. (*Mr. Huntington*) 489.

BENOIT, Mr.

Chambly Canal, widening (*Ques.*), 48.

BERGERON, Mr.

Beauharnois Canal Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 63.

" " Enlargement (*Ques.*) 140.

" " Site, etc. (*M. for Pap., by Mr. Mousseau*) 188.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1413.

Palace Car fares (*B.* 96, 1^o*) 1533.

BERGIN, Mr.

Public Works Contracts, 1873-79 (*M. for Pap.*) 236.

Cornwall Canal, hydraulic leases (*M. for Ret.*) 239.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. 576-7, 608-9.

Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1248.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o—(Wool) 1511-14.

Factories Regulation Act (*B.* 103*) 1696.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights and Meas.) 1720.

Berthier Wharf, Repairs.

Since 1874, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Lanéry*) 240.

Betting, Act against, Amt. B. No. 38

(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*).
 1°*, 222; 2°*, 562; M. into Com., 845;
 Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Cameron,*
S. Huron) agreed to, 847.

Bie, Old, Harbour.

Improvements, M. for Pets. (*Mr. Fiset*) 657.

Bie, Seigneurial, Fishing Rights.

To whom belonging, Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 111;
 M. for Pap., 137.

BILLS.

Bill (No. 1) *Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*).
 1°*, 4.

Bill (No. 2) *Relating to Bankruptcy.*—(*Mr. Colby*.)

1°*, 41; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Bill (No. 3) *To amend "The Insolvent Act of 1875," and the Acts amending the same.*—(*Mr. Bourassa*.)

1°*, 48; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Bill (No. 4) *To make better provision for the trial of Controverted Elections of Members of the House of Commons, by amending and consolidating the Acts now in force on that subject.*—(*Mr. McCarthy*.)

1°*, 59; 2° propd., 164; resumed debate, 847; 2° and referred to Sel. Com., 853.

Bill (No. 5) *To declare the rule of decision in the Courts of the North-West Territories.*—(*Mr. Mills*.)

1°*, 65; 2° m., 675; neg., 680.

Bill (No. 6) *To incorporate the Saskatchewan Colonisation Railroad Company.*—(*Mr. Schultz*.)

1°*, 71; 2°*, 107; Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1706.—(42 Vic., c. 66.)

Bill (No. 7) *To amend the Act incorporating the Canada Life Assurance Company.*—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*.)

1°*, 71; 2°*, 108; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3°*, 924.—(42 Vic., c. 71.)

Bill (No. 8) *To ensure the better qualification of Public Servants, and the greater efficiency and economy of the Public Service.*—(*Mr. Casey*.)

1°*, 71; 2° m., 1266; B. withdn., 1273.

Bill (No. 9) *To incorporate the Selkirk and South Saskatchewan Railway Company.*—(*Mr. Rykert*.)

1°*, 71; 2°*, 109; B. withdn., 1213.

Bill (No. 10) *To extend the powers of the Dominion Telegraph Company and to amend the Act incorporating the said Company.*—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick*.)

1°*, 71; 2°*, 111; Senate amts. agreed to*, 798.—(42 Vic., c. 68.)

Bill (No. 11) *Respecting the International Bridge Company.*—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick*.)

1°*, 71; 2°*, 111; 3°*, 628.—(42 Vic., c. 63.)

Bill (No. 12) *To authorise the Welland Railway Company to convert their Six per cent. Mortgage Bonds into five per cent. Deben- ture Stock, and for other purposes.*—(*Mr. Drew*.)

1°*, 88; 2°*, 111; Com. of W. and report- ed*, 829; 3°*, 650.—(42 Vic., c. 60.)

BILLS.—Con.

Bill (No. 13) *To amend and consolidate as amended the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)

1°*, 88; 2°*, 125; Com., 126, 221; 3°*, 221.—(42 Vic., c. 36.)

Bill (No. 14) *To reduce the Capital Stock of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.*—(*Mr. Langevin*.)

1°*, 88; 2°*, 111; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 798.—(42 Vic., c. 69.)

Bill (No. 15) *To repeal the Insolvency Laws now in force in the Dominion of Canada.*—(*Mr. Béchard*.)

1°*, 107; order for 2°*, 1575; postponed, 1578; resumed, 1622; 2° carried (J. 117, N. 60), 1627; Com. of W., 1769; Amts. (*Mr. Girouard, J. Cartier*), 1769, withdn., 1782; Amt., operations of B. deferred (*Mr. MacDonnell*), negatived, 1783; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. MacDonald, Pictou*) negatived (J. 55, N. 107), 1783; B. 3°, 1784.

Bill (No. 16) *Relating to the protest of Inland Bills of Exchange.*—(*Mr. Doull*.)

1°*, 107; 2°*, 924; referred to Com. on Bank- ing and Commerce, 926; Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1765.—(42 Vic., c. 46.)

Bill (No. 17) *To provide for the payment of the Defendant's costs in certain actions at the suit of the Crown.*—(*Mr. MacDonnell*.)

1°*, 107; order for 2°*, 1578; order dischgd. and B. withdn., 1578.

Bill (No. 18) *To amend the Acts respecting the "Isolated Risk and Farmers' Fire Insurance Company of Canada," and to change the name thereof to the "Sovereign Fire and Marine Insurance Company of Canada."*—(*Mr. Mackenzie*.)

1°*, 107; 2°*, 156; Com. of W. and report- ed*, 924; 3°*, 924.—(42 Vic., c. 70.)

Bill (No. 19) *To amend the Act respecting the Election of Members of the House of Com- mons.* (37 Victoria, Chap. 9.)—(*Mr. Casey*.)

1°*, 107; 2° m., 853; resumed debate, 927; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Arkell*), 857; resumed debate, 927; Amt. agreed to on a division, 943.

Bill (No. 20) *To amend the Act 41 Victoria, Chap 29, intituled: "An Act to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Com- pany."*—(*Mr. Scriver*)

1°*, 107; 2°*, 156; Com. of W. and reported*, 629; 3°*, 651.—(42 Vic., c. 59)

Bill (No. 21) *To amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)
 1°*, 125; order for 2° discharged and B. with- drawn, 1534.

Bill (No. 22) *To repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875, and to make provision in lieu thereof.*—(*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*.)

1°*, 126; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Bill (No. 23) *To incorporate the "Gazette" Printing Company.*—(*Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre*.)

1°*, 128; 2°*, 208; Com. of W. and reported, 651; 3°*, 705.—(42 Vic. c. 78.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill, To empower Robert G. Dalton, Clerk of the Court of Queen's Bench, Ontario, to pay to John Stewart, of the City of Kingston, surgeon, one thousand dollars.—(Mr. McCarthy.) Introduction M., 139; over-ruled and B. withdrawn, 140.

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and to extend the time for the completion of the said Railway.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

1^o*, 140; 2^o*, 208; Com. of W., Amd. and reported, 629; 3^o*, 651; Senate Amds. agreed to*, 1123.—(42 Vic., c. 61.)

Bill (No. 25) To abolish the use of French Weights in the Province of Quebec.—Mr. Gasgrain.

1^o*, 140.

Bill (No. 26) To authorise the Trustees of the Toronto Savings Bank to sell and convey to the Home Savings and Loan Company (limited).—(Mr. Cameron, North Victoria.)

1^o*, 140; 2^o*, 825; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1470.—(42 Vic. c. 55.)

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Act to Incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Williams.)

1^o*, 140; 2^o*, 208; Com. of W. and reported*, 798; 3^o*, 798; Senate Amds. agreed to, 1290.—(42 Vic., c. 58.)

Bill (No. 28) To amend an Act intituled "An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway," passed in the 39th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

Introduction M., 138; objected to and withdn., 139; introduced and 1^o, 156; 2^o*, 562; Com. and reported*, 1266; 3^o on a division, 1572.—(42 Vic. c. 10.)

Bill (No. 29) To amend the "Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Act," and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. McLennan.)

1^o*, 189; 2^o*, 488.

Bill (No. 30) To amend the "Coteau and Province Line Railway and Bridge Act," and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. McLennan.)

1^o*, 189; 2^o*, 488; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1643.—(42 Vic., c. 57.)

Bill (No. 31) To amend and consolidate the laws respecting the duties on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange.—(Mr. Baby.)

1^o*, 189; 2^o*, 562; Com. of W., 1237; reported, 1238; 3^o*, 1293.—(42 Vic., c. 17.)

Bill (No. 32) To amend "An Act to provide for more effectual inquiry into the existence of corrupt practices at Elections of Members of the House of Commons."—(Mr. Ives.)

1^o*, 189; 2^o, 1274; Com. of W. and reported*, and 3^o*, 1575.—(42 Vic., c. 6.)

Bill (No. 33) To amend "An Act to extend certain provisions of 'The Seaman's Act, 1873,' to vessels employed in navigating the Inland Waters of Canada."—(Mr. Rykert.)

1^o*, 221.

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 34) To repeal the Act, 40 Vict., chap. 21, to establish a Court of Maritime Jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. McCuaig.)

1^o*, 221; order for 2^o, 684; dischgd. and B. withdn., 688.

Bill (No. 35) Fixing the Rate of Interest in Canada and prohibiting Usury.—(Mr. Méthot.)

1^o*, 221; 2^o m., 1582; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (Mr. Plumb) carried. (Y. 97, N. 68), 1585.

Bill (No. 36) To revive and amend the Acts relating to the Union Assurance Company of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the "Crown Assurance Company of Canada."—(Mr. Kilvert.)

1^o*, 221; 2^o*, 312.

Bill (No. 37) To provide against Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

1^o*, 221; order for 2^o dischgd. and B. withdn., 562.

Bill (No. 38) To amend the "Act for the repression of Betting and Pool Selling." (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

1^o*, 222; 2^o*, 562; m. into Com., 845; Amt., 6 months' "hoist"—(Mr. Cameron, S. Huron); agreed to, 847.

Bill (No. 39) To amend "The Post Office Act, 1875"—(Mr. Langevin.)

1^o*, 222; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported*, and 3^o*, 1249.—(42 Vic., c. 20.)

Bill (No. 40) To incorporate the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Hooper.)

1^o*, 251; Com. of W. and reported*, 798; 3^o*, 798.—(42 Vic., c. 67.)

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the British American Mutual Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

1^o*, 251; Com. of W. and reported*, 1003; 3^o*, 1003.—(42 Vic., c. 73.)

Bill (No. 42) To amend the Act respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Gigault.)

1^o*, 251.

Bill (No. 43) To provide for the transfer of lands, and estates and interests in lands, and for other matters relating to Real Property in the Territories of Canada.—(Mr. Mills.)

1^o*, 293.

Bill (No. 44) To repeal the Act passed in the thirty-eighth year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled "An Act to regulate the construction and maintenance of Marine Electric Telegraphs."—(Mr. McCarthy.)

1^o*, 293; 2^o m., 1278; carried (Y. 54, N. 28), 1284; referred to Com. of W., 1285; ordered into Com. of W., 1572; Com. and reported*, 1575; 3^o on a division, 1575.

Bill (No. 45) To authorise the construction of a bridge over the Ottawa River for the use of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Holton.)

1^o*, 338; 3^o*, 1141.—(42 Vic., c. 56.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 46) *To incorporate the Yarmouth Dyking Company, of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. Killam.)

1^o, 338; m. into Com. of W., 921; order dischgd. and B. withdn., 924.

Bill (No. 47) *To extend the corporate character and powers of the Direct United States Cable Company to the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)

1^o, 338; B. withdn., 1696.

Bill (No. 48) *To change the name of "The Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Company" to that of "The Metropolitan Insurance Company," to reduce its Capital Stock, and for other purposes.*—(Mr. Rochester.)

1^o, 338; B. withdn., 1453.

Bill (No. 49) *To repeal so much of the Act thirty-third Victoria, Chapter forty-six, as relates to the collection of dues and tolls upon logs, timber, cedar, pine and railway ties, passing down the Moira River through the port of Belleville.*—(Mr. McCuaig.)

1^o, 488; Com. of W. and reported, 1885; 3^o, 1885; Fees remitted, 1982.—(42 Vic., c. 51.)

Bill (No. 50) *Respecting "La Banque Jacques Cartier."*—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

1^o, 409; 2^o, 489; Com. and reported*, 1266; 3^o, 1346.—(42 Vic., c. 54.)

Bill (No. 51) *To amend "The Penitentiaries Act, 1875."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

1^o, 409; 2^o, 1298; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1533.—(42 Vic., c. 42.)

Bill (No. 52) *Respecting the Consolidated Bank of Canada.*—(Mr. Gault.)

1^o, 488; 2^o, 562; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3^o, 924.—(42 Vic., c. 52.)

Bill (No. 53) *To amend the Act of Incorporation of the Confederation Life Association.*—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

1^o, 488; 2^o, 562; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3^o, 924.—(42 Vic., c. 72.)

Bill (No. 54) *To amend "An Act respecting Police of Canada."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

1^o, 506; 2^o, 562; Com. of W. and reported*, 1293; 3^o, 1293.—(42 Vic., c. 37.)

Bill (No. 55) *To provide against Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.*—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

Res. in Com. of W., 506; 1^o, 507; 2^o, 1246; Com. of W., 1246; reported, 1249; re-com., amd., reported, and 3^o, 1293.—(42 Vic., c. 23.)

Bill (No. 56) *To incorporate the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.*—(Mr. Colby.)

1^o, 562; 2^o, 629; Com. of W. and reported*, 924; 3^o, 924.—(42 Vic., c. 65.)

Bill (No. 57) *To make further provision in relation to Statutory Holidays.*—(Mr. Domville.)

1^o, 562; 2^o, 1285; Com. of W. and reported, 1765; Amt. to 3^o, 3 months' "hoist" (Mr. Holton), negatived (Y. 54, N. 100); Amt., re-com. to exempt Quebec (Mr. Brooks), 1767; agreed to on a Division, 1769; re-com. and reported*, 1769; 3^o, 1806.

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 58) *To amend the "Truro and Pictou Railway Transfer Act, 1877."*—(Mr. Tupper.)

1^o, 610; 2^o, 1238; Com. of W. and reported*, 1241; 3^o m., 1504; Amt. to refer back to Com. of W. (Mr. Brecken) 1505-7; negatived on a Division, 1508; 3^o, 1508.—(42 Vic., c. 12.)

Bill (No. 59) *To amend "The Railway Act, 1868," as respects Bridges over Railways and Railway Bridges over Canals and Rivers.*—(Mr. Tupper.)

1^o, 611; order for 2^o dischgd. and B. withdn., 1587.

Bill (No. 60) *To amend "The Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874."*—(Mr. Tupper.)

1^o, 611; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3^o, 1702.—(42 Vic., c. 13.)

Bill (No. 61) *To regulate Stock-Brokers and suppress Gambling in Stocks.*—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

1^o, 612; 2^o, 1285.

Bill, *Respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton.)

Introduction m., 649; over-ruled and withdn., 649.—(See No. 89.)

Bill (No. 62) *To repeal "An Act to render Members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included or which may hereafter be included within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada."*—(Mr. Ouimet.)

1^o, 649.

Bill (No. 63) *To grant certain powers to "La Société Permanente de Construction du District d'Iberville."*—(Mr. Mousseau.)

1^o, 738; 2^o, 825; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o, 1885.—(42 Vic., c. 76.)

Bill (No. 64) *To amend the Act fortieth Victoria, chapter fifty-seven, respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.*—(Mr. White, Carleton.)

1^o, 738; 2^o, 1391; B. withdn., 1730.

Bill (No. 65) *To incorporate the Geographical Society of Quebec.*—(Mr. Fortin.)

1^o, 740; 2^o, 825; 3^o, 1141.—(42 Vic., c. 77.)

Bill (No. 66) *Respecting the offices of Receiver General and Minister of Public Works.*—(Mr. Tupper.)

Res. in Com. of W. agreed to*, 741; 1^o, 741; 2^o, 1241; Com. of W., 1241; reported; 1246; 3^o, 1293.—(42 Vic., c. 7.)

Bill (No. 67) *Respecting Census and Statistics.*—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

Res. in Com. of W., agreed to, 742; 1^o, 742; 2^o, 1233; Com. of W., 1233; amd. and reported, 1236; re-com. and reported, and 3^o, 1533.—(42 Vic., c. 21.)

Bill (No. 68) *To incorporate "The Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company."*—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.)

1^o, 782; 2^o, 1141; B. withdrawn, 1730.

Bill (No. 69) *Further to amend the Act incorporating the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited).*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

- 2^o*, 825; Com. of W. and reported*, 1003; 3^o*, 1003.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- Bill (No. 70) *To remove doubts as to the true intent and meaning of certain provisions of the "Canada Temperance Act, 1878."*—(Mr. McCuaig.)
- 1^o*, 904; 2^o, 1285; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1575.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- Bill (No. 71) *To amend the Act relating to Banks and Banking, and the Acts amending the same.*—(Mr. Tilley.)
- 1^o*, 1003; 2^o, and referred to Sel. S. Com. on Banking, &c.,*, 1535; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1804.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- Bill (No. 72) *To explain and amend the Act respecting the appropriation of certain Dominion Lands in Manitoba.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
- 1^o*, 1003; 2^o, 1296; Com. of W., 1296; reported*, 1534; 3^o*, 1702.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- Bill (No. 73) *To amend the Act 40 *Vic.*, chap. 21, to establish a Court of Maritime Jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario.*—(Mr. McCuaig.)
- 1^o*, 1026, 2^o*, 1804; Com. of W. and reported, 1804; 3^o*, 1805.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- Bill, *To provide for the peaceful separation of British Columbia.*—(Mr. DeCosmos.)
- Introduction m., 1079 (Vol. ii); there being no seconder, dropped, 1080.
- Bill (No. 74) *Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Court Act."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- 1^o*, 1080; 2^o, 1587; Com. of W., 1801; amd. and reported, 1803; 3^o m., 1803; postpd. 1804; 3^o*, 1806; Senate Amts. propd. 2036; Amts. respecting Appeals (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) agreed to, 2043.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- Bill (No. 75) *To amend "An Act for the more speedy trial in certain cases of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- 1^o*, 1080; 2^o, 1294; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1533.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- Bill (No. 76) *Respecting "The Andrew Mercer Ontario Reformatory for Females."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
- 1^o*, 1080; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported*, and 3^o*, 1296.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- Bill (No. 77) *To make the first day of July a Public Holiday by the name of Dominion Day.*—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)
- 1^o*, 1123; 2^o, 1286; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1575.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- Bill (No. 78) *To amend the Act incorporating "The Ottawa Loan and Investment Company," and to change the name to "The Manitoba and North-West Loan Company (Limited)."*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)
- 1^o*, 1123; 2^o*, 1141; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1540.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- Bill (No. 79) *Respecting Building Societies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)
- 1^o*, 1213; 2^o*, 1287; 3^o*, 1805. (42 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

- Bill (No. 80) *Respecting tonnage dues levied in Canadian ports under Canadian law.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1287; 1^o*, 1288; Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1535.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- Bill (No. 81) *Respecting the Official Arbitrators.*—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)
- 1^o, 1291; 2^o, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1865.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- Bill (No. 82) *Respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs.*—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1292; 1^o*, 1293; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1594.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- Bill (No. 83) *To amend the Act known as "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878," so far as the same may become applicable to the Province of Manitoba.*
- Incorp. with B. No. 70.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- Bill (No. 84) *To repeal "The Supreme and Exchequer Court Act," and the Acts amending the same.*—(Mr. Keeler.)
- 1^o, 1373; 2^o m. for to-morrow, 1375; 3 months' "hoist" m. (Mr. Mackenzie), neg. (Y. 44, N. 120), 1375; Debate on Proceed., 1376-91.
- Bill (No. 85) *To repeal the Insolvent Act of 1875, and the Acts amending it, and to make provision for the liquidation of the estates of Insolvents.*—(Mr. Colby.)
- 1^o*, 1412; 2^o m., 1594; Amt. Res. for unconditional repeal (Mr. Béchard), 1610; m. to adj. debate (Mr. Coursol), 1616, withdn., 1621; Amt. carried (Y. 99, N. 75), 1621.
- Bill (No. 86) *To amend an Act further securing the Independence of Parliament.*—(Mr. Rykert.)
- 1^o*, 1453.
- Bill (No. 87) *To amend and consolidate the laws relating to Weights and Measures.*—(Mr. Baby.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1501; 1^o*, 1501; 2^o*, 1841; Com. of W., 1841; reported, 1848; 3^o*, 1848.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- Bill (No. 88) *To amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1501; 1^o*, 1502; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3^o*, 1702.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- Bill (No. 89) *Respecting the Harbour of North Sydney in Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., 1502; 1^o*, 1503; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1669.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- Bill (No. 90) *To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of Pictou in Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
- Res. in Com. of W., amd.,*, 1503; 1^o*, 1503; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported, and 3^o*, 1669.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- Bill (No. 91) *To amend "The Pilotage Act, 1873."*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

Res. in Com. of W., 1503; 1°, 1503; 2°, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3°, 1702.—(42 Vic., c. 25.)

Bill (No. 92) *To amend "The Seamen's Act, 1873."*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Res. in Com. of W., 1503; 1°, 1504; 2°, Com. of W. and reported, and 3°, 1669.—(42 Vic., c. 27.)

Bill (No. 93) *To alter the duties of Customs and Excise.*—(Mr. Tilley.)

For Res. in Com. of W. & M., see "Tariff." 1°, 1533; order for 2°, 1806, debate; 3° carried on a Division, 1830.—(42 Vic., c. 15.)

Bill (No. 94) *To amend "The Indian Act, 1876."*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

1°, 1533; 2°, 1669; Com. of W. and reported*, 1702; Senate Amts. agreed to, 2003-4.—(42 Vic., c. 34.)

Bill (No. 95) *To reduce the salaries and allowances of certain public functionaries and officers, and the indemnity to members of the Senate and House of Commons.*—(Mr. Béchard.)

1°, 1533.

Bill (No. 96) *To regulate charges on Railway Palace and Sleeping Cars.*—(Mr. Bergeron.)

1°, 1533.

Bill (No. 97) *To provide for the salaries of two additional Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

M. of H. into Com. of W., 1288; agreed to, 1290; Res. in Com., 1534, reported 1535; 1°, 1535; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669.

Bill (No. 98) *To amend and consolidate "The Railway Act, 1868," and the Acts amending it.*—(Mr. Tupper.)

1°, 1550; 2°, 1702; Com. of W., 1705, 1711; reported 1715; 3°, on a Division, 1716.—(42 Vic., c. 9.)

Bill (No. 99) *For the Relief of Eliza Maria Campbell.*—(Mr. Macdougall.)

1°, 1572; 2°, 1706; Com. of W. and reported*, 1878; 3° m., 1878; Amt., 3 months' "hoist" (Mr. Mills) 1879; Resumed debate, 2004; Amt., to re-com. (Mr. Farrow) negatived, 2010; Mr. Mills's Amt. negatived (Y. 38, N. 56) 2010; 3°, on same division reversed, 2011.—(42 Vic., c. 79.)

Bill (No. 100) *To amend an Act to Incorporate the Detroit River Tunnel Company.*—(Mr. Kilvert.)

1° and 2°, 1585; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1706.—(42 Vic., c. 62.)

Bill (No. 101) *To amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Detroit River Bridge Company.*—(Mr. Kilvert.)

1°, 1585; 2°, 1585; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1755.—(42 Vic., c. 64.)

Bill (No. 102) *Respecting certain Ordnance and Admiralty Lands in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

1°. 1628; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669.—(42 Vic., c. 33.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 103) *To regulate the employment of children and young persons in the Mills and Factories of the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. Bergin.)

1°, 1696.

Bill, *To enable the Court of Chancery in Ontario to dissolve the contract of marriage in certain cases.*—(Mr. Hooper.)

Introduction m., 1696; negatived on a division, 1696.

Bill (No. 104) *To provide for the inspection, safe-keeping and storage of Petroleum and the products thereof.*—(Mr. Baby.)

Res. in Com. of W., 1696; 1°, 1697; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1805.—(42 Vic., c. 18.)

Bill (No. 105) *To further amend the Acts therein mentioned respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. Bowell.)

Res. in Com. of W., 1697; 1°, 1702; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1848.—(42 Vic., c. 35.)

Bill (No. 106) *Respecting the safe keeping of Dangerous Lunatics in the North-West Territories.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

1°, 1730; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1848.—(42 Vic., c. 38.)

Bill (No. 107) *To amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.*—(Mr. Tupper.)

1°, 1765; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1805.—(42 Vic., c. 31.)

Bill (No. 108) *To provide for the payment of an additional temporary grant to the Province of Manitoba.*—(Mr. Tilley.)

Res. in Com. of W., 1784, reported, 1786; 1°, 1786; 2°, 1786; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 2.)

Bill (No. 109) *To provide for the salary of one additional Judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Res. in Com. of W., 1787; 1° and 2°, 1793; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 3.)

Bill (No. 110) *Respecting the salaries of the County Court Judges of Prince Edward Island.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Res. in Com. of W., 1793; 1° and 2°, 1795; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 4.)

Bill (No. 111) *For granting an annual subsidy towards the construction and maintenance of Telegraphic Communication to and upon Anticosti and the Magdalen Islands.*—(Mr. Tupper.)

Res. in Com. of W., 1796; B. introduced, 1796; 1° and 2°, 1799; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 5.)

Bill (No. 112) *To extend "An Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships."*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Res. in Com. of W., 1799; 1° and 2°, 1800; 3°, 1806.—(42 Vic., c. 26.)

Bill (No. 113) *To provide for the Liquidation of the affairs of Building Societies in the Province of Quebec.*—(Mr. Desjardins.)

1° and 2°, 1800; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1865.—(42 Vic., c. 46.)

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 114) *Respecting "The Consolidated Bank of Canada."*—(Mr. Tilley.)
1^o and 2^o*, 1805; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1885.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 53.)

Bill (No. 115) *To continue in force for a limited time "The better prevention of Crime Act, 1878."*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
1^o, 2^o and 3^o*, 1841.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

Bill (No. 116) *To further amend "The Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874."*—(Mr. Tupper.)

Res. m., 1886; Resumed debate, 1944; H. in Com. of W., 1960; Res. reported, 1^o and 2^o*, 1965; conc. in Res. 1 m., 1965; Amt. to re-com. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1970; negated (Y. 37, N. 115), 1978. On Res. 12, Amt., route (Mr. Mackenzie), neg. same division, 1979; Res. 13 and 14 agreed to, on a division, 1979; B. 1^o, 2^o and 3^o*, 1980.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 14.)

Bill (No. 117) *To amend the Act of the present Session, intituled "An Act to provide for the inspection, safe-keeping and storage of Petroleum, and the products thereof."*—(Mr. Baby.)

1^o, 2^o and 3^o*, 1980.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 19.)

Bill (No. 118) *For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1879, and the 30th June, 1880, and for other purposes relating to the public service.*—(Mr. Tilley.)

Res. in Com. of W. and M. agreed to, and reported*, 2001; B. 1^o and 2^o*, 2011; 3^o m., 2011, debate; 3^o, 2035.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

Bill (No. 119) *For the acquisition by the Dominion of a certain portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, to be made part of the Intercolonial Railway.*—(Mr. Tupper.)

Res. in Com. of W. and reported*, 1982; Res. considered, 1992; agreed to, on a division, 1999; B. 1^o*, 1999; 2^o, 1999; 3^o*, 2001.—(42 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

Bill, *To further amend the Insolvent Act of 1875.*—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Introduction m., 1885; M. withdn., 1886.

Bills of Exchange Acts Amt. and Consolid., B. No. 31 (Mr. Baby).

1^o*, 189; 2^o* 562; Com. of W., 1237; reported, 1238; 3^o*, 1293. (42 *Vic.*, c. 17.)

Bills of Exchange. Inland, Protest of, B. No. 16 (Mr. Doull).

1^o*, 107; 2^o, 294; referred to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 926; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1765. (42 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

Bills, Private, reception of.

Extensions of time for, 65, 71, 126, 221, 562, 688.

Blake (Vice-Chancellor), complaint against,
For objectionable language, Remarks (Mr. Costigan), 1083; remarks and discussion (Mr. McCuaig and others), 1983 to 1992.

BLANCHET, Mr.

See "SPEAKER, Mr.

BOLDUC, Mr.

Drummond and Arthabaska Mail Service (M. for Ret.) 70.

Penny coin, withdrawal of (*Ques.*), 223.

Supreme and Exchequer Courts, working of (M. for Ret.) 496.

Weights and Measures Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1844.

Bond, Merchandise in,

Recently, M. for Rets. (Mr. Burpee, St. John) 185.

BORDEN, Mr.

Windsor Branch Ry. settlement (*Ques.*) 73.

Tariff.—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1350.

Bouchard, J. D., St. Simon Station Master.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Fiset) 1265.

BOULTBEE, Mr.

Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 134.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 196.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 290.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 924.

Supreme Court Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2^o and Q. of Proced., 1382.

Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 537; on Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1169; Res. 11, on 2^o (Books, &c.) 1344; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1528.

National Currency, on Mr. Wallace's Res., 1571.

Weights and Measures Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1846.

Pacific Ry. Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Tupper) Res 1, on Conc. and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1970.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1988.

Supply.—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1641.

BOURASSA, Mr.

Insolvency Acts Amt. (B. 3, 1^o*), 48; B. referred to Sel. Com. on Insolvency, 293.

Tariff.—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Pig iron) (*Amt.*, free, &c.) 1447.

BOURBEAU, Mr.

Drummond and Arthabaska, Inspector of Weights, &c. (M. for Cor.) 549.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 589.

Tariff.—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Shovels, Tools, &c.) 1482; (Tobacco) 1509.

Weights and Measures Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby), in Com. 1843-7.

Bourdeau, J., Ste. Flavie.

Engine House Supt., removal of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Fiset) 1398; M. withdn. 1398.

BOWELL, Mr.

Trade and Navigation Tables (*presented*) 26.

Debates, Reporting (M. for Sel. Com.—*postpd.*) 58; Contract, Ratification (*Moved*) 89, 102; Sel. Com. appointed, 104.

Tin, rebate on, B.C. (*Ans.*) 73.

Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 121.

BOWELL, Mr.—Con.

- Newfield*, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 159, 160.
 Iron imports, N.S. & N.B., M. for Ret., (*Amt.*) 180.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 592, 597-8, 600.
 Custom-Houses, expenses, regulation of, (*Ans.*) 651.
Caspian, duties on goods ex. (*Ans.*), 652.
 Mitchell & Co., supplies by, on M. for Pap., and Q. of Ord., 662.
 Emerson, Custom-house for (*Ans.*) 827.
 Saugeen R., Lighthouse for, on M. for Cor., 836.
 Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 911.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's *Amt.* (*Q. of Ord.*) 1163; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) 1331-3; Res. 11, on 2° (Books, &c.) 1344; (Carriages, &c.) 1419; (Cheese) 1424. On Mr. Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1456. (Screws, iron) 1462; (Printing Presses) 1476.
 Militia Act *Amt.* (*B.* 105, *Res. in Com. and 1°*) 1698, 1702.
Supply.—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1630; Militia (Brigade-Majors) 1632-3-4; (Drill instruction) 1635-6-9, 1640-2; (Ammunition and Stores) 1642; (Annual Drill) 1642; (Drill in Colleges) 1643; Collection of Revenue (Customs), 1693-4.
 Supplementary Estimates, 1878-79: Miscellaneous (Trade Mission to France), 1839; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1839-40.
 Concurrence: (Pacific Ry., Wallace's claim) 1877.
Brandy-Pots, Lighthouse-keeper.
 Richard, resignation of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 844.
Brazil, Steamship line to.
 Establishment of, Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 1249.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1853.
BRECKEN, Mr.
 The Address (*moved*) 6.
 Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 225.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 389.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 553.
 Truro & Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (*Mr. Tupper*) 1505.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's *Amt.*, 1165; Res. 11, on 2°—(Coal) 1437.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's *Amt.*, 1613; B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on M. for 2° and Mr. Girouard's *Amt.*, 1780.
 N.B. Supreme Court Judge B. 109 (*Mr. McDonald*) on Res., 1792; in Com., 1794.
Bridge, International (*Mr. Kirkpatrick's B.*) See "International."
Brighton and Prince Edward Mail Route.
 Reason of change, Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 547.

- Brit. Amer. Life Ins. Co.* (*Mr. Mackenzie's B.*) See "North Amer."
British Columbia, Boundary.
 Alaska, M. for Pap. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 230.
British Columbia, Chinese Labour in.
 M. to refer Petition to Sel. Com. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 1251.
British Columbia, Chinese Tax Bill.
 Intentions of Government, Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 66.
British Columbia, Fisheries.
 M. for Sess. Pap. 42, 1877, &c. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 178, 684.
British Columbia, Graving Dock.
 Construction, M. for Cor. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 69.
 Advances made, Pap. (*Message*) 1628.
 Res. propd., withdn. (*Mr. Tilley*) 1787.
British Columbia, Imports and Exports.
 M. for Ret., 1878 (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 137.
British Columbia, Indians.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1684,
British Columbia, Machinery for.
 Securities for duty, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Thompson, Cariboo*) 655.
British Columbia, Mail Service.
 Vancouver Island, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunster*) 87.
British Columbia, Penitentiary.
 Site, Construction, &c, M. for Pap. (*Mr. McInnes*) 1406.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1540.
British Columbia, Rebate on Tin.
 Intention of Government, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 73.
British Columbia, Ry. expenditure.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1648; carried on div., 1992.
British Columbia, Ry. Reserve Lands.
 Rights of Settlers, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 827.
British Columbia, Salmon Hatchery.
 Establishment of, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 652.
British Columbia Secession B. (*Mr. DeCosmos*).
 Introduction m., 1079 (Vol. ii); there being no seconder, dropped, 1080.
British Columbia Supreme Court Judges' Salaries B. No. 97 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
 M. of H. into Com. of W., 1288, agreed to, 1290; Res. in Com., 1534, reported, 1535; B. 1st, 1535; 2nd Com. of W. and reported and 3rd, 1669.
British Columbia, Tariff, Special, for.
 Application for, Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 491.
British Columbia, Vancouver Island.
 Canal on E. Coast, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1250.
Brodie's, Inverness, Megantic.
 P. O. for, Ques., (*Mr. Olivier*) 1250.

BROOKS, Mr.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^o, 1623.
Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3^o (*Amt. m.*), to re-com., to exempt Quebec, 1767.

BROWN, Mr.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 909.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Coal) 1430; (Pig iron) 1449.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors) 1631; (Drill Instruction) 1636, 1642; Pub. Works, Inc. (Buildings, Ont.) 1662; (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1665.

Bruce, N.R., Mail Service.

Extension to Paisley, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 223.

Extension to Lion's Head, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 651.

Bryant, Tug. See "*Sarah E. Bryant.*"**BUDGET, THE.**

Speech of Finance Minister, 409.

For Debate thereon, See "TARIFF."

Building Societies, Ont. (Mr. Kirkpatrick's B.) See "Ontario."**Building Societies, Que. (Mr. Desjardin's B.)** See "Quebec."**BUNSTER, Mr.**

Rails, removed to Frazer River (*M. for Pap.*) 27.

Vancouver I. Mail Service (*M. for Pap.*) 87.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 220.

Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 244.

War with Russia, volunteers for (*M. for Ret.*) 665-6.

Nanaimo Customs Officer, salary (*M. for Cor.*) 667.

Rails, removal from Vancouver I. (*M. to refer Instrns. to P. A. Com.*) 837.

Controv'd. Elections Act *Amt. B. 4* (Mr. McCarthy), on M. for reference to Com., 853.

Canal, East coast of Vancouver I. (*Ques.*) 1250.

Chinese in B.C., M. for Sel. Com. (*seconded*) 1260.

Supreme Court Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2^o and Q. of *Proced.*, 1387.

Kootenay R., clearing of (*Ques.*) 1397.

N. B. claims against Dom., on M. for Cor., 1404.

C. Beale, Light-keeper, (*M. for Pap. respecting*) 1404-5.

Penitentiary, B. C., construction of, on M. for Pap., 1410.

Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 541, 820, 1019; Res. 11, on 2^o (Barley) 1346; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1526.

Pacific Ry. Act, 1874. *Amt. B. 116* (Mr. Tupper) on Res., 1930.

BUNSTER, Mr.—Con.

Supply.—Estimates: Legislation (Sess. Clks., &c.) 1543; Immigration, 1544; Pub. Works, cap. (Pacif. Ry.) 1646-8; Collection of Revenues (Weights & Measures) 1719.

BUNTING, Mr.

Welland Canal, old, supplies for (*M. for Ret.*) 185.

Yarwood, C. St. G., superannuation (*M. for Pap., by Mr. Stephenson*) 675.

Wrecking and Coasting (*M. for Cor., for Mr. Stephenson*) 1405.

Tariff.—Res. 2 (Drawbacks) on 2^o, 1325; Res. 11, on 2^o (Sugars) 1492.

Welland Canal Solicitors, payments to (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.

Burlington Bay Canal.

Piers, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 74.

BURNHAM, Mr.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 906.

BURPEE, Mr. (St. John).

Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 122.
Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O. C., 133.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal (*M. for Cor.*) 141.

Imports and Exports, recent (*M. for Ret.*) 185.

Bonded Merchandise, recent (*M. for Ret.*) 185.

Spirits, tobacco, &c., manufactured (*M. for Ret.*) 185.

Navigation of U. S. Canals, on M. for Cor., 187-8.

Keitchum, Mr., case of, on M. for Pap. (*Amt.*) 492; (*M. for further Pap., by Mr. Mackenzie*) 667.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 581-2, 592-9, 602.

Quartz Machinery, B. C., duties, on M. for Pap., 656-7.

Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 989; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2^o, 1330-31; Res. 11, on 2^o (Cotton sheetings, &c.) 1439; (Screws, iron) 1462.

Supply.—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (St. John Passenger Station) 1645; Collection of Revenue (Customs) 1693-5.

Suppl. Estimates, 1878-'79: Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1839.

BURPEE, Mr. (Sunbury).

Eastern Extension Ry., N.B. claims (*Ques.*) 547.

Calais & St. Stephen Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. (*B. 68, 1^o*) 782; B. withdn., 1730.*

N. B. claims against Dom. (*M. for Cor.*) 1399, 1401.

Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 1060.

Cable Co., U. S. Direct (Mr. McCarthy's B.) See "U. S."

Calais and St. Stephen Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.) 1^o*, 782; 2^o*, 1141; B. withdn., 1730.

CAMERON, Mr. (North Victoria).
 Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 83.
 Stewart, John, Deposit, on propd. B., 140.
 Toronto Savings' Bank, powers (*B. 26, 1°**)
 140.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for
 Res., 372.
 Trent R. Navigation Works, M. for Com
 (*seconded*), 904, 915.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler)
 on 2°, 1383.
 Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White)
 on 2°, 1391, 1394.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (Mr. Colby)
 on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1612;
 (*Q. of Ord.*) 1620; B. 15 (Mr. Béchard)
 on 2°, 1624.
 Selkirk Election (*M. for Pap.*) 1764.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*)
 1988.
Supply.—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Ca-
 nals, Welland) 1661.
 Conduct of stranger (Macdonell) on Q. of
 Priv. and Summons; (*Amt.*) to refer mat-
 ter to Com. on Priv. & Elections, 1980-81.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdou-
 gall) on 3°, 2005.
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald)
 on Senate Amt., 2037, 2043.

CAMERON, Mr. (South Huron).
 Dismissals, Appointments, &c., recent (*Ms.*
for Rets.) 27, 28.
 Hamilton, appointments, &c., in, on M. for
 Ret., 112.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for
 Res., 376.
 Maritime Court, Ont., Repeal B. 34 (Mr. Mc-
 Cuaig) on M. for 2°, 685-6.
 Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Robertson) on
 M. into Com. of W. (*6 months' "hoist"*)
 847.
 Controvd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr.
 McCarthy) on 2°, 167, 851.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam)
 on M. into Com., 922.
 Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on 2°
 924.
 Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) on
 2°, 942.
 Bills of Ex. B. 31 (Mr. Baby) in Com. of W.,
 1237.
 Elections, Corrupt Practices, B. 32 (Mr.
 Ives) on 2°, 1274.
 Speedy Trials Act Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Mc-
 Donald) on 2°, 1294.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler)
 on 2°, 1384.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 743, 754;
 Res. 11, on 2° (Wheat flour) 1361; (Salt)
 1476; (Sugars) 1486.
 Defendants' costs in Crown suits B. 17 (Mr.
 MacDonnell) on 2°, 1580.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr.
 Béchard) on 2°, 1576-7; B. 85 (Mr. Colby)
 on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's Amt.,
 1616; B. 15, in Com., on Mr. Girouard's
 Amts., 1769, 1775.
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Mc-
 Donald) on 2°, 1588.

CAMERON, Mr. (South Huron.)—Con.
 Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) on 2°
 1705-6.
 N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. Mc-
 Donald) on Res., 1788.
Supply.—Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Pub.
 Works, Cap. (Intercol. Ry., Murray's
 claim) 1835.

Campbell, Eliza Maria, Relief B. No. 99
 (*Mr. Macdougall*).
 1°, 1572; 2°, 1706; Com. of W. and re-
 ported*, 1878; 3° m., 1878; Amt., 3
 months' "hoist," (*Mr. Mills*) 1879; Re-
 sumed debate, 2004; Amt., to re-com.
 (*Mr. Farrow*) negatived, 2010; Mr. Mills's
 Amt. negatived (*Y. 38, N. 56*) 2010; B. 3°,
 on same division reversed, 2011. (42 Vic.,
 c. 79).

Campbell's Cove, Breakwater, P.E.I.
 Completion of, Ques. (*Mr. Muttart*) 1397.

Campbell, W. D., Fishing Rights—See
 "Bic."

Camps of Military Instruction.
 Intention this year, Ques. (*Mr. Thompson,*
Haldimand) 112.

Canada and Detroit Bridge (*Mr. Kilvert's*
B.) See "Detroit."

Canada Central Ry. Extension.
Supply.—discussion in, 1645.

Canada, Consolidated Bank (*Mr. Gault's*
and Mr. Tilley's Bs.) See "Consolidated
 Bank."

Canada Life Ass. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 7
 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*).
 1°, 71; 2°, 108; Com. of W. and reported*,
 924; 3°, 924. (42 Vic., c. 71.)

Canada Police Act Amt. B. No. 54 (*Mr. Mc-*
Donald, Pictou).
 1°, 506; 2°, 562; Com. of W. and reported*
 and 3°, 1293. (42 Vic., c. 37.)

Canada Temperance Act (*Mr. McCuaig's*
B.) See "Temperance."

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.
 See "PACIFIC RAILWAY."

Canadian Registration of American Ves-
sels.
 M. for Pets. (*Mr. Valin*) 180.

Canadian Vessels entering L. Michigan.
 Reporting at Sheboygan, M. for Cor. (*Mr.*
Kilvert) 663.

"*Canadien*," article in.
 Q. of Priv. and explan. (*Mr. Huntington*) 488.

Canals, expenditure on, 1873-79.
 Details of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bergin*) 236.
Supply.—discussion in: Lachine and Corn-
 wall, 1649; Welland, 1649, 1726.

Canals, U.S., Navigation of.
 By Canadian Vessels, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cur-*
rier) 185.

Cans (Fish) American, duty on.
 M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ogden*) 667.

Cape Beale, B.C., Lighthouse-keeper.
Cox, appointment and conduct of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1404.

Cape Sable Island, Customs District.
M. for Pets. and Reps. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 70.

Capes Tormentine and Traverse.
Branch Rys. to, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 1550.

Cardinal, Régis, Paymaster, Lachine Canal.
Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington*) 550; Resumed debate, 563; M. agreed to, 610; Explanation of remarks in debate (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) 1373.

Carillon Dam and Works.
Completion, Ques. (*Mr. Christie*) 42; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Christie*) 44.

CARON, Mr.
Intercol. Ry., refuse lumber (*M. for Pap.*) 87.
Intercol. Ry., on M. for Ret. (*Adj. debate*) 137.
Pacific Ry., Conts. '13, 14, 15, 25 (*M. for Ret.*) 235.
Ketchum, Mr., case of, investigation (*M. for Reps. for Mr. Domville*) 492.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 569.
Mr. Ryland's award claim (*M. for Pap., for Mr. Coursol*) 652.
Tariff.—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1085.
Assiniboine, Land, Prof. O'Donoghue's claim (*M. for Pap.*) 1763.
Statutory Holidays B. 57 (*Mr. Domville*) on M. for 3° and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1767.

Caron, Mr., Fishery Overseer, Kamouraska.
Complaint against, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 920.

Carriers, Responsibilities of.
Legislation upon, Ques. (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre*) 491.

Cartier, Sir George, Monument to.
Intention of Government, Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 1250.

CARTWRIGHT, Mr.
Dismls., Appts., &c., recent, on M. for Ret., 28.
Rys. and Canals, certain, Exp. on (*M. for Ret.*) 47.
Revenue, Feb., 1879 (*M. for Ret.*) 54.
Imports and Exports, 1878 (*M. for Ret.*) 54.
Receipts and Expenditure, 1878 (*M. for Ret.*) 54.
Loan of 1878 (*M. for Ret.*) 106.
Customs and Excise, Feb., 1879 (*M. for Ret.*) 119.
Mounted Police B. 13, in Com. of W., 127.
Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 135.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 191.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, M. for Pap., on Q. of Ord., 598; on main Ques. (*for Mr. Mackenzie*) 599.
Que. Geograph. Society Incomp. B. 65 (*Mr. Fortin*) on 2° and Q. of Proceed.—Examiner of Priv. B's suggested 826.

CARTWRIGHT, Mr.—Con.
Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 914.
Lougheed, Samuel, disml. of (*M. for Pap.*) 920.
Census and Statistics B. 67 (*Mr. Pope, Compton*) in Com. of W., 1233-4-5-6.
Ventilation of Chamber, on M. for Com., 858.
Trade Marks B. 82 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. of W., 1292.
Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2°, 1705; in Com., 1712-14.
Reciprocity negotiations, on Sir A. J. Smith's expenses, 1754.
Statutory Holidays B. 57 (*Mr. Domville*) on M. for 3° and Mr. Holton's Amt. ("hoist"), 1766.
Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (*Mr. Tilley*), on Res., 1782.
Dynamite Explosion, Stratford (*Remarks*) 1801.
Pacific Ry. Act Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*) on proposed Res., 1913, 1959; on Q. of Ord., 1938; Res. 1 on M. for Conc. and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1977-8.
Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2°, 2001.
Tariff—Budget Speech (*Reply to*), 430; comments in reply to Mr. Tupper, 458-9, 470. W. & M. Res., on 2°, financial statement called for, 509, 618; on Mr. Tilley's speech, comments, 713-16, 722-3; on Ques., 726; Res. amd., on 2°, 1321; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2°, 1333; Res. 11, on 2°, (Muriatic Acid) 1334; (Agricultural Implements) 1334; (Ale) 1339; (Animals) 1339; (Artificial Flowers) 1339; (Books, &c.) 1344; (Brass) 1346; (Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt., 1355; (Wheat Flour) 1359-60; (Butter) 1417; (Carriages, &c.) 1417-19; (Cheese) 1425; (Clocks) 1426; (Cotton Sheetings, &c.) 1437-8; (Cotton Jeans, &c.) 1439; (Earthenware) 1441; (Fruits) 1443; (Furniture) 1443-4-5; (India-rubber goods) 1446; (Pig Iron) 1448-9; (Screws, iron) 1461-3 5-9; (Paintings, &c.) 1473; (Printing Presses) 1475; (Quinine) 1476; (Wines) 1480-1; (Sugars) 1485-8-9, 14 91-7; Res. 12, Free List, on 2°, (Wool) 1529; Res. 14 (Excise duty, Spirits), on 2°, 1531-2-3; B. No. 93, on 2°, 1806; on Mr. Tilley's speech, 1813-15.
Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul), 1537; Legislation (Sess. Clerks), 1543; Immigration (Salaries), 1544; Ocean and R. Service (Mail Subsidy, Campbellton and Gaspé), 1673; Fisheries (Breeding), 1679; Indians (Ont.), 1684; (B. C. and N. W.), 1684-9.
Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Ocean and R. Service (Canada and Brazil Subsidy), 1853-4; Collection of Revenue (Customs, exports), 1854-5; Legislation (Sess. Clerks), 1855.
Conc. (Intercol. Ry., nut-locks) 1860; (Intercol. Ry.) 1870-2.

Casumpec Harbour, Improvement.
M. for Reps. and Cor. (*Mr. Hackett*), 87.

- CASEY, Mr.**
Public Service, qualifications, &c. (*B.* 8, 1^o) 71; 2^o *m.*, 1267; (*B. withdrawn.*), 1273.
Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify cont., 96.
Election Act Amt. (*B.* 19, 1^o), 107; (2^o *m.*) 853; 927, 935, 941.
Contd. Elections Act Amt. *B.* 4, on 2^o, 172.
Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 387.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. 554-5, 577; on Q. of Ord., 597.
Port Stanley Revenue (*M. for Pap.*) 655.
Betting Act Amt. *B.* 38 (*Mr. Robertson*); on M. into Com. of W., 846.
Tariff—Res. 2, (drawbacks), on 2^o, 1327; Res. 11, on 2^o (Books, &c.) 1343-5; (Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt., 1358; (Carriages, &c.) 1419; (Furniture) 1444; (Plants) 1474; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1524.
Insolvency Laws Repeal *B.* 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1619.
Insolvent Act. Amt. *B.* (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on M. to introduce, 1886.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1639; (Annual Drill) 1642.
- CASGRAIN, Mr.**
Plague, Precautions, on M. for Address, 55, 57.
G. T. R., Riv. du Loup Br. (*Ques.*) 73.
French Weights, abolition (*B.* 25, 1^o) 140.
Contd. Elections Act Amt. *B.* 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2^o, 172.
Criminal Laws, codification (*Ques.*) 223.
Commercial Laws, codification (*Ques.*) 223.
Banks, inspection, measures for (*Ques.*) 223.
Quebec Constitutional Question (*Ques.*) 294; on M. for Res., 385.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Ord.*) 553.
Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. *B.* 65 (*Mr. Fortin*) on 1^o, 740.
Supreme Ct. Act, Repeal *B.* 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2^o, 1383.
Tariff—Copies, in French, insufficient (*Remarks*) 824, 1405. *W. & M. Res.*, on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1179; Res. 11, on 2^o (Coal) 1432; (Pig Iron) on Mr. Bourassa's Amt., 1447; (Sugars) 1492.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, &c., *Que.*) 1666.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. *B.* 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 3^o, 1803.
- “*Caspian*,” Goods *ex*, duties on.
Clearances allowed, *Ques.* (*Mr. Charlton*) 652.
- Census and Statistics, B. Respecting, No. 67** (*Mr. Pope, Compton*).
Res. in Com. of W., agreed to, 742; 1^o, 742; 2^o, 1233; Com. of W., 1233; amd. and reported, 1236; re-com. and reported and 3^o, 1533. (42 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- Centennial Exhibition, Canadian Commission.**
Expenses of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 837.
- Certificates, Masters', &c.** (*Mr. Pope's B.*)
See “Masters and Mates.”
- Chambly Canal, Bridge Over.**
Langelier, Mr., payments to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Houde*) 844.
- Chambly Canal, Widening of.**
Intention of Government, *Ques.* (*Mr. Benoit*) 48.
- Charlevoix Election.**
Mr. Perreault's seat, *Ques. Priv.* (*Mr. Mousseau*) 42; Mr. Perreault introduced, 73.
- CHARLTON, Mr.**
Elections, general (*M. for Ret.*) 46.
Plague, Precautions (*M. for Address*) 55, 56, (*withdrawn.*) 57.
Lord's Day observance, Res. (*seconded*) 77.
Caspian, duties on goods *ex* (*Ques.*) 652.
House, employés of (*M. for Ret.*) 667.
Betting Act Amt. *B.* 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on M. into Com. of W., 845.
Ventilation of Chamber (*Remarks*) 858.
Contagious Diseases, Animals, *B.* 55 (*Mr. Pope*) on re-com. and Amt., 1293.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2^o, 527; Res. 11, on 2^o (Corn) 1348; (Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt. (*Amt. m.*), Wheat, Coal and Pig Iron, free, 1354; (Butter) 1416; (Cheese) 1421; (Coal) 1432; (Pig Iron) 1447; (Plaster of Paris) 1471; (Shovels, Tools, &c.) 1481; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1510.
National Currency, on Mr. Wallace's Res., 1550.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1634.
- Cheticamp Harbour, Inverness.**
Dredging of, *Ques.* (*Mr. MacDonnell*) 1249.
- Chicoutimi Indians.**
Vaccination of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Cimon*) 241.
- Children in Factories** (*Mr. Bergin's B.*)
See “Factories.”
- Chinese Labour in B.C.**
M. to refer Pet. to Sel. Com. (*Mr. De Cosmos*) 1251.
- Chinese Tax Bill, B.C.**
Intentions of Govt., *Ques.* (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 66.
- Chippewa, Landing Waiter.**
Yarwood, superannuation of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunting*) 675.
- CHRISTIE, Mr.**
Carillon Dam (*Ques.*) 42; (*M. for Ret.*) 44.
Lord's Day observance (*Res.*) 75, 84.
North River Dredging (*M. for Pap.*) 664.
Mails, Montreal and Ottawa (*Ques.*) 826.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.* 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1348; (Wheat flour) 1361; Res. 12, Free list, on 2^o (Wool) 1521.
- CIMON, Mr.**
Railways, Loans to, on M. for Ret., 64.
Indians, Chicoutimi, vaccination (*M. for Pap.*) 241.
Indians, Saguenay, vaccination (*M. for Pap.*) 241.
Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 386.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1186.

Civil Service.

[For particular branches and places refer to such.]

Dismissals and appointments, Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Cameron, S. Huron*) 27, 28.

Examination Boards and Candidates, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson*) 113.

Money due from officers of, recovery, Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 140.

Dismissals, &c., 1873 and 1878, M. for Cabinet Cor. (*Mr. Williams*) 491.

Superannuations, 1873-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, W. Middx.*) 496.

Dismissals &c., a very general discussion,—see "Cardinal, dismissal."

Superannuation, M. for Sel. Com. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 741.

Civil Service Efficiency B. No. 8 (*Mr. Casey*).

1°*, 17; 2° m., 1266; B. withdn., 1273.

Clarke, Henry, Truro, damages claim.

Intercol. Ry., M. for Pap. (*Mr. McKay*) 838.

Clark, W. R., payment to.

For Fishery Com. Services, M. for Pap. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 113.

Coal Oil, St. Lawrence Lighthouses.

M. for Tends., Conts., &c., (*Mr. Méthot*) 836.

Coal on Maritime Prov. Govt. Rys.

Shipment at false rates, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 489.

Cars over-weighted; sale of coal to officials; M. for Pap. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 654.

Coal, transport on Eastern Extension Ry.

Amount of Rolling Stock, Ques. (*Mr. Doull*) 652.

Coasting, American, in Canadian Waters.

M. for Cor. since 1874 (*Mr. Stephenson*) 1405.

COCKBURN, Mr. (Muskoka).

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 674. On Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1456. Res. 11, on 2° (Shovels, tools, &c.) 1482.

Supply—Estimates: Light-houses, &c. (Construction), 1675.

COCKBURN, Mr. (West Northumberland).

Dismissals, &c., officials of House, on M. for Pap., 36.

Supreme Court Act, Amt. (*Ques.*) 66.

Arbitrators' Awards, Appeal (*Ques.*) 66.

Stewart, John, Deposit, on propd. B., 140.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 162.

Intercol. Ry. Act, Amt. (*Ques.*) 66; Bill (*propd., withdn.*) 138-9; (*B. 28, 1°**) 156.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 200.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on Premier's statements, 984.

Confederation Life Association Act Amt. (*B. 53, 1°**) 488.

Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on M. into Com. of W, 847.

Controv. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 849-51.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 907.

COCKBURN, Mr. (W. Northum'd).—Con.

Dominion Day, Holiday (*B. 77, 1°**) 1123; on 2° & Q. of Proceed., 1286.

Bills of Ex. B. 31 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com. of W., 1237.

Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. McCarthy*) reference to Com. of W., on Q. of Proceed., 1285.

Official Arbitrators (*B. 81, 1°*) 1291.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2°, and Q. of Proceed., 1379.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 757; Res. 11, on 2° (Screws, iron) 1463.

Pacific Ry. Debate (*Q. of Ord.*) 1938, 1941

Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on Senate Amts., 2036, 2042-3.

Codification of Laws.—See "Laws."*Coins, Copper, Pennies and Halfpennies.*

Withdrawal of, Ques. (*Mr. Boldue*) 223.

COLBY, Mr.

Bankruptcy, relating to (*B. 2, 1°**) 41; B. referred to Sel. Com. on Insolvency, 293.

Bankruptcy (*M. to refer all Pets. to Sel. Com.*) 293.

Atlantic and N. W. Ry. (*B. 56, 1°**) 562.

Mounted Police, Expenditure for (*M. for Rets., for Mr. Stephenson*) 837.

Centennial Commission, Expenses, &c. (*M. for Rets., for Mr. Stephenson*), 837.

Legal Services for Govt. (*M. for Rets., for Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Oak Conts. for Canals (*M. for Rets., for Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Insolvency Laws, Repeal, etc. (*B. 85, 1°**) 1412; *B. 15* (*Mr. Béchard*) on M. for 2°, 1577; *B. 85, 2° m.*, 1594; *B. 15*, on 2°, 1623.

Colleges, Drill in. See "Militia."*Collingwood Harbour.*

Expenditure, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 82.

Supply—discussion in, 1665.

Committees, Select Standing. See "Sel. Stand. Com."**COMMONS.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."*Confederation Campaign, N.B.*

Personal explanations (*Mr. Tilley and others*), 1456-9.

Confederation Life Association Act Amt.

B. No. 53 (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*).

1°*, 488; 2°*, 562; Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 924. (42 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

CONNELL, Mr.

N. B. Ry., Postal Car for (*Ques.*) 652.

Woodstock, Bridge at (*M. for Pap.*) 653. (Also see "Addenda," Vol. i.)

Canada Gazette, Officials supplied (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.

Consolidated Bank of Canada B. No. 52

(*Mr. Gault*).

1°*, 488; 2°*, 562; Com. of W. and reported * and 3°*, 924. (42 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

Consolidated Bank of Canada B. No. 114

(*Mr. Tilley*).
1^o and 2^o*, 1805; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1885. (42 *Vic.*, c. 53.)

Consolidated Railway Act (*Mr. Tupper's B.*) See "Railway."

Constitutional Question. See "Quebec."

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Prevention Bs. Nos. 37 & 55 (*Mr. Pope, Compton*).

B. No. 37, 1^o, 221; Order for 2^o dischd. and B. withdn., 562.

Res. in Com. of W., 506; B. No. 55, 1^o*, 507; 2^o*, 1246; Com. of W., 1246; reported, 1249; re-com. and reported and 3^o, 1293. (42 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

Supply,—discussion in, 1548.

Controverted Elections.

Generally, see "*Elections*,"—Special cases, see the respective *Districts*.

Cornwall Canal.

Hydraulic Leases, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bergin*) 239.

Supply—discussion in, 1649.

COSTIGAN, Mr.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 397.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 575.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat Flour), on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1372.

Mr. Coughlin's vote on Usury B. (*Remarks*), 1754.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1083, 1984; (*M. to Adj. H.*) 1985; (*M. for Pap.*) 1986, 1991-2.

Costs in Crown Suits (*Mr. MacDonnell's B.*) See "Defendants."

Coteau & Province Line Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 30 (*Mr. McLennan*).

1^o*, 189; 2^o*, 488; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1643. (42 *Vic.*, c. 57.)

COUGHLIN, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1118.

Usury B., Vote on (*Explanation*) 1754.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, language of (*Remarks and M. to Adj. H.*) 1986.

County Judges' Criminal Court (*Mr. McDonald's B.*) See "Speedy Trials Act."

County Judges' Salaries, P. E. I. (*Mr. McDonald's B.*) See "P. E. I."

"*Courrier du Canada*," Article in.

Ques. of Priv. and explanation (*Mr. Huntington*) 613.

COURSOL, Mr.

Montreal Custom-house appts. (*M. for Ret.*) 26.

Ryland, Mr., claim of (*M. for Pap.*) 550, 653. Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2^o, 1388.

Tariff—W. and M. Res., on 2^o, 995.

Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on res. into Com. of W., 1575.

COURSOL, Mr.—Con.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1616, 1621.

Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (*Mr. Bowell*) on Res., 1702.

Statutory Holidays B. 57 (*Mr. Domville*) on M. for 3^o and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1768.

Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. McDougall*), on M. for 3^o, and Mr. Mills's Amt. for "hoist," 2009.

Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1539; Militia (Brigade-Majors) 1633; Geological Surveys, 1681.

Courts. See "Exchequer C.," "Supreme C.," &c.

Cow Bay Breakwater.

Supply,—discussion in, 1667.

Cox, Mr., Cape Beale, B. C.

Lighthouse-keeper, conduct of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1404.

Crime, Prevention of, Act, 1878, Continuance in force B. No. 115 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1^o, 2^o and 3^o*, 1841. (42 *Vic.* c. 41.)

Crown Ass. Co. (*Mr. Kilvert's B.*) See "Union Ass. Co."

Culling Timber, Expenditure for.

Supply,—discussion in, 1716.

Currie, Messrs., Solicitors.

Welland Canal, payments to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 1763.

CURRIER, Mr.

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 100.

Navigation of U.S. Canals (*M. for Cor. by Mr. Rochester*) 185.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 558-9.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 911.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Screws, iron) 1465.

Supply—Estimates: Immigration, 1546; Collection of Revenue (Excise, culling) 1717-18; (Weights and Measures) 1719.

Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Pub. Works, Cap. (Ottawa, Central Block) 1836.

Customs Act (*Mr. Tilley's B.*) See "TARIFF."

Customs, Bonded Warehouses.

Merchandise in, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.

Customs Clearances, ex "Caspian."

At former rates, Ques. (*Mr. Charlton*) 652.

Customs, Expenditure for.

Supply,—discussion in, 1601, 1834, 1854.

Customs Offices, expenses of.

Proportion to duties, Ques. (*Mr. Kranz*) 651.

DALY, Mr.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 147.

DALY, MR.—*Con.*

Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 247.
Allan Mail Cont. (*M. for Cont. and Cor.*) 673.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Sugars) 1497.

DAWSON, MR.

Ontario Boundaries (*M. for Reports*) 50.
Indians, Treaties with (*M. for Pap.*) 180.
Kaministiquia, Harbour at, M. for Pap. (*seconded*) 831.
Prince Arthur's Landing, Harbour at, M. for Pap. (*seconded*) 834.
Indians, enfranchisement of (*M. for Ret.*) 844.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B 74 (Mr. McDonald) on 2°, 1593.
St. Joseph's Island, Land Sales (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on proposed Res., 1919: in Com., 1961-5.
Supply—Estimates: Immigration (Mennonites) 1549; Pub. Works, Cap. (Georgian Bay Br. Ry.) 1648; Geolog. Survey, 1681; Indians (Ont.) 1684; (N. W.) 1689. Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Pub. Works, Cap. (Pacific Ry., W. of Red R.) 1851.

Debates, Official Reporting of.

Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 6; M. for Tenders (*Mr. Ross, W. Midd.*) 27; M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Bowell) 58, 104; Report (*Mr. Speaker*) 58; Contract ratified (Mr. Bowell) 89, 104; Com. of Supply,—discussion in, 1832.

DECOSMOS, MR.

Pacific Ry. route (*M. for Ret.*) 57.
Chinese Tax Bill, B. C. (*Ques.*) 66.
Esquimalt Graving Dock (*M. for Cor.*) 69.
Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 120.
Imports and Exports, B. C. (*M. for Ret.*) 137.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141.
Fisheries, B. C. (*M. for Sess. Pap., etc.*) 178; agreed to, 684.
American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for Pap., 181, 182.
Pacific Ry., Engineer's Rep. (*Ques.*) 222.
Alaska Boundary (*M. for Cor.*) 230, 232.
Tariff, special, for B. C. (*Ques.*) 491.
Separation of B. C. (*M. to introduce B.*) 1079 (Vol. ii.): (*withdn.*) 1080.
Chinese in B. C. (*M. for Sel. Com.*) 1251-60-63.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on propd. Res., 1897, 1903; in Com., 1961-3-5.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Pacific Ry.) 1645.

Defendants' Costs in Crown Suits B. No.

17 (*Mr. MacDonnell.*)
1°*, 107; order for 2°, 1578; order dischgd. and B. withdn., 1881.

Deschamps, Antoine, St. Anne's.

Lighthouse Keeper, discharge of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Girouard) 675.

DESJARDINS, MR.

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify cont., 99.
Lachine Canal Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 125.
Red River, Timber Leases on (*M. for Ret.*) 189.
Quebec Constitutional Ques., on Premier's statements, 985, 1027.
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary employés (*M. for Ret.*) 147.
Sir Geo. Cartier, monument to (*Ques.*) 1250.
Supreme Court Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 1°, 1375.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Stone, building) 1485; (Sugars) 1487.
Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res., 1697.
Building Societies, Que. (*B.* 113, 1° and 2°*) 1800.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res., 1944.

Detroit, Canada and, Bridge Co. Incorp.

B. No. 101 (*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°, 1585; 2°, 1585; Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1755. (42 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

Detroit R. Tunnel Co. Incorp. B. No.

100 (*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°, 1585; 2°*, 1585; Com. of W. and reported, and 3°*, 1706. (42 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

DEWDNEY, MR.

Race Rocks, Fog Bell (*Ques.*) 67.
Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway (*M. for Repts.*) 87.
Quartz Machinery, B.C., duties, on M. for Pap., 657.
B. C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald) on Res. in Com., 1534.

Digby, N.S., Pier, repairs.

Supply,—discussion in, 1667.

Direct U.S. Cable Co. (Mr. McCarthy's B.)

See "U.S."

Diseases, Animals (Mr. Pope's B.)

See "Contagious Diseases."

Dismissals. See "Civil Service" and "Horse" for general questions, and the names or places referred to for special cases.

DIVISIONS.

Campbell, Eliza Maria, Relief B. No. 99.—(Mr. Macdougall).

On M. for 3°; Amt., 3 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Mills*) 1878; Amt. to re-com. B. (*Mr. Farrow*) negatived, 2010; *Mr. Mills's* Amt. negatived (*F.* 38, N. 56) 2010; B. 3° (on same division reversed) 2011.

Insolvent Acts Repeal, and provision for liquidation B. No. 85 (Mr. Colby).

On M. for 2°; Amt. Res. for unconditional Repeal (*Mr. Béchard*) carried (*F.* 99, N. 75) 1621.

DIVISIONS.—*Con.*

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. No. 15 (*Mr. Bécharde*).

2° carried (*Y. 117, N. 60*) 1627; Amt. to 3°, 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) negatived (*Y. 55, N. 107*), 1783; B. 3°, 1784.

Marine Telegraphs Act, 1875, Repeal B. No. 44 (*Mr. McCarthy*).

2° carried (*Y. 54, N. 28*) 1284.

Pacific Railway B. No. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*).

Res. of Com. of W., on conc. in Res. 1, Amt., as to rate of construction, &c., (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1970; negatived (*Y. 37, N. 115*) 1978. On Res. 12, Amt., as to route (*Mr. Mackenzie*) negatived (*on same division*).

Quebec, Province, Constitutional Question.

Res. condemning Lt. Gov's action, m. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 251, 270. Previous ques. m. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 282; carried (*J. 136, N. 51*) 407. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) carried (*on same division*) 400.

Statutory Holidays B. No. 57 (*Mr. Domville*).

On M. for 3°, Amt., three months' "hoist" (*Mr. Holton*) negatived (*Y. 54, N. 100*) 1766; Amt., to re-com., to exempt Quebec (*Mr. Brooks*) 1767; agreed to, on a division, re-com. and reported*, 1769.

Supply—Concurrence.

Intercolonial Ry., nut-locks. vote for, carried (*Y. 111, N. 42*) 1860.

Pacific Ry., Mr. Wallace's claim, vote for, carried (*Y. 114, N. 37*) 1884.

Supreme Court Acts Repeal B. No. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*).

On M. for 2°, Amt., 3 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Mackenzie*) negatived (*Y. 44, N. 120*) 1375.

Telegraphs, Marine. See "Marine Telegraphs."

Usury Prohibition B. No. 35 (*Mr. Méthot*).

On M. for 2°, Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Plumb*) carried (*Y. 97, N. 68*) 1585.

Ways and Means Com., Resolutions.

2° m. (*Mr. Tilley*) 507.

Amt., condemning Govt. tariff, m. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1077-79; negatived (*Y. 53, N. 136*) 1201.

Amt., to place Wheat on free list (*Mr. Visel*) negatived (*Y. 61, N. 109*) 1353.

Amt., Wheat, Coal and Pig iron free (*Mr. Charlton*) negatived (*Y. 53, N. 116*) 1354.

Amt., Corn-meal free (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) negatived (*Y. 57, N. 112*), 1354.

Amt., flour free (*Mr. Vallée*) negatived (*Y. 61, N. 121*), 1415.

Divorce Court, New Brunswick.

Judge's salary, provision for, Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 827.

Divorce in Ontario, B. to provide for (*Mr. Hooper*).

Introduction m., 1696; neg. on a div., 1696.

Divorce.—See "Campbell."

Dominion Day Holiday B. No. 77 (*Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland*).

1°, 1123; 2°, 1286; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1575. (42 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

Dominion Lands Act Amt. B. No. 21 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*).

1°, 125; order for 2° dischgd. and B. withdrawn., 1534.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolid. B. No.

107 (*Mr. Tupper*).

1°, 1765; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1805, (42 *Vic.*, c. 31.)

Dominion Lands, Manitoba, Act Amt. B. No. 72 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*).

1°, 1003, 1291, 1296; Com. of W., 1296; reported*, 1534; 3°, 1702. (42 *Vic.*, c. 32.)

Dominion Police (*Mr. McDonald's B.*)

See "Canada Police."

Dominion Steamers.

Supply,—discussion in, 1669.

Dominion Telegraph Co. Act Amt. B. No.

10 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).

1°, 71; 2°, 111; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 798. (42 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

DOMVILLE, Mr.

Welland Canal, Mr. McMahon, on M. for Ret., 62.

Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 133.

Public servants, money due from, recovery

(*Ques.*) 140.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 143, 151.

Election trials, N.B. (*Ques.*) 156.

Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4, on 2°, 177.

Iron Imports, N.S. and N.B., (*M. for Ret.*) 180.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 200.

Election Petitions, N.B. (*M. for Ret.*) 233-4; (*M. withdrn.*) 235.

Ketchum, Mr., case of, investigation (*M. for Rep.*) 492.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 554-5, 595-6-7-9.

Statutory Holidays (*B. 57, 1°*) 562; on 2°, 1285; on 3° and Mr. Holton's Amt. for "hoist," 1766.

Courrier du Canada and Mr. Huntington's explanations, 617.

Woodstock, N.B., Bridge at, on M. for Pap., 653-4.

Mitchell & Co., supplies by, on M. for Pap., 660.

Intercol. Ry. damages (*M. for Ret.*) 663.

Stark, E. O., Station Agent, dismissal of (*M. for Pap.*) 918.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (*Mr. Killam*) on M. into Com., 924.

Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (*Mr. Doull*) on 2°, 926.

Waterley, D. H., damages due to (*Ques.*) 1249.

Tarif—W. & M. Res., on 2°, on Mr. Weldon's speech, comments, 796; on Ques., 799; Res., amd., on 2°, 1319; Res. 11, on 2°—(Pig iron) 1448-9; (Tin plates) 1450. Personal explanations, 1450-2-4-5.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Bécharde*) on 2°, 1625.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) in Com., 1712-14.

Glendon, purchase of (*M. for Pap.*) 1757.

On Sir A. J. Smith's expenses, Reciprocity negotiations, 1754.

Drawback on exports, 1877-8 (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.

DOMVILLE, Mr.—*Con.*

Canada *Gazette*, Officials supplied (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.

N. B. Supreme Court Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1792.

Riv. du Loup Br., G. T. R., purchase of B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) Res., on conc., 1997.

Supply—Estimates: Public Works, Inc. (Public Buildings, N.B.) 1663.

Conc.: (Intercol. Ry., to deep water, St. John) 1856-8.

Dorchester Penitentiary, Clerk of Works.

Dismissal, M. for Pap. (*Sir A. J. Smith*). 492.

DOULL, Mr.

Bills of Exchange, Inland (B. 16, 1st), 107: on 2^o, 925; reft. to Banking Com., 927.

Fisheries, B. C., on M. for Pap., 179.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 556; explanation, 557-8.

Eastern Extension Ry., coal rolling-stock for (*Ques.*) 652.

Judge Wilkins's Resignation, &c. (*M. for Cor.*) 842.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 515, 526. Vote, *Globe* Report (*Q. of Priv*) 1250. W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Coal) 1430.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper), in Com., 1715: on 3^o, 1716.

Pictou & Truro Ry. transfr (*M. for Pap.*). 1763.

Drawbacks. See "Duties, Rebate."

DREW, Mr.

Welland Ry. Co. Bonds (B. 12, 1st) 88: (2^o) 111.

Insolvent Estates (*M. for Ret.*) 106.

Hillsburg P. O. (*M. for Pap.*) 107.

Postmasters' Salaries, increase (*Ques.*) 112.

Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2^o, 175.

Postmasters' Salaries (*M. to refer P. M. G's. Report to P. A. Com.*) 827.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1123.

Insolvent Act Amt. B. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton), introduction (*objected to*), 1886.

Drill. See "Militia."*Drummond and Arthabaska Election.*

Judge's Report, 3.

Drummond and Arthabaska Mails.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bolduc*) 70.

Drummond and Arthabaska, Weights and Measures.

M. for Inspector's Cor. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 549.

Duncan City, Reporting of Vessels at.

M. for Cor. as to necessity of (*Mr. Kilbert*) 663.

Dual Representation Abolition Act Repeal B. No. 62 (*Mr. Ouimet*).

1^o*, 649.

DUBUC, Mr.

Manitoba, Transportation to, arrangements (*Ques.*) 74.

Manitoba, Emigrant Sheds (*Ques.*) 111.

DUBUC, Mr.—*Con.*

Manitoba, Immigrants to (*M. for Ret.*) 180.

Red River, Reservations on (*M. for O. Cs.*) 232.

Emerson, Custom-house for (*Ques.*) 827.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1519.

Manitoba, Settlers' Claims (*Ques.*) 1755.

Red R., Squatters' Lands (*Ques.*) 1755.

Sitting Bull's nationality (*Ques.*) 1756.

DUGAS, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat Flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1370.

Dussault, J. B., L'Islet.

Payments to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 675.

Duties charged in Newfoundland.

M. for Cor. respecting (*Mr. Fortin*) 1410.

Duties paid in Feb., 1879.

Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 119.

Duties paid on Canadian Tobacco.

1873-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Vallée*) 119.

Duties, Rebate of.

1874-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jones*) 65.

On Tin, B. C., *Ques.* (*Mr. McInnes*) 73.

On goods exported, 1877-8; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 1763.

Duval, Ulric, St. Nicholas.

Postmaster, complaints against, *Ques.* (*Mr. Olivier*) 1250.

Dynamite explosion at Stratford.

Remarks (*Mr. Hesson and others*) 1800.

Eastern Extension, N.B. See "INTERCOL. Ry."*East Middlesex.* See "Middlesex, E.R."*Election, Eligibility* (*Mr. Ouimet's B.*)

See "Dual Representation."—(*Mr. Ryker's B.*) See "Independence of Parlt."

Election of Members Act Amt. B. No. 19 (*Mr. Casey*).

1^o*, 107; 2^o m., 853; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Arkell*), 857; Resumed Debate, 927; Amt. agreed to on a div., 943.

Election of Members Act Amt. B. No. 42 (*Mr. Gigault*).

1^o*, 251.

Election Trials, N.B.

Intention of Govt., *Ques.* (*Mr. Domville*) 156; M. for Ret., 233; M. withdn., 235.

Elections, Controverted, Acts Amt. B. No. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*).

1^o*, 59; 2^o propd., 164; Resumed debate, 847; 2^o and referred to Sel. Com., 853.

Elections, Corrupt Practices at, Act Amt. B. No. 32 (*Mr. Ives*).

1^o*, 189; 2^o, 1274; Com. of W. and reported * and 3^o*, 1575. (42 *Vic.*, c. 6).

Elections, General, the late.

Votes polled, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 46.

Expenses of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 65.

Elgin, E.R., Election.

Judge's Report, 41.

"*Ella G. McLean*," Schooner.

Purchase of, M. for Pap. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 505.

ELLIOTT, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Agricult. Implements) 1336.

Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville), on M. for 3° and Mr. Holton's Amt. for "hoist," 1766.

Emerson, Custom House at.

Establishment of, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 827.

Emerson, Emigrant Shed.

Erection of, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 111.

English Reciprocity and Free Trade Association.

Memorial from, Ques. of its reception (*Mr. Speaker*) 1412; ruled, reception irregular, 1453.

Esquimalt & Nanaimo Ry. See "PACIFIC Ry."

Esquimalt Dock. See "British Columbia."

Estimates, the.

Submitted and referred to Com. of Supply (*Mr. Tilley*) 251. See "SUPPLY."

Exchequer Court (Mr. McDonald's B.)

See "Supreme Court." (*Mr. Cockburn's B.*) See "Official Arbitrators."

Exchequer Court, Work and Expense of.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bolduc*), 496.

Excise Act (Mr. Tilley's B.) See "TARIFF."

Expenditure, General.

Recent, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 54.

Explanations, Personal, of Members.

For cases raised as Ques. of Priv., see "Priv."

For explanations introduced in course of general debate, reference must be made to the member's name.

Exports.

Recent, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 54; (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.

British Columbia, M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 137.

Factories Regulation B. No. 103 (*Mr. Bergin*).

1°, 1696.

FARROW, Mr.

Saw-logs measurement (*Ques.*) 111.

Kincardine Harbour Works, expenditure (*M. for Ret.*) 240.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 574.

Parliament, time of meeting (*Ques.*) 651.

Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdougall) on m. for 3°, and Mr. Mills's Amt. for "hoist" (*Amt. m.*) to re-com. B., 2010.

Felonies, Trial (Mr. McDonald's B.) See "Speedy Trials."

Female Reformatory, Ont. (Mr. McDonald's B.) See "Ontario."

Fertilizers, Manufacture of, Fraud in.

M. for Sel. Com. of Enquiry (*Mr. Massue*) 498; M. withdn., 499.

FISSET, Mr.

Riel, Louis, pardon of (*Ques.*) 42, 66.

Riv. du Loup Branch, G.T.R. (*M. for Cor.*) 47.

Intercol. Ry., Dismissals, &c. (*M. for Pap.*) 57.

Rimouski, Statute Labour in, on M. for Pap. (*Amt.*) 68.

St. Donat, Postmaster, conduct (*M. for Pap.*) 70.

Intercol. Ry., carriage of electors, on M. for Ret., 86.

St. Fabien, Mail Contract (*Ques.*) 111.

Rimouski Wharf Improvement (*Ques.*); 112; (*M. for Rep.*) 125.

Rimouski, work at Matane, &c., on M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 113-14-16.

Intercol. Ry., sleepers (*M. for Tend.*) 125.

Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 229.

St. Fabien, Mail Contract (*M. for Cor.*) 232.

Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on M. for Cor., 248.

Intercol. Ry., St. Flavie land claims (*Ques.*) 491.

Cardinal, Régis, Dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 565.

Lavoie, Capt., employment of (*Ques.*) 563; (*M. for Orders to*) 920, 1581.

Old Bic Harbour Improvement (*M. for Pets.*) 657.

St. Anaclet, P.O., Location of (*Ques.*) 904.

Bouchard, J. O., Dismissal of (*M. for Statement*) 1265.

Bourdeau, J., Disml. of (*M. for Cor.*) 1398; M. withdn., 1398.

St. Fabien P.O., Removal of (*M. for Cor.*) 1399.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° and Mr. Houde's Amt. (*Amt.*) Wheat, free, 1353.

Fish-breeding, St. John River.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. King*) 1250.

Fish-cans, American Duty on.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ogden*) 667.

Fisheries, Expenditure for.

Supply,—discussion in: Breeding, 1676, 1837; Overseers, &c., 1837; P.E.I. claims, 1838.

Fisheries of British Columbia.

M. for Pap. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 178, 684.

Salmon Hatchery, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McInnes*) 104; Ques., 652.

Fishery Award, Washington Treaty.

P. E. I. claims, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 74; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Yeo*) 241; M. withdn., 251; Ques. (*Mr. Bain, for Mr. Yeo*) 1756; in Com. of Supply, Remarks (*Mr. Muttart*) 1838.

N.S. claims, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 490.

N.S., N.B., and P.E.I. claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 658.

N.B. claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1399.

Fishery Award, Washington Treaty—Con. Appropriation of, for restoring Fisheries, Res.; M. into Com. of W. (*Mr. Fortin*) 1730; Debate, 1749-54. In Com. of Supply, Remarks (*Mr. Kaultback*) 1837.

Fishery, Salmon, Miramichi.
Barnaby River, Fry for, Ques. (*Mr. Snowball*) 826.

Fishing with Seines, Practice of.
M. for Cor. (*Mr. Macdonald, Kings, P.E.I.*) 224.

Fish of Newfoundland.
Admission of, Ques. (*Mr. Muckenzie*) 743.

FLEMING, Mr.
Railways, employés and accidents (*M. for Ret.*) 129.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 1020; Res. 11, on 2°—(Corn) 1347; (Butter) 1417; (Cheese) 1424; (Coal) 1432; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1517.

FLYNN, Mr.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 226.
Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on M. for Cor., 244-7.
Tariff—Res. of Com. W. & M., on 2°, 510.
Lobster cans, American duty, on M. for Cor., 670.
Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Mail Subsidies, Halifax and St. John) 1673.

Forsyth, Mr., P.O. Dept.
Appointment of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington, by Mr. Mills*) 236.

Fort Frances Lock.
Expenses of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 70.

FORTIN, Mr.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 146.
American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for Pap., 181, 183.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 224.
Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 243.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 560-1.
Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. (*B.* 65, 1°) 740; on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 825.
Masters, extra certificates for (*M. for Pap.*) 842.
Newfoundland, duties levied by (*M. for Cor.*) 1410-12.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1371.
Fishery Award, disposal of (*Res. m.*) 1730.
Anticosti, &c., Telegraph Subsidy B. 111 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 1°, 1797.
Supply—Estimates: Fisheries (Breeding) 1680.

France, Trade Mission to, Expenses of.
Supply,—discussion in, 1839.

Fraser River, B.C.
Salmon Hatchery for, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McInnes*) 104; Ques., 632.
Post-office for, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 652.

Fredericton, N.B., Barracks.
Transfer from Govt., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Strange*) 664.

French Edition of Tariff.
Supply of, remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1405.

French Weight Abolition, Quebec, B. No. 25 (*Mr. Casgrain*).
1°, 140.

GALBRAITH, Mr.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 2 (Drawbacks) on 2°, 1328; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1515.

Gaspé & Campbellton Mail Subsidy.
Supply,—discussion in, 1673.

GAULT, Mr.
Consolidated Bank of Canada (*B.* 52, 1°) 488.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Coal) 1436; (Earthenware) 1441-2.

"*Gazette*," Canada, in N.B.
Officials supplied, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Connell*) 1763.

"**Gazette**" Printing Co. Incorp. B. No. 23 (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre*).
1°, 126; 2°, 208; Com. of W. and reported, 651; 3°, 705. (42 *Vic.*, c. 78).

GEOFFRION, Mr.
Intercol. Ry., carriage of electors, on M. for Ret., 87.
Quebec Constitutional Ques., on M. for Res., 337.
Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. Macdougall*) on 3°, and *Mr. Mills's Amt.* for 3 months' "hoist," 2010.

Geographical Society (Mr. Fortin's B.)
See "Quebec."

Geological Survey, Expenditure.
Supply,—discussion in, 1681.

Georgetown and Pictou Ferry.
Continuance of, Ques. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's*) 1756.

Georgian Bay Br. See "PACIFIC RY."

GIGAULT, Mr.
Insolvt. Act, 1875, Amt. of (*Ques.*) 48.
Election Act Amt. (*B.* 42, 1°) 251.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 762; Res. 11, on 2° (Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1364.

GILL, Mr.
Dredging, St. Francis and Yamaska (*Ques.*) 74.
Banks, affairs of (*M. for Ret.*, by *Mr. Lantier*) 671; M. postpd. 672.

GILLIES, Mr.
Mail service extension in N. Bruce (*Ques.*) 223, 651.
Saugeen R., Lighthouse erection (*M. for Cor.*) 836.
Port Elgin Harbour Improvement (*Ques.*) 1551.
Ont. School Fund, payment (*Ques.*) 1756.

- GILLMOR, Mr.**
 Woodward's Cove, Appropriation for (*Ques.*) 223.
 Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 228.
 Divorce Court Judge for N. B. (*Ques.*) 827.
 Steamship line, Halifax and Brazil (*Ques.*) 1249.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 1013; Res. 11, on 2° (Corn) 1349.
Supply—Estimates: Fisheries (Breeding) 1679.
- GIROUARD, Mr. (Jacques Cartier).**
 St. Anne's Lock, widening (*Ques.*) 141.
 Banque Jacques Cartier (*B.* 50, 1°*) 409; (2°*) 489.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 550.
 Stock-gambling suppression (*B.* 61, 1°) 612.
 Deschamps, Antoine, discharge of (*M. for Pap., by Mr. Grandbois*) 675.
 Rails, old, disposal of (*M. for Ret. for Mr. Vallée*) 837.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 950.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal (*B.* 22, 1°*) 126;
 B. referred to Sel. Com. on Insolvency, 293; B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 1602; B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2°, (*Amts. m.*) 1769, 1772, 1778; *Amts.* withdn., 1782.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdougall) on 3°, and Mr. Mills's Amt. for 3 months' "hoist," 2007.
- "Glendon," Government Steamer.
 Purchase, repairs, &c., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville, for Mr. Plumb*) 1757.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1669-73.
- Gold Mining Machinery for B.C.**
 Securities for duty, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Thompson, Cariboo*) 655.
- Government Business, Precedence.**
 Ms. for (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 738, 1290, 1533, 1668, 1841, 1885.
- Government, Constitutional Ques.** See "Quebec."
- Government, Legal Services to, 1873-78.**
 Particulars of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 838.
- Government Life Insurance.**
 Res. respecting (*Mr. Tilley*) withdn., 1669.
- Government, Salaries of, Rates of.**
 Since 1841, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 839.
- Government, Salaries, Reduction (Mr. Béchard's B.)** See "Indemnity."
- Governor-General.**
 Royal Instructions, *Ques.* (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 26; copies of (*H. E.*) 42; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mills*) 124.
- GRANDBOIS, Mr.**
 Isle Blanche, Floating Light (*Ques.*)
 Riv. du Loup Pier, work on (*M. for Ret.*) 84.
 Intercol. Ry. Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 137;
 M. agreed to, 178.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 581.
- GRANDBOIS, Mr.—Con.**
 Deschamps, Antoine, discharge of (*M. for Pap., for Mr. Girouard*) 675.
 Riv. du Loup Wharf, light for (*Ques.*) 826.
 Richard, Mr., Light-keeper, resignation (*M. for Cor.*) 844.
- Grand Manan, Woodward's Cove.**
 Re-vote, intention, *Ques.* (*Mr. Gillmor*) 223.
- Grand Trunk Railway.**
 Riv. du Loup Br., M. for Cor. with Co. (*Mr. Fiset*) 47; *Ques.* (*Mr. Casgrain*) 73.
- G. T. R., Riv. du Loup Br., purchase of (Mr. Tupper's B., etc.)** See "INTERCOL. RY."
- Green Island, St. Lawrence.**
 M. for Cor. with Indian Agent (*Mr. McCarthy*) 674.
- Grouville, S.R., Election.**
 M. for Pet. and for Enquiry (*Mr. McCarthy*) 236-7.
- Grosse Isle and Québec Transport.**
 Contract, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 67.
- Grosse Isle, Dismissals at.**
 Jolicœur and Hurst, *Ques.* (*Mr. Landry*) 563.
- Grosse Isle, Government Land.**
 Settlement of, *Ques.* (*Mr. Landry*) 651.
- Grosse Isle, Public Works on.**
 M. for Conts. (*Mr. Valin*) 70.
- Grosse Isle, Sheds, Rebuilding.**
 Intention, *Ques.* (*Mr. Landry*) 546.
- Grosse Isle, Works at.**
 Since 1874, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 241.
- GUNN, Mr.**
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1120; Res. 2 (Drawbacks) on 2°, 1327; Res. 11, on 2° (Sugars) 1490-1.
- GUTHRIE, Mr.**
 Controv. Elections Act Amt. B 4 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2°, 172.
 Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 195.
 Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White) on 1°, 740.
 Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 915.
 Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on 2°, 925.
 Elections, Corrupt Practices, B. 32 (Mr. Ives) on 2°, 1277.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 998, 1003; Res. 11, on 2°—(Agric. Implemts.) 1335; (Barley) 1347; (Corn) 1349; (Wheat Flour) 1360; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1531; Res. 14 (Excise Duty; Spirits) on 2°, 1532.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1782.
 Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1711-15.
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald) in Com., 1801.

HACKETT, Mr.

- Cascumpee Harbour, improvement (*M. for Reps.*) 87.
 Mackerel, seining for, on *M. for Cor.*, 227.
 Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on *M. for Cor.*, 250.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 584.
 Fishery Award, disposal, on *Mr. Fortin's Res.*, 1753.
Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1671; (Mail Subsidies, Campbellton and Gaspé) 1674.

HADDOW, Mr.

- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 561.
 Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on *M. for Cor.*, 669.
Tariff—*W. & M.*, Res. 11, on 2° (Tin plates) 1450.

HAGGART, Mr.

- Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 214.
 Pacific Railway Expenditure, to March, 1879 (*M. for Ret.*) 235.
Courrier du Canada and *Mr. Huntington's* explanations, 617.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 1°, 1374.
Supply—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans) 1629.

Halhimand, Land Damages.

- Welland Canal, *M. for Ret.* (*Mr. McCallum*) 106.

Half-Breed Reservations.

- Manitoba, *M. for O. C., &c.* (*Mr. Merner*) 674.

Halifax and Brazil, Steamship Line.

- Establishment of, *Ques.* (*Mr. Gillmor*) 1249.
Supply,—discussion in, 1853.

Halifax and Queenstown Mail Contract.

- Termination of, *M. for Pap.* (*Mr. Daly*) 673.

Halifax and St. John Mail Subsidy.

- Supply*,—discussion in, 1673.

Halifax as a Winter Port.

- M. for Cor.* with *Ry. Compy.* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 70.

Halifax, Intercol. Ry. Terminus.

- Intentions of *Govt.*, *Ques.* (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 66.
 Private Property Rights, *Ques.* (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*) 66.
 (*Mr. Cockburn's B.*) See "INTERCOL. RY."

Hamilton, Appointments in.

- 1873-78, *M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Robertson*) 112.

Hamilton, Emigrants at.

- Aided by *Govt.*, *M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Robertson*) 124.

Hamilton, Public Buildings.

- Intention of purchasing, *Q.* (*Mr. Robertson*) 74.

Harbours, generally, of Dominion.

- Expenditure on, &c. *M. for Ret.* (*Mr. Mills*) 499.

HAY, Mr.

- Toronto Postmastership (*Ques.*) 111; (*M. for O. C.*) 130.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 210.
Tariff—*W. & M.*, Res. 11, on 2° (Screws, iron) 1463.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1991.

Hemlock Bark, Export duty on.

- Intention, *Ques.* (*Mr. Vallée*) 651.

HESSON, Mr.

- Lord's Day Observance, on *Res. for*, 79.
 Welland Canal, Damages (*M. for Ret.*, for *Mr. McCallum*) 179.
 American Vessels, Registration of, on *M. for Pap.*, 184.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 202.
 Stratford, *Govt. Offices*, erection (*Ques.*) 222.
 Cardinal, Régis, Dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 609.
 Inland Revenue Refunds (*M. for Ret.*) 665.
 Molesworth Postmastership (*M. for Pap.*) 830.
 Betting Act *Amt. B.* 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on *M. into Com. of W.*, 847.
 Ventilation of Chamber (*Remarks*) 859.
 Elections Act *Amt. B.* 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2°, 943.
Tariff—*W. & M.*, Res. on 2°, 899; *Res. 2* (Drawbacks) on 2°, 1328; *Res. 11*, on 2° —(Corn) 1351; (Cheese) 1422; (Coal) 1433; (Furniture) 1444; (Screws, iron) 1463; (Stone, building) 1484.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal *B.* 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on 2°, 1578.
 Dynamite explosion, Stratford (*Remarks*) 1800.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Bands) 1642.
 Conc.: (Post-Office) 1862.

HILLIARD, Mr.

- Tariff*—*W. & M.*, Res. 11. on 2° (Wheat flour) 1362.

Hillsburg Post-Office.

- M. for Pap.* respecting (*Mr. Drew*) 107.

Holiday, Dominion Day (Mr. Cockburn's B.) See "Dominion Day."**Holidays, Statutory, further provision for, B. No. 57 (Mr. Domville).**

- 1°, 562; 2°, 1285; *Com. of W.* and reported, 1765; *Amt.* to 3°, three months' "hoist" (*Mr. Holton*) neg. (*J.* 54, *N.* 100); *Amt.*, *Re-com.*, to exempt Quebec (*Mr. Brooks*) 1767; agreed to on a *div.*, 1769; *re-com.* and reported *, 1769; 3°, 1805.

HOLTON, Mr.

- Debates, Reporting, *Cont.*, on *M.* to ratify, 91, 93.
 Stewart, John, deposit, on *propd. B.*, 140.
 Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on *M. for Cor.* (*Q. of Ord.*), 162.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 191.
 Northern Light, on *M. for Ret.* respecting (*in to adj. debate*) 236.
 S. Grenville Election, Enquiry, on *M.* for Address (*Amt.* to refer *Pct.* to *Sel. S. Com.* on *Priv.* and Elections) 237-8; *M.* as *amd.*, agreed to, 238.

HOLTON, Mr.—*Con.*

- Q.M.O. & O. Ry., Ottawa Bridge (*B.* 45, 1^o) 338.
- Quebec Constitutional Question: on Q. of Ord., respecting vote, 408; on Premier's statements, 1027; on Mr. Mousseau's M. for Res. (*Q. of Ord.*) 1762; on course of Govt. (*Remarks*) 1835; on M. of conc. in W. & M. Res, 2001-2-3; on 3^o of Supply B., 2029.
- Private Bills, extension of time (*protested against*) 562.
- B. C. Separation B. (Mr. DeCosmos) (*Q. of Ord.*) 1080.
- Pacif. Ry., on offer of Engrs'. Reports *confidentially* to Leader of Opp. (*Remarks*) 1080-81.
- Census and Statistics B. 67 (Mr. Pope) in Com. of W., 1236.
- Receiver-Genl. and Min. of P. W. B. 66 (Mr. Tupper) in Com. of W., 1241-2.
- Bouchard, J. D., St. Simon, dismissal, on M. for Pap.; *reasons* for such Ms. (*Remarks*) 1266.
- Dominion Day B. 72 (Mr. Cockburn) on 2^o and Q. of *Proced.*, 1286.
- Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2^o and Q. of *Proced.*, 1376, 1386.
- Memorial, Free Trade Association, Eng., on Q. of *Proced.*, 1412.
- Tariff*—W. & M., Res. in Com., *en bloc* (*Q. of Proced.*) 473-4; Res., on 2^o, Debate (*Q. of Proced.*) 508; on Mr. Doull's Q. of Priv. (*Globe report*) 1251; Res., reading *seriatim* (*Q. of Proced.*) 1324; Res. 2 (Drawbacks) on 2^o, 1324-5-7; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2^o, 1332-3; Res. 7 (Appraisers) on 2^o, 1332; on Mr. King's explan. and Q. of Ord., 1454-5; B. No. 93, on 2^o, 1823-4.
- Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on Res. into Com. of W., 1572-3.
- Canada and Detroit Bridge Co. B. 101 (Mr. Kilvert) on 2^o, 1586.
- Insolvency Laws Repeal, B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^o, 1576; B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt. (*Q. of Ord.*) 1620.
- Insolvent Act Amt. Bill (Mr. Robertson) on M. to introduce (*Q. of Proced.*) 1886.
- Divorce in Ont., on Mr. Hooper's propd. B., 1696.
- Petroleum Inspection B. 104 (Mr. Baby) on Res. in Com., 1697.
- Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3^o (*Amt. m.*) 3 months "hoist," 1766; on Mr. Brooks's Amt., to re-com., 1768.
- Masters' and Mates' Certs. Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Pope) on Res. (*Q. of Proced.*) 1799.
- Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald) in Com., 1802; on 3^o (*Q. of Proced.*) 1803-4.
- Fees, remission of, Moira R. Toll B. (*Q. of Proced.*) 1983.
- Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of, on Mr. McCuaig's Remarks (*Q. of Ord.*) 1985; on Mr. Costigan's Remarks (*Q. of Ord.*) 1986.

HOLTON, Mr.—*Con.*

- Riv. du Loup Br. G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) Res. on conc., 1993; on 2^o, 1999, 2000.
- Supply*—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Pub. Works, maintenance,—Intercol Ry.) 1728.
- Conc.: (Mr. Piché's gratuity) (*Q. of Ord.*) 1874; (Library Catalogue) 1876.
- Stranger (Macdonell), misconduct of, on Q. of *Proced.*, 1981; on Mr. McLennan's remarks, 2044-6.
- Home Savings and Loan Co.* (Mr. Cameron's B.) See "Toronto Savings Bank."

HOOPER, Mr.

- Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 212.
- Moore, S. J., claim for losses (*M. for Pap.*, for Mr. Kilvert) 240; & M. withdn., 241.
- Napanee, Tamworth & Que. Ry. Co. Incorpor. (*B.* 40, 1^o) 251.
- Ont. & Pacif. Junct. Ry. Co. B. 27 (Mr. Williams); Senate Amts. (*conc. m.*) 1290.
- Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1349; (Sugars) 1499.
- Divorce in Ont. (*M. to introduce B.*) 1696.
- Militiamen of 1837-38, Land Grant for (*Ques.*) 1757.
- Supply*—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights and Meas.) 1720.

HOUDE, Mr.

- Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 205.
- Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on M. for Cor., 249.
- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 578.
- Langélier, Chas., payments to (*M. for Ret.*) 844.
- Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 859; Res. 11, on 2^o—(*Amt.*) Wheat, proviso, 1352; (*Amt. withdn.*) 1355-9; (Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1365; (Tobacco) 1508.
- Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^o, 1623; in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1774.
- Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1842.
- Supply*—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1539-40

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

- Appointments, Clerks Assistant (*Mr. Speaker*) 5.
- Account current (*Mr. Speaker*) 6.
- Dismissals, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Anglin*) 29.
- Internal Commission, Appointment (*H. E.*) 41.
- Employés, names, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 667.
- Indemnities of Members, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 839.
- Ventilation of Chamber, Remarks (*Mr. Charlton*) 858.
- Stationery, quality of, Com. to rep. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 1213.
- French edition of *Tariff*, Remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 824, 1405.
- Elections, Indemnity, etc., (*Bs. r* See those subjects.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—*Con.*

- Official Reporting of Debates. See "Debates."
- Supply—Speaker's salary, arrears, 1540; Dep. Clk's. salary, 1541; Sess. Clks., etc., 1542, 1855; Library, Catalogue, 1832, 1875; Mr. Piché's gratuity, 1873.
- HUNTINGTON, Mr.**
Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 96.
Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 131, 135.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 162.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 199.
P.O.D., Messrs. Forsyth and LeSueur (*M. for Pap.*, by *Mr. Mills*) 236.
Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 308, 312; on 3^o of Supply B., 2034.
Canadien, statements in (*Ques. Priv.*) 488.
Courrier du Canada, statements in (*Ques. Priv.*) 613, 615.
St. Geneviève and Point Clair Mail Cont. (*Ques.*) 489.
Belrath P.O., closing of (*Ques.*) 489.
P.O.D., use of private letter on file, on M. for Cor., 547-9.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of (*M. for Pap.*) 550-1-2, 572-3-4; M. agreed to, 610.
Postmasters' Salaries, on M. to refer P.M.G.'s Report to P.A. Com., 827.
Intercol. Ry., Murray & Co.'s claims, on M. for Pap., 918.
Chinese in B.C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1263.
Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 34 (Mr. Keeler) on 2^o, 1380.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Corn) 1348.
Remarks on Mr. White's sp., 1344.
Supply—Estimates: Geological Survey, 1681; Collection of Revenue (Weights & Meas.) 1724.
Conc.: (Post Office) 1863.
Kamouraska and Paspebiac Mail Service (*Remarks*) 1729.
Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on propd. Res., and personal remarks, 1933-6-9, 1940-1-3.
Stranger's conduct, attention called to, 1940.
Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) Res., on conc., 1999.
- Hurst, Benjamin, Grosse Isle.*
Dismissal of, *Ques.* (Mr. Landry) 563.
- HURTEAU, Mr.**
L'Assomption R., deepening of (*Ques.*) 563; (*M. for Cor.*, by *Mr. Robitaille*) 671.
L'Assomption R., Bridge over (*M. for Pap.*) 845.
- Iberville, Société de Construction (Mr. Ouimet's B.)* See "Société."
- Immigration expenses.*
Supply,—discussion in, 1544, 1549.
- Immigration to Manitoba:*
1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 180.
- Immigration to Manitoba, arrangements.*
With Mr. Prittie, etc., M. for Cor. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) 496.

- Immigration to N. West, encouragement.*
Grants of land for, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Oliver*) 106.
- Imports.*
Recent, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 54; (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.
Brit. Columbia, M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 137.
- Indemnities, Members', rates of.*
Since 1841, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 839.
- Indemnity of Members, reduction, B. No. 95** (*Mr. Béchard*).
1^o*, 1533.
- Independence of Parlt. Act Amt. B. No. 86** (*Mr. Rykert*).
1^o*, 1453.
- Indian Act Amt. B. No. 94** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*).
1^o*, 1533; 2^o*, 1669; Com. of W. and reported*, 1702; Senate Amts. agreed to, 2003-4. (42 *Vic.*, c. 34).
- Indian Agents, &c., N.W. Territories.*
Appointments & Dismissals, M. for O. Cs. (*Mr. Mills*) 666.
- Indian Dept. N.W., Supplies for.*
Contractors, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 497.
- Indian Reservations, Manitoba.*
M. for O. Cs., &c., respecting (*Mr. Merner*) 674.
- Indians, Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Vaccination of, Ms. for Pap. (*Mr. Cimon*) 241.
- Indians, Enfranchisement of.*
M. for Ret. respecting (*Mr. Dawson*) 844.
- Indians, Expenditure for.*
Supply,—discussion in, 1684-90, 1854.
- Indian, Sitting Bull, Nationality of.*
Statement in papers, *Ques.* (*Mr. Dubuc*) 1756.
- Indians, Lakes Huron and Superior.*
Arrears due to, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Dawson*) 180.
- Indians, starving, at La Chapelle, N.W.T.*
Information respecting, *Ques.* (*Mr. Mills*) 1292.
- Infectious Diseases (Mr. Pope's B.)* See "Contagious Diseases."
- Inland Bills of Exchange (Mr. Doull's B.)*
See "Bills of Exchange."
- Inland Revenue Refunds.*
1873-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hesson*) 665; 1867-73, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Trow*) 920.
- Insolvency Acts Amt. B. No. 3** (*Mr. Bourassa*).
1^o*, 48; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.
- Insolvency, Assignees, Official, Quebec.*
Moneys paid by, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 919.
- Insolvency (Bankruptcy) B. No. 2** (*Mr. Colby*).
1^o*, 41; referred to Sel. Com.*, 293.

Insolvency Laws.

Amt., intention of Govt.. Ques. (*Mr. Gigault*) 48.

M. for Sel. Com. of Enquiry (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) 189; Debate resumed, 208; M. agreed to, 221; additional members appointed, 221; Petitions referred, 293.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. No. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*).

1^o*, 107; order for 2^o, 1575; postponed, 1578; resumed, 1622; 2^o carried (*Y.* 117, *N.* 60) 1627; Com. of W., 1769; Amts. (*Mr. Girouard, J. Cartier*) 1769, withdn., 1782; Amt., to defer operation of B. (*Mr. MacDonnell*) negatived, 1783; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) negatived (*Y.* 55, *N.* 107) 1783; B. 3^o, 1784.

Insolvent Act, 1875, Repeal, &c., B. No. 85 (*Mr. Colby*).

1^o*, 1412; 2^o m., 1594; Amt. Res. for unconditional repeal (*Mr. Béchard*) 1610; M. to adj. debate (*Mr. Coursol*) 1616; withdn., 1621; Amt. carried (*Y.* 99, *N.* 75) 1621.

Insolvent Act Repeal, &c., B. No. 22 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).

1^o*, 126; referred to Sel. Com., 293.

Insolvent Act, 1875, Amt. B. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*).

Introduction m., 1885; M. withdn., 1886.

Insolvent Estates, 1877-78.

Particulars, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Drew*) 106.

Insurance, Government Life.

Res. respecting (*Mr. Tilley*) withdn., 1669.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.**Intercol. Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 28** (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*)

Introduction m., 138; withdn., 139; introduced and 1^o, 156; 2^o*, 562; Com. and reported*, 1266; 3^o on a div., 1572. (42 *Vic.*, c. 10).

Rivière du Loup Branch, G.T.R., purchase, etc., B. No. 119 (*Mr. Tupper*).

Res. in Com. of W. and reported*, 1982; Res. considered, 1992; agreed to on a division, 1999; B. 1^o*, 1999; 2^o, 1999; 3^o*, 2001. (42 *Vic.* c. 11).

Riv. du Loup Br., G. T. R.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*) 47; Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 73.

Employés' Insurance Fund.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. McKay*) 49.

Dismissals, Northern Division.

Recently, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Fiset*); Amt., 1873-78 (*Mr. Vallée*) 57.

Halifax Terminus.

Waterside Term. and Elevator, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 66.

Private rights, Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*) 66.

Winter Port, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 70.

Carriage of Government Supporters.

Rimouski, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 84.

Lumber, refuse, purchased for.

Northumberland. M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville*) 87.

INTERCOLONIAL R'LWAY—Con.*Employés in Rimouski.*

Particulars respecting, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 107.

Rimouski Wharf Improvements.

Intention to make, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 112; M. for Engr.'s Rep., 125.

Monthly Receipts from, and Freight on.

Ms. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 124.

Sleepers, last contract for.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fiset*) 125.

Employés of, on 31st Dec., 1878.

Names, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 137, 178.

Coal on N.S. and N.B. Branches.

Shipment at false rates, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 439.

Cars over-weighted; sale of coal to officials; M. for Pap. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 654.

Ste. Flavie, Land claims.

Marquis and Beaubien, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 491.

Eastern Extension, purchase of.

N. B. Govt. claims, Ques. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 547; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1299.

Eastern Extension, Coal Rolling Stock.

Amount of, Ques. (*Mr. Doull*) 652.

Wood Supply for, in Rimouski.

Tenders, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 658.

Damages to cattle and goods.

Payments for, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 663.

Metapedia River, Buildings on.

Sale of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robitaille*) 828.

Clarke, Henry, Truro.

Damages claim, M. for Pap. (*Mr. McKay*) 838.

Murray & Co., Contractors.

Disputed claims, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 916. See "Supply," below.

Stark, E. O., Spring Hill Station Agent.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville*) 918.

Bouchard, J. D., St. Simon Station Master.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Fiset*) 1265.

Bourdeau, J., Ste. Flavie, Engine House Superintendent.

Removal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*) 1398; M. withdn., 1398.

Branch Ry. to Cape Tormentine.

Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 1550.

Supply—Discussion in: St. John Deep

Water Extension, 1643, 1856; Nut-locks, 1643, 1858; Maintenance, 1728, 1865; Murray's claim, 1833; carried on div., 1884.

Interest, rate of, B. No. 35 (*Mr. Méthot*).

1^o*, 221; 2^o m., 1582; Amt., 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Plumb*) carried (*Y.* 97, *N.* 68) 1585.

Internal Commission.

Appointment (*H. E.*) 41.

International Bridge Co., B. No. 11 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).

1^o*, 71; 2^o*, 111; 3^o*, 628. (42 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

Inverness, P. O. at Brodie's.Establishment of, Ques. (*Mr. Olivier*) 1250.**Iron, Bar, Imports, N. S. and N. B.**1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dompville*) 180.**Isle Blanche, Floating Light.**Intentions of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 71.**Isolated Risk & Farmers' Fire Ins. Co. Acts Amt., and change of name of Co. B. No. 18** (*Mr. Mackenzie*).1°*, 107; 2°*, 156; Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 924. (42 *Vic.*, c. 70.)**IVES, Mr.**Red R., R. McKenzie's losses (*M. for Cor.*) 105.Veterans, 1812 (*M. for Ret.*) 105.Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 170.Elections, Corrupt Practices Act Amt. (*B.* 32, 1°*) 189; on 2°, 1274.*Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 695.*Supply*—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1628-30; Militia (Drill Instruction) 1636.**JACKSON, Mr.**Ministers' Salaries, Members' Indemnities (*M. for Ret.*) 839-40.**Jacques Cartier Bank B. No. 50** (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).1°*, 409; 2°*, 489; Com. and reported *, 1266; 3°*, 1346. (42 *Vic.*, c. 54.)**John Stewart Deposit** (*Mr. McCarthy's B.*). See "Stewart."**Jolicœur dit Lachaine, Grosse Isle.**Dismissal of, Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 563.**JONES, Mr.**Carillon Dam, M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 45.Duties, Rebate (*M. for Ret.*) 65.Trade Marks B. 82 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. of W., 1292.*Tariff*—Res. 2 (Drawbacks) on 2°, 1327;

Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) 1329; 1331; Res. 11, on 2°—(Cheese) 1421;

(Coal) 1431; (Screws, iron) 1462-6.

Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1538; Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1629; Pub. Works, Inc. (Buildings, Que.) 1663; Collection of Revenue (Customs) 1692.Statutory Holidays B. 57 (*Mr. Domville*) on 3°, and *Mr. Holton's* Amt. ("hoist") 1766; on *Mr. Brooks's* Amt. (to re-com.) 1768.**Jordan Bay Breakwater.**Erection, cost, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson*) 54.**Judges' Salaries, Prov. of Quebec.**Increase of, Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 562.**Judges' Salaries** (*Bs. respecting*). See the respective Provinces.**Kaministiquia.** See "PACIFIC RAILWAY."**Kamouraska and Paspébiac Mail Service.**Change of Cont., Remarks (*Mr. Huntington*) 1729.**Supply**,—discussion in, 1729.**Kamouraska, Fishery Overseer.**Caron, complaint against, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 920.**KAULBACK, Mr.***Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 775.*Supply*—Estimates: Fisheries (Overseers, and Breeding) 1837.Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1844.**KEELER, Mr.**Trent R. Navigation Works (*M. for Ret.*) 104; (*M. for Cont.*) 904; Addendum, 1025.P.O.D., use of private letter on file (*M. for Cor.*) 495, 547-9.Mail route, Brighton and Pr. Edwd. (*Ques.*) 547.Presqu' Isle Light-keeper, dismissal (*M. for Pap.*) 663.Presqu' Isle Govt. lands (*Ms. for Ret. respecting*) 829.Presqu' Isle Channel, dredging of (*Ques.*) 904.Murray Canal, construction of (*Ques.*) 904.Presqu' Isle Lighthouse, site of (*M. for Pap.*) 919.*Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Books, &c.) 1342.Supreme Ct. Act Repeal (*B.* 84, 1° m.) 1373; on 2°, 1379, 1390.**Ketchum, Mr., St. John Penitentiary.**Investigation, M. for Rep. (*Mr. Domville*) 492; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 667.**KILLAM, Mr.***Newfield*, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 148.

American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for Pap., 182.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. Incorp. (*B.* 46, 1°*) 338; on order into Com. of W., 921-2-3;(*B. withdn.*) 924.

Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 668.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 737-8, 1160; Res. 11, on 2° (Brass) 1346.Montreal Harbr. Dues B. 88 (*Mr. Pope*) on Res. in Com., 1501-2.Seamen's Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Pope*) on Res. in Com., 1503.**KILVERT, Mr.**Union Assurance Co. Acts Amt. (*B.* 36, 1°*) 221.Moore, S. J., claim for losses (*M. for Cor.*, by *Mr. Hooper*) 240; M. withdn., 241.Port Huron, vessels reporting at (*M. for Cor.*) 663.*Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2° and *Mr. Mackenzie's* Amt., 1091.Detroit Tunnel Co. Incorp. (*B.* 100, 1°*) 1585.Canada & Detroit Bridge Co. Incorp. (*B.* 101, 1°) 1585; 2° m., 1585.**Kincardine Harbour Works.**Expenditure on, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Farrow*) 240.

KING, Mr.

- Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 777. Personal explan., 1451-2-4-5.
Fish-breeding Estab., St. John R. (*Ques.*) 1250.
Washademoak R., dredging of (*Ques.*) 1250.

Kingston & Pembroke Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 24 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).

- 1°, 140; 2°, 208; Com. of W., amd. and reported, 629; 3°, 651; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 1123. (42 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

Kingston, John Stewart Deposit (*Mr. McCarthy's B.*) See "Stewart."*Kingston, Ordnance Lands in.*

- Disposal of, intention, *Ques.* (*Mr. Skinner*) 1397.

KIRKPATRICK, Mr.

- Dismissals, Appointments, &c., recent, on Ms. for Ret., 27, 28, 29.

- Public Acts., reference to Sel. Stand. Com. (*m.*), 70.

- Domin. Telegraph Co. Act Amt. (*B.* 10, 1°*) 71.

- International Bridge Co. (*B.* 11, 1°*) 71.

- Kingston & Pembroke Ry. Act Amt. (*B.* 24, 1°*) 140.

- Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 173; (*M. to refer to Com.*) 833.

- Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 382.

- Sarah E. Bryant*, seizure of, on M. for Pap., 681.

- Ont. Maritime Court B. 34 (*Mr. McCuaig*) on M. for 2°, 685.

- Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 916.

- Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (*Mr. Doull*) on ref. to Banking Com., 926.

- Ottawa Loan & Investment Co. Act Amt. (*B.* 78, 1°*) 1123.

- Building Societies, Ont. (*B.* 79, 1°*) 1213.

- Stationery, quality of (*M., Print. Com. to enquire*) 1213.

- Supply*—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1658.

- Ont. Maritime Ct. Act Amt. B. 73 (*Mr. McDonald*) in Com., 1804.

Kootenay River, B.C.

- Clearing of, intention, *Ques.* (*Mr. Bunster*) 1397.

KRANZ, Mr.

- Custom-houses, expenses, regulation of (*Ques.*) 651.

- Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Books, &c.) 1344.

Lachaine, Gaiien, Crane Island.

- Postmaster, dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 835.

Lachine Canal.

- Expenditure on, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 47.

- Employés' names, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 125.

Lachine Canal—Con.

- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington*) 550; Resumed debate, 563; M. agreed to, 610.

- Supply,—discussion in, 1649.

Lady Head, Govt. Steamer.

- Loss of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Vallée*) 549.

Lands (*Bs. respecting*). See "Dominion," "N. W. Territories," and "Ordnance."**LANDRY, Mr.**

- Montmagny Basin Survey (*M. for Ret.*) 54.

- St. Lawrence Survey (*M. for Rep.*), 62.

- Grosse Isle Transport Contract (*M. for Pap.*) 67.

- Rimouski, Statute Labour in, (*M. for Pap.*) 67.

- Intercol. Ry., Carriage of Electors, on M. for Ret., 84.

- Intercol. Ry. Employés, Rimouski (*M. for Ret.*) 107.

- Rimouski, Work at Matane, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 113, 117.

- Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 216.

- Berthier Wharf repairs, particulars (*M. for Ret.*) 240.

- Grosse Isle, repairs, particulars (*M. for Ret.*) 241.

- Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 339.

- Taschereau, Judges, appointment of (*M. for Cor.*) 505.

- Grosse Isle, Sheds. re-building of (*Ques.*) 546.

- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 553.

- Joliceur and Hurst, dismissals of (*Ques.*) 563.

- Grosse Isle, settlement of (*Ques.*) 651.

- Intercol. Ry., Wood Tenders (*M. for Ret.*) 658.

- Rimouski, Harbour of Refuge (*M. for Cor.*) 658.

- Dusseault, J. B., payments to (*M. for Ret.*) 675.

- Montmagny, Postmasters, complaints against (*M. for Pap.*) 835.

- Caron, Clovis, complaints against, &c. (*M. for Pap.*) 920.

- Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1369; (Pig iron) on Mr. Bourassa's Amt., 1447.

- Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1593.

LANE, Mr.

- Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2°, and Mr. Béchar's Amt., 1610.

- Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. Macdougall*) on 3° and Mr. Mills's Amt. for "hoist," 2010.

Langélier, Charles, Chambly Canal.

- Payments to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Houde*) 844.

LANGÉVIN, Mr.

- P. O. Dept., Report (*presented*) 71.

- Hamilton, Public Buildings, purchase (*Ans.*) 74.

- P. O. Regulations., returning letters, (*Ans.*) 57.

- Lord's Day observance, Res. (*Amt.*) 79.

LANGÉVIN, Mr.—Con.

- Intercol. Ry., carriage of electors, on M. for Ret., 86.
 Quebec Fire Ass. Co. Stock (*B.* 14, 1^o*) 88.
 Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify cont. 98.
 St. Fabien, Mail Contract, (*Ans.*) 111.
 Toronto Postmastership (*Ans.*) 111; on M. for O.C., 131.
 Paymasters' Salaries, Increase (*Ans.*) 112.
 Registered Letters, tampering with (*Ans.*) 112.
 Rimouski Wharf Improvement (*Ans.*) 112.
 Rimouski, Work at Matane, &c, on M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 114.
 Post Office Act Amt. (*B.* 39, 1^o*) 222.
 Mail Service in N. Bruce (*Ans.*) 223, 651.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 331.
 Ste. Geneviève Mail Cont. (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 489.
 Belrath P. O., closing of (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 489.
 Albert Ry., Postal Car for (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 489.
 Newspaper Postage, abolition (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 547.
 Brighton and Pr. Edwd. Mails (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 547.
 Fraser R., B.C., P.O. at (*Ans.*) 652.
 N.B. Ry., Postal Car for (*Ans.*) 652.
 Allan Mail Cont., on M. for Cont. and Cor., 674.
 Com., Private Bs., extension of time (*m.*) 688.
 Ottawa and Montreal Mails (*Ans.*) 826.
 Postmasters' Salaries, on M. to refer P.M.G.'s Report to P.A. Com., 827.
 St. Anaclet P.O., location of (*Ans.*) 904.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 923.

LANTIER, Mr.

- Banks, Affairs of (*M. for Ret.*, for *Mr. Gill*) 671; M. postpd., 672.

LARUE, Mr.

- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. 571.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat Flour) on Mr Vallée's Amt., 1363.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on div. and Ques. respecting vote, 1979.

Laurier, Mr.

- Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 323.
Tariff—W. & M., Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1181.
 Traverse, Navigation Improvement (*Ques.*) 1755.
 Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1843-5.
Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Excise, Culling) 1717-18.

Lavoie, Capt., Str. "Rimouski."

- Removal of, *Ques.* (*Mr. Fiset*) 563; M. for orders, 920; Resumed debate, 1581; M. agreed to, 1582.

Laws, Codification of.

- Intention of Govt., *Ques.* (*Mr. Casgrain*) 223.

Leclerc, Victor, Mail Contract of.
 Removal, *Ques.* (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1250.

Legal Services to Govt., 1873-78.

- Particulars of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Lesslie, Mr., Postmaster. Toronto.

- Superannuation, M. for O.C. and Cor. (*Mr. Hay*) 130.

LeSueur, Mr., P.O. Dept.

- Superannuation of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Huntington) 236.

Letellier, Lt.-Governor. See "Quebec."

Letter, private, improper use of.

- In P. O. Dept., M. for Cor. (Mr. Keeler) 495; M. postpd., 496; M. renewed, 547; agreed to, 549.

Letters, Registered, Regulations.

- Intention to alter, *Ques.* (*Mr. Little*) 112.

Letters, uncalled for, Regulations.

- Ques.* respecting (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 75.

Lévesque, Postmaster, St. Donat.

- Complaint against, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Fiset*) 70.

Lévis Graving Dock.

- M. for Ret. of Tends, etc. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 188.

Library of Parliament.

- Annual Report, 5; Com. appointed, 48; Catalogue, discussion in Com. of Supply, 1832, 1875.

Lighthouse Service.

- Supply,—discussion in, 1675.

Lion's Head, Saugeen Peninsula.

- Mail extension to, *Ques.* (*Mr. Gillies*) 651.

L'Islet, works at, payments.

- To J. B. Dusseault, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 675.

LITTLE, Mr.

- Registered letters, tampering with (*Ques.*) 112.

Loan, Govt., of 1878.

- M. for Ret. respecting (*Mr. Cartwright*) 106.

Loans, Foreign.

- Application of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gill*) 671.

Loans to Railways.

- Before Confederation, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Vallée*) 63.

Lobster-cans, American duty on.

- M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ogden*) 667.

Logs, Measuring, Standard Rule.

- Authorised by Govt., *Ques.* (*Mr. Farrow*) 111.

London and Canadian Loan and Agency Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 69 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).

- 2^o*, 825; Com. of W. and reported*, 1003; 3^o*, 1003. (42 *Vic.*, c. 75).

London, Inspector of W. and Meas.

Spettigue, suspension of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Macmillan*) 240; McClary, superannuation of (*Mr. Macmillan*) 241.

LONGLEY, Mr.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 404.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 974.

W. & A. and W. C. Rys., settlement (*Ques.*) 1756.

Lord's Day Observance, Pub. Depts.

Res. (*Mr. Christie*) 75; Amt. (*Mr. Langevin*) 79, agreed to, 84.

Lougheed, Samuel, Molesworth.

Postmaster, dismissal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hesson*) 830; similar M. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 920.

"Louise," Schooner, damages by.

Welland Canal, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McCallum*) 830.

Lunatics, N.W.T. (Mr. McDonald's B.)
See "N. W. Territories."**MCCALLUM, Mr.**

Welland Canal Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 104.
Welland Canal Land Damages (*M. for Ret.*) 106.

Tug, Amer., *Sarah E. Bryant*, seizure of, on M. for Ret., 119, 123, 681.

Welland Canal, Damages (*M. for Ret.*, by *Mr. Hesson*) 179.

U.S. Canals, navigation of, on M. for Cor., 188.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 209.
Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, etc., on M. for Ret., 502.

P.O.D., use of private letter on file, on M. for Cor., 549.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 606; on Q. of Ord., 599.

Welland, marsh land claims (*M. for Cor.*) 672.

Maritime Ct., Ont., Repeal B. 34 (*Mr. McCuaig*) on M. for 2°, 687.

Welland Canal, damages by *Louise* (*M. for Pap.*) 830.

Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 910.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 542, 1008; Res. 11, on 2°—(Carriages, &c.) 1429; (Coal) 1433; (Stone, building) 1484.

Canada and Detroit Bridge Co. Incorp. B. 101 (*Mr. Kilvert*) 1586.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) in Com., 1711.

Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1651-3-4; Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1665-6; Collection of Revenues (Pub. Works, Maintenance,—Canals) 1727.

Conc.: Pacif. Ry., (*Wallace's claim*) 1877.

MCCARTHY, Mr.

Quebec, Lt.-Gov., M. for Pap. (*Amt.*) 49.

Collingwood Harbour Expenditure (*M. for Ret.*) 84.

MCCARTHY, Mr.—Con.

Stewart Deposit (*B., propd., withdn.*) 139, 140.

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (*B. 4, 1°**) 59; (*2° m.*) 164.

S. Grenville Election, Enquiry (*M. for Address*) 236-7; M. amd. and agreed to, 238.

Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal (*B. 44, 1°**) 293; 2°, 1278; M. to refer to Com. of W., 1285; on Res. into Com., 1572-3.

Direct U.S. Cable Co. (*B. 47, 1°**) 338; *withdn.*, 1696.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 271.

Green Island, etc., leases (*M. for Pap.*, by *Mr. Stephenson*) 674.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2°, 1378.

Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1590.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Bécharde*) on 2°, 1626.

Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1665.

Assiniboine, Prof. O'Donoghue's land claim (*M. for Pap.*) 1763.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1991.

McClary, Peter, London.

Insp. of W. and M., superannuation of (*Mr. Macmillan*) 241.

MCCUAIG, Mr.

Maritime Court, Ont., Act Repeal (*B. 34, 1°**) 221; 2° m., 684, 687; B. *withdn.*, 688.

Moir River, Timber dues, Repeal of (*B. 49, 1°**) 409; (*2°**) 488; in Com., 1885; 3° 1885; Fees remitted, 1982-3.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 591-2.

Tug, Amer., *Sarah E. Bryant*, seizure of, on M. for Pap., 683-4.

Temperance Act, intent (*B. 70, 1°**) 904; on 2°, 1285.

Maritime Court, Ont., Act Amt. (*B. 73, 1°**) 1026.

Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 1282.

Montreal Harbour Dues B. 88 (*Mr. Pope*) Res. in Com., 1502.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Bécharde*) in Com., on *Mr. Girouard's* Amts., 1777.

Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1846.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1983-6, 1992.

Supply—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans) 1630; Militia (Brigade Majors) 1631-2; Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1649; Pub. Works, Inc. (Buildings, Ont.) 1662.

Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. McDougall*) on 3° and *Mr. Mills's* Amt. for 3 months' "hoist," 2009.

MCDONALD, Mr. (Cape Breton).

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 572-3-5.

McDONALD, Mr. (Cape Breton)—Con.

N. Sydney Harbour, B. respecting (*introduction m., and withdn.*) 649.

Supply—Estimates; Ocean Service (Mail Subsidies, Campbellton & Gaspé) 1674.

MACDONALD, Mr. (King's, P.E.I.)

Mail Contract, P.E.I. (*M. for Pap.*) 137.

Mackerel, Seining for (*M. for Cor.*) 224; agreed to, 230.

Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on M. for Cor., 248.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com. on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1777.

Fishery Award, disposal, on Mr. Fortin's Res., 1749.

Georgetown and Pictou steam ferry (*Ques.*) 1756.

McDONALD, Mr., (Pictou.)

Insolvency Act, 1875, (*Ans.*) 48.

Chinese Tax Bill, B.C. (*Ans.*) 66.

Supreme Court Act Amt. (*Ans.*) 65.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 154, 162.

Penitentiaries, Report on, presented, 156.

Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4, on 2°, adj. debate, 178.

Insolvency Laws (*M. for Sel. Com.*) 189, 213.

Criminal and Commercial Laws, Codification (*Ans.*) 223.

Election Petitions, N. B., on M. for Rets., 235.

Public Works Contracts, 1873-79, on M. for Pap. (*for Mr. Tupper*) 236.

S. Grenville Election, Enquiry, on M. for Address (*Q. of Proceed.*) 237-8.

St. John Penitentiary, on M. for Cor. (*Amt. suggested*) 240.

Penitentiaries Act, 1875, Amt. (*B. 51, 1°*) 409; on 2°, 1298-1300.

Carriers' responsibilities, legislation on (*Ans.*) 491.

Ont. Maritime Court, working of, on M. for Rets., 503.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Doull's sp., 526; on Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1455.

Police of Canada Act Amt. (*B. 54, 1°*) 506.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 602-4.

Judges' Salaries, Quebec (*Ans., by Mr. Tupper*) 563.

N. W. Territories Courts !. 5 (Mr. Mills) on M. for 2°, 676, 680.

Divorce Court Judge for N.B. (*Ans.*) 827.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killiam) on M. into Com., 923.

Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on 2°, 925, 926.

Vice-Chancellor Blake, on Mr. Costigan's remarks, 1084.

Bills of Ex. B. 31 (Mr. Baby) in Com. of W., 1237-8.

Waterley, D. H., P. O. Clerk, damages awarded (*Ans.*) 1249.

Dominion Day B. 72 (Mr. Cockburn) on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 1286-7.

B.C. Supreme Court Judges (*B. 97, M. into Com. of W.*) 1288-9-90; in Com., 1534-5; (*B. 1°*) 1535.

McDONALD, Mr. (Pictou)—Con.

Supreme Ct. Act Amt. (*B. 74, 1°*) 1080; on 2°, 1587-8-9, 1890-1-2; in Com. (*Amts.*)

1801-2-3-4; Senate Amts. (*agreement to m.*) 2036, 2042; (*Amt. m.*) 2043.

Speedy Trials Act Amt. (*B. 75, 1°*) 1080; on 2°, 1294-5.

Mercer Female Reformatory (*B. 76, 1°*) 1080; on 2°, 1296.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 1°, 1373; on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 1379.

Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1536-7; (Manitoba) 1540;

(B.C.) 1540; Legislation (Speaker's arrears) 1541.

Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Penitentiaries (Manitoba) 1832; Railways (Intercol. Murray's claim) 1834-5.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on 2°, 1575-6-7-8; B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, and Mr. Béchard's

Amt., 1621; B. 15, in Com., 1776; (*Amt. m.*) 6 months' "hoist," 1782.

Defendants' costs in Crown suits B. 17 (Mr. MacDonnell) on 2°, 1578-9-80.

Ordnance Lands, N.S. and N.B. (*B. 102, 1°*) 1628.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1712.

Lunatics, N.W.T., keeping of (*B. 106, 1°*) 1730.

N.B. Supreme Ct. Judge (*B. 109, Res. in Com., 1° and 2°*) 1787-9, 1793.

P.E.I. County Ct. Judges (*B. 110, Res. in Com., 1° and 2°*) 1793-5-6.

Ont. Maritime Ct. Act Amt. (*B. 73, 2°*) 1804.

Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdougall) on 3°, 1879.

Prevention of Crime Act extension (*B. 115, 1°, 2° and 3°*) 1841.

Insolvent Act Amt. B. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) on M. to introduce, 1886.

McDONALD, Mr. (Victoria, N.S.)

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 958.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights & Meas.) 1724.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.

Election of Speaker, (*M.*) 2.

Oaths of Office (*B. 1°*) 4.

Speech from Throne, consideration, (*m.*) 5.

Select Standing Committees (*M. for*) 5, 25, 47.

Debates, Reporting (*Ans.*) 6; on M. to ratify cont., 93.

Address, on the, 22.

Gov.-Gen'l's Commission & Instructions (*Ans.*) 26, (*Mess.*) 42.

Dismissals, Appointments, &c., recent, on M. for Ret., 28.

Dismissals, &c., officials of House, on M. for Pap., 35, 38, 39.

Messages from His Excellency, 41, 42, 83.

Riel, Louis, pardon of (*Ans.*) 42, 66.

Charlevoix, Mr. Ferreault's seat, on Ques. Priv., 43, 44.

Library Committee, (*M.*) 48.

Princess Alice's death, 48; Address (*moved*) 59; (*Mess.*) 1397.

Plague, Precautions, on M. for Address, 56.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—*Con.*

- Sel. Stand. Coms., (*M.*) 5; lists (*conc.*) 47, 59; (*additions to*) 546.
 Quebec Walls, improvement (*Ans.*) 60.
 Welland Canal, Mr. McMahon, on M. for Ret., 62
 Bills, Private, Pets. for, time extended (*M.*) 65.
 Race Rocks, B.C., Fog Bell (*Ans.*) 67.
 Ash Wednesday, adjournment over (*m.*) 71.
 Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1°, 73; on 2°, 110.
 Fishery Award, share of P.E.I. (*Ans.*) 74.
 Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 81.
 Mounted Police Acts Amt. (*B.* 13, 1°*) 88; in Com. of W., 126-9 (*Amt.*); 221.
 Red R., R. McKenzie's losses, on M. for Cor., 105.
 Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co. Bill 6 (Mr. Schultz) on 2°, 108.
 Tug, Amer. Wrecking, seizure, on M. for Ret., 123.
 Dominion Lands Act Amt. (*B.* 21, 1°*) 125; (*withdn.*) 1534.
 Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 132, 135.
 Intercol. Ry., Halifax City Ry., on proposed B. (Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.) 139; B. 28, on 1°, 156.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 161.
 Election Trials, N.B. (*Ans.*) 157.
 Manitoba, Colonisation Roads (*Ans.*) 157.
 Ontario Boundary, confirmation of Award (*Ans.*) 157.
 Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 190, 219; to add names to Com. (*m.*) 221.
 Mounted Police, Recruiting for (*Ans.*) 222.
 Penny coins, withdrawal of (*Ans.*) 223.
 Banks, Inspection, measure for (*Ans.*) 224.
 Alaska Boundary, on M. for Cor., 232.
 Red River, Reservations, on M. for O. Cs., 233.
 Quebec Constitutional Question: on Q. of Ord. respecting vote, 408; H. E.'s action (*Statement*) 944; on Mr. Ouimet's remarks (*Reply*) 983; on Mr. Mackenzie's Ques. and remarks (*Replies*) 1027-9; on *Globe* report (*Contradiction*) 1100; on Mr. Mousseau's M. for Res., condemning reference of case to England (*Q. of Ord.*) 1762; on Mr. Holton's remarks, 1831; on conc. in W. & M. Res., 2002-3; on 39 of Supply B., 2011-15-16, 2021-3-4-5-6.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. in Com., passing *en bloc*, on Q. of Proceed., 474-5; Special Tariff for B.C. (*Ans.*) 491; Res. 2°, discussion on Q. of Proceed., 507-8; Debate, precedence (*M. & Q. of Ord.*) 650; (*M.*) 688; Additional Copies in French (*Ans.*) 824, 1406; Res., on conc. (*Amt., M. into Com.*) 1202; on Mr. Doull's Q. of Priv. (*Globe* report) 1251; Res. 11, on 2° and Mr. Houde's Amt. (Wheat) for Res. in Com. of W., 1355-6; (Wheat flour) 1360; on Mr. Vallée's Amt., Wheat flour free, 1364; Mr. King's personal explan. (*Q. of Ord.*) 1434-5; on Mr. Tilley's personal explan., 1459; (Screws, iron) 1464; on Q. of Ord., Mr. Plumb's sp., 1469; (Opium) 1471;

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—*Con.*

- (Paintings. &c.) 1473; B. No. 93, on 2°, 1820-3-4-5; H. E.'s despatches (*Ans.*) 1669.
 Rifles, importation into N.W. (*Ans.*) 489.
 Ste. Geneviève Mail Contract (*Ans. for Mr. Langevin*) 489.
 Beltrath P.O., closing of (*Ans. for Mr. Langevin*) 489.
 Albert Ry., postal car for (*Ans. for Mr. Langevin*) 489.
 Average Adjusters, appointment of (*Ans.*) 491.
 Appointments, &c., 1873 & 1878, Cabinet cor. respecting (*Ans.*) 492.
 Dorchester Penitentiary, Robertson, dismissal, on Q. of Proceed., production of Pap., 494.
 P. O. D., use of private letter on file, on M. for Cor., 496, 548-9.
 Mounted Police, supply contracts, on M. for Ret., 497.
 Miramichi Marine Hospital, state of, on M. for Pap., 498.
 Fertilisers, fraud in manufacture of, on M. for Sel. Com., 499.
 Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, etc., on M. for Ret., 501.
 Maritime Ct., Ont., working of, on M. for Ret., 504.
 Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) in Com. of W., 507.
 Newspaper Postage, abolition (*Ans., for Mr. Langevin*) 547.
 Mail route, Brighton and Pr. Edwd. (*Ans., for Mr. Langevin*) 547.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal, M. for Pap., on Mr. Tilley's personal statement, 604.
 Mounted Police, Supplies (*Ans.*) 651.
 Hemlock bark, export duty (*Ans.*) 651.
 Parliament, time of meeting (*Ans.*) 651.
 Quartz machinery, B.C., duties, on M. for Pap., 657.
 Mitchell & Co., supplies by, &c., on M. for Pap., 659-62.
 Banks, affairs of, on M. for Ret., 672.
 N. W. Terr. Courts B. 5 (Mr. Mills) on M. for 2°, 677-8-9.
 Maritime Ct., Ont., Repeal B. 34 (Mr. McCuaig) on M. for 2°, 686-8.
 Govt. business, precedence (*Ms. for*) 738, 1290, 1533, 1668, 1841, 1885.
 Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White) on 1°, 740; on 2°, 1396.
 Superannuation Act, working (*M. for Sel. Com.*) 741.
 Census and Statistics, on Res. in Com. of W. (Mr. Pope) 742; in Com., B. 67, 1233-5-6-7.
 Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (Mr. Fortin) on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 826.
 Indians, enfranchisement of, on M. for Ret., 845.
 Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Robertson) on M. into Com., 847.
 Controvd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2°, 851-2.
 Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 912-14-15-16.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 922.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—Con.
 Receiver Genl. and Min. of P.W., B. 66 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1244-6.
 Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1247-8-9.
 Steamship line, Halifax and Brazil (*Ans.*) 1249.
 LeClerc, Victor, P. O. Contract, removal (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Duval, U., Postmr., St. Nicholas, complaints (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Brodie's, Megantic, P. O. for (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Sir Geo. Cartier, Monument to (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Elections, Corrupt Practices B. 32 (Mr. Ives) on 2°, 1277.
 Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2°, 1283; on M. for Ref. to Com. of W. and Q. of Proceed., 1285.
 B.C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald) on M. into Com. of W., 1288-90.
 Official Arbitrators B. 81 (Mr. Cockburn) on 1°, 1291.
 Indians, starving, at LaChapelle (*Ans.*) 1292.
 Manitoba Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 72. 1°) 1003; on 2°, 1296; in Com. of W., 1296.
 Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 51 (Mr. McDonald) on 2°, 1298-9.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 1°, 1374; on 2°, 1381; on Q. of Proceed., 1376, 1386; of Ord., 1389.
 Kingston, Ordnance Lands, disposal of (*Ans.*) 1397.
 St. Fabien P. O., removal of, on M. for Cor., 1399.
 Indian Act Amt. (B. 94, 1°) 1533; Senate Amts. (*Agreement m.*) 2003.
 Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1537; Legislation (Sess. Clks.) 1542; Geolog. Survey, 1681; Indians (Ont.) 1684; (B.C. & N.W.) 1684-8-9, 1690.
 Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Legislation (Library Catalogue) 1832. *See Conc.*
 Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Arts, &c. (Ont. Exhibition) 1849; Ocean and R. Service (Canada and Brazil subsidy) 1853-4; Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1854; Legislation (Sessional Clerks) 1855-6.
 Conc.: (Intercol. Ry. 'to deep water, St. John) 1858; (Mr. Fichet's gratuity) 1874; (Library Catalogue) 1875-6.
 Defendants' costs in Crown Suits B. 17 (Mr. MacDonnell) on 2°, 1579, 1581.
 Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res. in Com., 1700-1.
 Judge Polette, on Pet. for removal, (*Q. of Ord.*) 1755.
 Manitoba, Settlers' claims (*Ans.*) 1755.
 Red R., Squatters' lands (*Ans.*) 1755.
 Georgetown and Pictou Ferry (*Ans.*) 1756.
 Sitting Bull's nationality (*Ans.*) 1756.
 P. E. I. claims, Fishery Award, (*Ans.*) 1757.
 Militiamen of 1837-38, Land grants for (*Ans.*) 1757.
 Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3° and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1768.
 Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (Mr. Tilley) on Res. 1783-4-6; on 2° of B., 1786.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—Con.
 N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1790-1.
 Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1845.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. McDougall) on 3°, 1883, 2004.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper); on proposed Res., 1906, 1915, 1948; on conc. in Res., 1967-8, 1970-2-3-6-7.
 Vote, Mr. Larue's, B. 116, on Ques. of Ord., 1979.
 Stranger (Macdonell) conduct of, on Ques. of Priv., 1944; (*Summons m.*) 1981.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of, on discussion (*Remarks*) 1989; on Q. of Ord., 1984.
 Riv. du Loup Branch, G.T.R., B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) on 2°, 1999, 2000-1.
 Ontario Boundary Award (*Ans.*) 2011.

Macdonell, John A., conduct of.
 Insult to a member, Q. of Priv. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1943; charge formulated, and summons issued, 1980; Report, writ not servable, 2044; Remarks (Mr. McLennan and others) 2044.

MACDONNELL, Mr.
 Costs in Crown suits (B. 17, 1°) 107; m. (2° m.) 1578; (*B. withdn.*) 1581.
 Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 228.
 Port Hood Harbour Improvement (*Q.*) 490.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 608.
 Kaministiquia Terminus, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Ord.*) 833.
 Cheticamp Harbour, dredging (*Ques.*) 1249.
 Chinese in B.C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1264.
 Truro & Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (Mr. Tupper) on 3°, 1507.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2° and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1620; B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1774; (*Amt. m.*) to defer operation of B. 1782.
 Supply—Estimates: Fisheries (Breeding) 1679.
 Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res., 1698.
 Fishery Award, disposal, on Mr. Fortin's Res., 1750.

McDoucAll, Mr.
 Dismissals, Appointments, etc., M. for Ret. (*Amt.*) 28.
 Dismissals, Officials of House, on M. for Pap., 40.
 Ontario Boundaries, on M. for Reports, 52, 54.
 Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1°, 72; on 2°, 109.
 Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 82.
 Debates, reporting, on M. to ratify cont., 101.
 Mounted Police B. 13 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. of W., 129.
 Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 193.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 288.

McDOUGALL, Mr.—*Con.*

- Inland Bills of Ex. B, 16 (Mr. Doull) on ref. to Banking Com., 926.
 Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) on 2°, 943.
 Pacif. Ry., on offer of Engrs'. Reports *confidentially* to Leader of Opp. (*Remarks*) 1081.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1172; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2°, 1331.
 Pacif. Ry. Route W. of Selkirk (*Ques.*) 1551.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief (*B.* 99 1°*) 1572; (2° *m.*) 1707; (3° *m.*) 1878, 1882, 2005.
 Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on Res. into Com. of W., 1573.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2°, 1576, 1624-6.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals—Welland) 1650; Geological Survey, 1683.
 Conc.: (Library Catalogue) 1875.
 Pacif. Ry. Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res. in Com., 1961-3-4.

McINNES, Mr.

- Tin, rebate on, B. C. (*Ques.*) 73.
 Fraser R. Salmon Hatchery (*M. for Cor.*) 104; (*Ques.*) 652.
 Fraser R., P. O. for (*Ques.*) 652.
 New Westminster, P. O., construction of (*Ques.*) 652.
 Railway Reserves, B. C., Settlers' rights (*Ques.*) 827.
 Penitentiary, B. C., construction of (*M. for Pap.*) 1406-9.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Agricultural implements) 1338.
Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (B. C.) 1540.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res., 1951.

McISAAC, Mr.

- Tracadie Harbour, Dredging (*Ques.*) 223.
 Arisaig Pier, Improvement (*Ques.*) 827.
 McNair's Cove, Pier (*Ques.*) 1249.
 Bayfield, Breakwater at (*Ques.*) 1550.

McKAY, Mr.

- Intercol. Ry., Ins. Fund (*M. for Ret.*) 49.
 Govt. Rys., N. S. and N. B., coal-cars checked, on M. for Ret., 654.
 Amet Island Breakwater (*M. for Pap.*) 657.
 Intercol. Ry., H. Clarke's claim, (*M. for Pap.*) 838.
 Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 924.

MACKENZIE, Mr.

- Election of Speaker, on M., 2.
 Appointments of Clerks Assistant, on Mr. Speaker's Rep., 5.
 Debates, Reporting (*Ques.*) 6; on M. to ratify cont., 92.
 Address, on the, 16.
 Gov.-Gen's Commission and Instructions, (*Ques.*) 26.
 Pacific Railway, tenders (*Ques.*) 26, 824.
 Dismissals, &c., Officials of House, 37.
 Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat, *Ques.* of Priv., 43.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—*Con.*

- Carillon Dam, on M. for Ret., 45.
 Quebec, Lt.-Gov., on M. for Pap., 49.
 Pacific Ry. Route (*M. for Pap.*) 50.
 Princess Alice's Death, Address (*seconded*) 60.
 Welland Canal, Mr. McMahon, on M. for Ret., 62.
 Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1°, 72; on 2°, 110.
 Red B., R. McKenzie's losses, on M. for Cor., 105.
 Sovereign F. & M. Ins. Co. (*B.* 20, 1°*) 107.
 Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co., B. 6 (Mr. Schultz) on 2°, 107, 108.
 Rimouski, work at Matane, &c., on M. for Ret., 113-4.
 Tug, Amer. wrecking, seizure, on M. for Ret., 123, 681-3-4.
 Mounted Police B. 13 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. of W., 129.
 Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O. C. (*Amt.*) 130, 133.
 Intercol. Ry. (Halifax City Ry.) on proposed Bill, 138-9.
 Stewart, John, deposit, on propd. B., 139.
 Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141, 160.
 Indians, Treaties with, on M. for Pap., 180.
 Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 192.
 Brit. Amer. Life Ins. Co. Incorp. (*B.* 41, 1°*) 251.
 Priv. and Elections Com. (*M. to add Mr. Cameron, S. Huron*) 338.
 Quebec Constitutional Question: on M. for Res., 283, 296; on Premier's statements (*Ques. & Remarks*) 1026-8; on Mr. Mousseau's M. for Res., precedence (*Q. of Ord.*) 1841; on conc. in W. & M. Res., 2001; on 3° of Supply B., 2011-12, 2029.
Budget, on the, 466; on Mr. Tupper's comments, 508-9.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. in Com., passing *en bloc* (*Q. of Proceed.*) 473-4; Res., on 2°, on Mr. Tupper's comments (*Reply*) 508-9; financial statement (*called for*) 509; on Mr. Doull's speech (*comments*) 517, 526.
 Debate, precedence of (*Q. of Ord.*) 650.
 Newfld. fish, duty on (*Ques.*) 743. Res., on 2° (*Amt.*), condemning Govt. scheme, *m.*) 1065; on Mr. Kilvert's sp. (*comments*) 1093; on Mr. Pope's, 1163-4. On M. again into Com. on Proceed. (*Remarks*) 1202. On Mr. Doull's Q. of Priv. (*Globe report*) 1251. Res. 2, Drawbacks, on 2°, 1326-7-8; Res. 4, Tea and Coffee, differential, 1329; Res. 11—(Agricult. Implements) 1334; (Animals) 1339; (Books, &c.) 1341-2; (Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt., 1356; (Wheat flour) 1360, on Mr. Vallée's Amt., Wheat flour free, 1364; (Carriages, &c.) 1418; (Cement) 1420; (Cheese) 1423; (Coal) 1427-35-6-7; (Earthenware) 1441-2; (Furniture) 1444; (India-rubber goods) 1446; (Pig iron) 1449; Screws, iron) 1459-60-2-3-8; (Paintings, &c.) 1472; (Stone, building) 1483-4-5. B. No. 93, on 2°, 1816; on Mr. Tilley's sp., 1813; on Sir John A. Macdonald's, 1821-3. (*Remarks*) H. E.'s despatches, 1628, 1669, 1729.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—*Con.*

- Dorchester Penitentiary, Robertson, dismissal, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Proceed.*) 493.
- Fertilisers, fraud in manufacture of, on M. for Sel. Com., 499.
- Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, &c., on M. for Ret., 499-501.
- Taschereau, the Judges, appointment of, on M. for Cor., 506.
- Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) in Com. of W., 507-8.
- Ryland, Mr., claim of, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Proceed.*) 550.
- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal, on M. for Pap. (*Mr. Cartwright, on Mr. Bergin's personal statement*) 609.
- N. Sydney Harbour, on propd. B. (*Q. of Ord.*) 649.
- Woodstock, N.B., Bridge at, on M. for Pap., 653-4.
- Quartz-mining Machinery, B.C., duties, on M. for Pap., 657.
- Indian Agents, dismissal of (*M. for O. Cs.*) 666.
- War with Russia, volunteers for, on M. for Ret., 666.
- St. John Penitentiary, Warden (*M. for Cor., for Mr. Burpee*) 667.
- Banks, affairs of, on M. for Ret., 672.
- Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White) on 1^o, 739-40; on 2^o, 1395.
- Census & Statistics, on Res. in Com. of W. (Mr. Pope) 742.
- Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (Mr. Fortin) on 2^o and Q. of Proceed., 825.
- Metapedia, disposal of Ry. buildings, on M. for Ret., 829.
- Kaministiquia Harbour, terminus at, on M. for Pap., 833; (*Q. of Ord.*) 834.
- Ventilation of Chamber, on M. for Com., 858.
- Trent R. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 908, 914-15.
- Intercol. Ry., Murray & Co.'s claims (*M. for Pap.*) 916, 918.—See *Supply*, below.
- Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 923-4.
- Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (Mr. Doull) on ref. to Banking Com., 926.
- Pacif. Ry. Conts., Pap. incomplete (*Remarks*) 943; on offer of Engrs.' Reports confidentially, 1080-82.
- Truro & Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (Mr. Tupper) on 2^o, 1239-40; on 3^o, 1504.
- Receiver Genl. and Min. of P.W., B. 66 (Mr. Tupper) in Com. of W., 1242.
- Chinese in B.C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1260-62.
- Bouchard, J. D., St. Simon, dismissal, on M. for Pap., 1265.
- Marine Tel. Act Repeal B. 44 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2^o, 1280-1-4; on reference to Com. of W. (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1285; on Res. into Com., 1573-4.
- Dominion Day B. 72 (Mr. Cockburn) on 2^o (*Q. of Proceed.*) 1286.
- B.C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald) on M. into Com. of W. on Res., 1288.
- Ont. & Pacific Junct. Ry. B. 27 (Mr. Williams) on Senate Amts., 1290.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—*Con.*

- Official Arbitrators B. 81 (Mr. Cockburn) on 1^o, 1291.
- Manitoba Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on 2^o, 1296.
- Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 51 (Mr. McDonald) on 2^o, 1298-9.
- Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) 1374; on 2^o, (*Amt.*) 3 months' "hoist," 1375; on Q. of Proceed., 1377, 1385.
- B.C. Penitentiary, construction of, on M. for Pap., 1409.
- Newfoundland, duties levied by, on M. for Cor., 1411.
- Supply*—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1536-7-8, 1540; (Manitoba) 1540; Legislation (Commons, Dep. Clk.) 1542; (Sess. Clerks) 1543; Quarantine (Cattle) 1548; Militia (Drill instruction) 1639; Public Works, Cap. (Intercol. Ry., nutlocks) 1644; (Pacific Ry.) 1645-6; (Weland Canal) 1653-4-5-8, 1660-1; (Buildings, Ottawa, snow-shovelling) 1661; Pub. Works, Inc. (Navigable Rivers, Que. Harbour) 1661; (Buildings, Ont.) 1662; (Que.) 1662; (N.B.) 1663; (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1665-6; (N.S.) 1667; Miscellaneous (Telegraph Subsidy, Anticosti) 1668; Collection of Revenue (Weights and Measures) 1720-1-3-4; (Public Works, Maintenance, Canals) 1726-7.
- Suppl. Estimates, 1878-9: Legislation (Debates, Report) 1832; (Library Catalogue) 1832; Pub. Works, Cap. (Intercol. Ry., Murray's claim) 1833-4; Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, Oak Point, N.S.) 1836; Miscellaneous (Trade Mission to France) 1839.
- Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Arts, &c. (Ont. Exhibition) 1848; Pub. Works Cap. (Pacif. Ry., W. of Red R.) 1850.
- Conc.: (Intercol. Ry., to Deep water, St. John) 1858; (Nutlocks) 1858-9, 1860; (Ottawa Drill Shed) 1861; (Intercol. Ry.) 1866-7-8, 1870; (Mr. Piché's gratuity) 1873-4; (Library Catalogue) 1875-6; (Pacif. Ry., Wallace's claim) 1877; (Intercol. Ry., Murray's claim) 1884; (Pacif. Ry., B.C.) 1992.
- Rimouski, Capt. Lavoie, on M. for orders to, 1581.
- Usury Prohibition B. 35 (Mr. Méthot) on 2^o, 1584.
- Canada and Detroit Bridge B. 101 (Mr. Kilvert) on 2^o, 1586.
- Ry. Act, 1868, Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Tupper) on withdrawal, 1587.
- Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on 2^o, 1625.
- Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Bowell) on Res. in Com., 1700.
- R. Acts. Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) on 2^o, 1704-5.
- Selkirk Election, on M. for Pap., 1763.
- Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Donville) on M. for 3^o, and Mr. Brooks's Amt. to recom., 1767.
- Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (Mr. Tilley) on 2^o, 1786.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.

- N.B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1793.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper); on propd. Res., 1896, 1908-9, 1910-11-14; on Q. of Ord., 1938, 1941; 1956-7; in Com., 1964; on conc. in Res. 1, 1965 (*Amt. Res. m.*) 1970, 1973-6-7; on conc. in Res. 12 (*Amt. m.*) 1979.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of, on Mr. Costigan's Remarks and Q. of Ord., 1986.
 Riv. du Loup Br, G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) Res. on conc., 1994-5-6; on 2° of B., 1999.
 Stranger (J. A. Macdonell) conduct of (Q. of *Priv.*) 1943; charge formulated, 1981.
 Ont. Boundary Award (*Ques.*) 2011.

McKenzie, Roderick, Property Destroyed.
 Red River Rebellion, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 105.**Mackerel, Practice of Seining for.**

- M. for Cor. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's, P. E. I.*) 224.

"McLean," Schooner. See "*Ella G. McLean.*"**McLENNAN, Mr.**

- Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 80.
 Montreal & Ottawa Junction Ry. Act Amt. (B. 29, 1°*) 189.
 Coteau & Province Line Ry. Act Amt. (B. 30, 1°*) 189.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 380.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 517, 521; on Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1166; Res. 11, on 2° (Paintings, etc.) 1472-3.
 Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals—Welland) 1660.
 Conc.: (Post Office) 1861.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res., 1925.
 Stranger (Macdonell) conduct of (*Remarks*) 2044-6.

McMahon, James A., Welland Canal.

- Absence from duty, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 60.

MACMILLAN, Mr.

- Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 215.
 Spettigue, J. J., suspension of (*M. for Cor.*) 240.
 McClary, Peter, superannuation of (*M. for Cor.*) 241.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 607.
 Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Wheat) on Mr. Houde's Amt., 1358; (Stone, building) 1483.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2°, 1389.
 Supply—Estimates: Immigration, 1565; Collection of Revenue (Weights and Measures) 1726.
 Toronto P. O., Accounts and Salary, 1874-78 (*M. for Pap.*) 1757.
 Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (Mr. Macdonald) on 3° and Mr. Mills's Amt. for 3 months' "hoist," 2010.

McNair's Cove, Antigonish.

- Repair of, Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 1249.

MCRORY, Mr.

- Rideau Canal, damages (*M. for Ret.*) 838.

Magdalen Islands Telegraph (Mr. Tupper's B.) See "Anticosti;" also "Supplx."**Mail Services.** See the respective services.**Mail Subsidies.**

- Supply,—discussion in, 1673.

Malt and Malt Liquor.

- M. for Ret. respecting (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.

Manitoba, Additional Grant to, B. No. 108 (Mr. Tilley).

- Res. in Com. of W., 1784; reported, 1786; 1°, 1786; 2°, 1786; 3°, 1806. (42 *Vic.*, c. 2).

Manitoba and N. W. Loan Co. (Mr. Kirkpatrick's B.) See "Ottawa Loan and Investment Co."**Manitoba, Colonisation Roads in.**

- Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 157.

Manitoba, Financial position of.

- Papers respecting (*Message*) 1627.

Manitoba, Half-breed Reservations.

- M. for O. C.s, etc., respecting (*Mr. Merner*) 674.

Manitoba, Immigration, encouragement.

- Grants of land for, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Oliver*) 106.

Manitoba, Immigration into.

- 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 180.

Manitoba, Indian Agents, etc.

- Appointments and Dismissals, M. for O. Cs. (*Mr. Mills*) 666.

Manitoba, Land Claims.

- Of Prof. O'Donoghue, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 1763.

Manitoba, Land Patents.

- M. for list, with dates, &c. (*Mr. Schultz*) 185.

Manitoba Lands (Sir John A. Macdonald's B.) See "Dominion Lands."**Manitoba, means of Transport to.**

- Arrangements with Railways, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 74.

Manitoba Penitentiary.

- Supply,—discussion in, 1540.

Manitoba Rebellion, R. McKenzie.

- Property destroyed, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 105.

Manitoba, Reservation of Lands.

- On Red R., M. for O. C. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 232.

Manitoba, Settlement arrangements.

- With Mr. Prittie, &c., M. for O. C., &c. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 496.

Manitoba, Settlers' claims.

- Recognition of, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 1755.
 Squatters' lands, price, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 1755.

Manitoba, Telegraph.
 Selkirk and Battleford Cont., M. for Pap. (Mr. Schultz) 830.

Manitoba, Temperance (Mr. McCuaig's B.) See "Temperance."

Manitoba, Timber Leases.
 Red B. Belt, M. for Ret. (Mr. Dubuc) 189.

Marine Telegraphs Act repeal B. No. 44 (Mr. McCarthy).
 1*, 293; 2° m., 1278; agreed to (F. 54, N 28) 1284; referred to Com. of W., 1285; order into Com. of W., 1572; Com. and reported*, 1575; 3°* on a div., 1575.

Maritime Court, Ontario.
 Rules of, M. for Ret. (Mr. Rykert) 503; M. withdn., 505.
 Working of, &c., M. for Ret. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 663.
 (Mr. McCuaig's B.) See "Ontario."

Marquis, Alex., Ste. Flavie.
 Land claims of, Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 491.

MASSON, Mr.
 Militia Report (Presented) 26.
 Veterans, 1812 (Capt. Goddu) on M. for Ret., 105.
 Camps of Military Instruction (Ans.) 112.
 War with Russia, volunteers for, on M. for Ret., 666.

MASSUE, Mr.
 Ste. Anne de Sorel, Piers (M. for Pap.) 106.
 Yamaska R. improvement (M. for Pap.) 106.
 Fertilisers, fraud in manufacture of (M. for Sel. Com.) 498; M. withdn., 499.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1130.

Master Mariners, examination of.
 For extra Certificates, M. for Documents (Mr. Fortin) 842.

Masters and Mates' Certificates Act Extension B. No. 112 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)
 Res. in Com. of W., 1799; reported, 1800; 1^a and 2^{**}, 1800; 3^o*, 1806. (42 Vic., c. 26).

Matane, Work performed at.
 During election, &c., M. for Ret. (Mr. Landry) 113; Amt. (Mr. Fiset) 114.

Mates' Certificates (Mr. Pope's B.) See "Masters and Mates."

Measuring Saw-logs, Standard rule.
 Authorised by Govt., Ques. (Mr. Farrow) 111.

Melbourne Township P.O. See "Bel-rath."

Members' Indemnities, rates of.
 Since 1841, M. for Ret. (Mr. Jackson) 839

Members, indemnity of (Mr. Béchard's B.) See "Indemnity."

Members' Stationery, quality of.
 Printing Com. to report, M. (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 1213.

Memorial from an English Association.
 Reception of, Ques. (Mr. Speaker) 1412; ruled, reception irregular, 1453.

Menmonite Immigration.
 Supply,—discussion in, 1549.

Mercer Reformatory, Ont. (Mr. McDon-ald's B.) See "Ontario."

Mercier, P.A. & E.H., Montreal Customs.
 Absence from duty, Ms. for Ret. (Mr. Tel-lier) 105.

MERNER, Mr.
 Weights & Meas., Inspectors (Ques.) 71.
 Half-breed Reservations (M. for Ret.) 674.

Messages from His Excellency.
 Internal Commission, appointment, 41.
 Royal Instructions and Commission, 42.
 Reply to Address in Ans. to Speech, 88.
 Estimates, 1879-80, 251; Supplementary, 1878-79, 1796; 1879-80, 1840; further Supplementary, 1879-80, 1982.
 Princess Alice, death of; H. M.'s reply to Address, 1397.
 Manitoba, financial position of, Pap. respect- ing, 1627.
 Brit. Columbia, graving dock, Pap. respect- ing, 1628.
 Tariff, copy of H. E.'s despatch, 1784.

Metapedia, Buildings. See "INTERCOL. Ry."

MÉTHOT, Mr.
 Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 204.
 Interest, rate of (B. 35, 1^o*) 221; (2^o m.) 1582.
 Lighthouses, coal oil supply (M. for Pap.) 836.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mac- kenzie's Amt., 1111.
 Judge Polette, Pet. against (Presented) 1755.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1776.

Metropolitan Ins. Co. (Mr. Rochester's B.) See "Ottawa Agricult."

Michigan, Lake, Entrance of. See "Dun- can City."

Middlesex, E.R., Insp. of W. & M.
 Spettigue, suspension of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Macmillan) 240.
 McClary, superannuation of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Macmillan) 241.

Military Camps of Instruction.
 Intention this year, Ques. (Mr. Thompson, Hald.) 112.

Military Properties, Fredericton and other places.
 Transfer or Sale of, M. for Cor. (Mr. Strange) 664.

Militia & Defence Acts Amt. B. No. 105 (Mr. Bowell).
 Res. in Com. of W., 1697; reported, and B. 1^o*, 1702; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1848. (42 Vic., c. 35.)

Militia Expenditure.

Supply,—discussion in: Pensions to Veterans, 1812 & 1837, 1628; Brigade Staff, &c., 1630; Drill instrn. allowances, 1634; Ammunition & Stores, 1642; Annual Training, 1642; Bands, 1642; Drill in Colleges, 1643; Ottawa Drill Shed, 1861.

Militia, 21st Batt., No. 1 Co.

Drill of 1873-74, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tellier*) 505.

Militia Veterans.

Pensions to, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ives*) 105.
Supply,—discussion in, 1628.
Land Grants for, *Ques.* (*Mr. Hooper*) 1757.

Militia, Volunteers for War Service.

M. for Ret. of names, &c. (*Mr. Bunster*) 665.

Mills, Children in (Mr. Bergin's B.) See "Factories."**MILLS, Mr.**

Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat, on *Ques. Priv.*, 43.

Ontario Boundaries, on M. for Reports, 53; (*Ques.*) 157.

Debates, Reporting, on M. for Sel. Com., 58; on M. to ratify Cont., 93.

N. W. Territories Courts (*B. 5, 1°*) 65; *2° m.*, 675-7-8-9.

Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 121.
Royal Instructions (*M. for Cor.*) 124.

Mounted Police, B. 13 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. of W., 127-8.

Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O.C., 134.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 189.
Alaska Boundary, on M. for Cor., 231-2.

P.O.D., Messrs. Forsyth and LeSueur (*M. for Pap.*, for *Mr. Huntington*) 236.

S. Grenville Election, Enquiry, on M. for Address, Amt., and Q. of *Proced.*, 238.

Territories, Real Property Act (*B. 43, 1°*) 293.

Quebec Constitutional Question: on M. for Res., 362; on Q. of Ord., 408; on conc. in W. & M. Res., 2002; on 3° of Supply B., 2019-20-1.

P.O.D., use of private letter on file, on M. for Cor., 496.

Maritime Court, Ont., working of, on M. for Ret., 504.

Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 499, 500.

Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. of W., 507.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 604-5, 609.

Que. Geograph. Society Incorp. B. 65 (*Mr. Fortin*) on 2° and Q. of *Proced.*, 826.

Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on M. into Com., 846.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 879, 1013; Res. 2 (Drawbacks) 1325; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) 1330; Res. 11—

(Acids) 1334; (Agricult. Implements) 1335; (Books, &c.) 1340-2-5; (Barley) 1346; (Corn) 1348; (Wheat) on Mr.

MILLS, Mr.—Con.

Houde's Amt., 1359; (Butter) 1416; (Carriages, &c.) 1420; (Cheese) 1424; (Screws, iron) 1463; (Paintings, &c.) 1473; (Sugars) 1492-8. B. No. 93, on 2°, 1825.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (*Mr. Killam*) on M. into Com., 922-4.

Inland Bills of Ex. B. 16 (*Mr. Doull*) on ref. to Banking Com., 926.

Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2°, 942.

Census & Statistics B. 67 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. of W., 1234-6.

Bills of Ex. B. 31 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com. of W., 1238.

Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1247-8.

Chinese in B.C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1262.
Marine Telegraph Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 1283.

Dominion Day B. 72 (*Mr. Cockburn*) on 2° and Q. of *Proced.*, 1286.

B.C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (*Mr. McDonald*) on M. into Com. of W., 1290; in Com., 1534.

Indians, starving, at La Chapelle (*Ques.*) 1292.

Manitoba Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1297.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 1°, 1375; on 2° and Q. of *Proced.*, 1378, 1389.

Supply—Estimates: Penitentiaries (St. V. de Paul) 1539; Legislation (Sess. Clks., &c.) 1543; Immigration (Salaries) 1545; Militia (Drill Instruction) 1637; Pub. Works Inc. (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1666; Geolog. Survey, 1681; Indians, (N. W.) 1685-8-9, 1690.

Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Arts, &c., (Ontario Exhibition) 1849; Pub. Works, Cap. (Pacif. Ry., W. of Red R.) 1852; Legislation (Sess. Clks.) 1855-6.

Conc.: (Pacif. Ry., Wallace's claim) 1877, 1883.

Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1590.

Militia Act Amt. B. 105 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 1697-8, 1700-1.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2°, 1706; on 3°, 1715.

Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (*Mr. Tilly*) on Res., 1785; on 2° of B., 1787.

N.B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (*Mr. McDonald*) on Res., 1791-2.

Indian Act Amt. B. 94 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on Senate Amts., 2003.

Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in Com., 1845.

Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. Macdougall*) on 3°, 1878; (*Amt. m.*) 3 months' "hoist," 2005.

Pacif. Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*) on propd. Res., 1928; in Com., 1961-4; on conc. in Res., 1977.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of, on Mr. Costigan's Remarks and M. (*Q. of Ord.*) 1985-6, 1988.

- Mill-waste in Navigable Streams Act.*
Intentions respecting, Ques. (*Mr. Mongenais*) 74.
- Ministers' Salaries (Mr. Béchard's B.)*
See "Indemnity."
- Ministers' Salaries, rates of.*
Since 1841, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jackson*) 839.
- Miramichi, Marine Hospital.*
State of, &c., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Snowball*) 497.
- Mitchell & Co., Payments to.*
1870-74, M. for Pap. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 659.
- Moirs River, Timber Tolls (Mr. McCuig's B.)* See "Belleville."
- Molesworth, Postmaster.*
Lougheed, dismissal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hesson*) 830; similar m. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 920.
- Monck, Land Damages.*
Welland Canal, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCallum*) 106.
- Moneys due from Public Servants.*
Recovery of, Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 140.
- MONGENAIS, MR.**
Tobacco, Canadian, duties (*Ques.*) 74.
Rivière à la Graisse, survey, &c. (*Ques.*) 74.
Mill-waste in Navigable streams (*Ques.*) 74.
Ottawa R., drag-nets, prohibition (*Ques.*) 74.
- Montmagny Basin Survey.*
Labour, cost, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 54.
Survey, M. for Engr's. Rep. (*Mr. Landry*) 62.
- Montmagny, Postmasters in.*
Dismissals of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 835.
- Montreal & Champlain Junction Ry. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. Scriver).**
1°*, 107; 2°*, 156; Com. of W. and reported,* 629; 3°*, 651. (42 Vic., c. 59.)
- Montreal & Ottawa Junct. Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. McLennan).**
1°*, 189; 2°*, 488.
- Montreal and Ottawa Mails.*
Twice daily, Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 826.
- Montreal Custom House.*
Appointments, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Courso*) 26.
Officials, conduct of. See "Mercier."
- Montreal, Tobacco Seizures.*
1874-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tellier*) 505.
- Montreal Trinity House Acts Amt. B. No. 88 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.).**
Res. in Com. of W., 1501; 1°*, 1502; 2°*, Com of W. and reported*, 1669; 3°*, 1702. (42 Vic., c. 28.)
- Moore, S. J., Claim of.*
Australian Exhibition, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Hooper*) 240.
- Morpeth Harbour, Appropriation for.*
Supply,—discussion in, 1664-5.
- Mounted Police Acts Amt. B. No. 13 (Sir John A. Macdonald).**
1°*, 88; 2°*, 125; in Com., 126, Amd., 221; 3°*, 221. (42 Vic., c. 36.)
- Mounted Police, Expenditure for.*
1876-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 837.
- Mounted Police, Recruiting for.*
In Manitoba, Ques. (*Mr. Schultz.*) 222.
- Mounted Police, Supplies for.*
Contracts, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 497.
Contracts, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Schultz*) 651.
- MOUSSEAU, MR.**
Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's seat (*Ques. of Priv.*) 42.
Maintenance of Roads, &c. B (*M. for Cor.*) 46.
Quebec Constitutional Question (*M. for Pap*) 49; (*M. for Res.*) 251-70; carried (*F.* 136, *N.* 51) 407-9; on Premier's statements (*Remarks*) 986; (*Notice of M.*) for Res. respecting reference of case to England, 1762; M. postponed, 1763; on 3° of Supply B. and Mr. Mackenzie's remarks, 2026, 2032-3.
- Ministers' Salaries (Mr. Béchard's B.)** See Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2°, 176.
Beauharnois Canal, site (*M. for Pap., for Mr. Bergeron*) 188.
Société de Construction d'Iberville (*B.* 63, 1°* 738.
Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1778, 1781.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1591.
Campbell, Mrs., Relief B. 99 (*Mr. Macdougall*) on 3° and Mr. Mills's Amt. for "hoist," 2008.
- Murray & Co., Contractors, Intercol Ry.**
Disputed claims, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Mackenzie.*) 916.
Supply,—discussion in, 1833; vote carried on div., 1884.
- Murray Canal, Construction of.*
Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 904.
- MUTTART, MR.**
Souris Breakwater (*M. for Tend.*) 69.
Souris Ry.. Extension (*M. for Tend.*) 69.
Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 224.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 584.
P. E. I., Civil Service dismissals (*M. for Sess. & other Pap.*) 838.
Campbell's Cove Breakwater (*Ques.*) 1397.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 955.
Supply—Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Miscellaneous (on Testimonial to M. Delfosse, P. E. I. Fishery claims) 1838.
- Nanaimo and Esquimalt Ry.* See "PACIFIC RY."
- Nanaimo, Canal communication with.*
Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Bunter*) 1250.

- Nanaimo, Customs Officer.*
Peck, salary of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Bunster*) 667.
- Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Incorp. B. No. 40** (*Mr. Hooper*).
1°*, 251; Com. of W. and reported*, 798; 3°*, 798. (42 *Vic.*, c. 67).
- National Currency, adoption of.*
Res. proposed (*Mr. Wallace*) 1551; Amt. 6 months' "hoist" (*Mr. Charlton*) 1561.
- Negro Point Breakwater.* See "St. John."
- New Brunswick, Bar Iron Imports.*
1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 180.
- New Brunswick, Canada "Gazette" in.*
Officials supplied, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Connell*) 1763.
- New Brunswick, claims of Govt.*
Eastern Extension Ry., Ques. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 547.
Fishery claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 658.
Eastern Extension, Fishery and other claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1399.
- New Brunswick, Confederation Campaign.*
Personal Explanations (*Mr. Tilley and others*) 1304, 1317, 1456-9.
- New Brunswick, Divorce Court.*
Judge's salary, provision for, Ques. (*Mr. Giltmor*) 827.
- New Brunswick, Election Trials.*
Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 156; M. for Ret., 233; M. withdn., 235.
- New Brunswick, Fishery Award.*
Share of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 658; (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1399.
- New Brunswick, Govt. Rys.*
Coal shipment at false rates, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 489; M. for Pap., 654.
- New Brunswick, Lands* (*Mr. McDonald's B.*) See "Ordnance Lands."
- New Brunswick, Lighthouse Inspector.*
Supply,—discussion in, 1675.
- New Brunswick, Mail Service in.*
Postal Car, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Connell*) 652.
- New Brunswick, Public Works in.*
Supply,—discussion in: Buildings, 1663; Harbours, &c., 1643, 1666, 1856.
- New Brunswick Supreme Court, salary for additional Judge, B. No. 109** (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
Res. in Com. of W., 1787; reported, and B. 1° and 2°, 1793; 3°, 1806. (42 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- Newcastle District Navigation Works.*
Transfer to Ont. Govt., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 104; M. for Sel. Com., 904; Addendum, 1025.
- "*Newfield*," *Capt. Purdy's dismissal.*
M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 141; adjd. debate, 157; agreed to, 164.
- Newfoundland and the Tariff.*
Admission of Fish, Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 743.
- Newfoundland, Customs Dues.*
M. for Cor. respecting (*Mr. Fortin*) 1410.
- Newspaper Postage, Abolition.*
Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 547.
- New Westminster, B.C., Post-office.*
Erection of, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 652.
- Niagara Contd. Election.*
Judge's Report, 610; Mr. Plumb introduced, 618.
- North Amer. Mutual Life Ins. Co. Incorp. B. No. 41** (*Mr. Mackenzie*).
1°, 251; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1003. (42 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- "*Northern Light*," *Construction of.*
M. for Tend. and other Pap. (*Mr. Valin*) 235, 684.
Supply,—discussion in, 1669.
- Northern Ry. Co. Act (40 *Vic.*, c. 57) Amt. B. No. 64** (*Mr. White, Cardwell*).
1°, 738; 2°, 1391; B. withdn., 1730.
- North River, dredging of.*
Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Oliver*) 223; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Christie*) 664.
- North Shore Railway.*
Mail Contract, Leclerc, removal of, Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1250.
- North Sydney Harbour B.** (*Mr. McDonald, C. Breton*).
Introduction m., 649; over-ruled and withdn., 649.
- North Sydney Harbour B. No. 89** (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*).
Res. in Com. of W., 1502; 1°, 1503; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669. (42 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- Northumberland, Lumber purchased in.*
For Intercol. Ry., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Domville*) 87.
- N.-W. Police* (*Sir John A. Macdonald's B.*) See "Mounted Police"
- N.-W. Territories, Breech-loading Rifles.*
Introduction of, stoppage, Ques. (*Mr. Schultz*) 489.
- N.-W. Territories, Colonisation Roads in.*
Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 157.
- N.-W. Territories Courts B. No. 5** (*Mr. Mills*).
1°, 65; 2° m., 675; negatived, 680.
- N.-W. Territories, Immigration, encouragement.*
Land Grants for, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Oliver*) 106.
- N.-W. Territories, Indians.*
Agents, Appointments, &c., M. for O. C.s (*Mr. Mills*) 666.
Supply,—discussion in, 1684-90.
- N.-W. Territories, Real Estate Transfer & Registration B. No. 43** (*Mr. Mills*).
1°, 293.

N.-W. Territories, Safe-keeping of Lunatics B. No. 106 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
1°*, 1730; 2°*, Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1848. (42 *Vic.*, c. 38.)

Notes, Promissory (Mr. Baby's B.) See "Bills of Exchange."

Nova Scotia, Bar Iron Imports.
1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 180.

Nova Scotia, Fishery Award.
Share of, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 490; M. for Cor., 658.

Nova Scotia, Govt. Rys.
Coal, shipment at false rates, &c., Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 489; M. for Pap., 654.
Coal rolling stock for, Ques. (*Mr. Doull*) 652.

Nova Scotia, Harbours and Breakwaters.
Supply,—discussion in, 1667, 1836.

Nova Scotia Lands (Mr. McDonald's B.)
See "Ordnance Lands."

Nut-locks. See "INTERCOL. RY."

Oak, for St. Lawrence Canals.
Contract, remission of duties, &c., M. for Cor. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Oak Point Breakwater.
Woodworth's claim, discussion in Supply, 1836.

O'Donoghue, Professor, Land Claims.
On Assiniboine R., M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 1763.

Official Arbitrators B, No. 81 (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*).
1°, 1291; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1865. (42 *Vic.*, c. 8.)

Official Assignees. See "Assignees."

OGDEN, Mr.
Newfield, Capt, Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 158.
Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 246.
Lobster-cans, Amer. duty on (M. for Cor.) 667-9, 671.

Oil for St. Lawrence Lighthouses.
M. for Tends, Conts., &c. (*Mr. Méthot*) 836.

OLIVER, Mr.
Elections, General, expenses (*M. for Ret.*) 65.
Standard Weights and Measures, cost (*M. for Ret.*) 65.
Immigrants, N.W., grants of land (*M. for Pap.*) 106.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 203.
North River, dredging of (*Ques.*) 223.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 701-4-5, 721; Res. 11, on 2° (Carriages) 1418-19; (Cheese) 1421-2; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1512.
Ministers' Salaries, &c., on M. for Ret. (*Q. of Ord.*) 839.
Betting Act Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. Robertson*) on M. into Com. of W., 847.
Supply—Conc.: (Intercol. Ry., to deep water, St. John (Amt. n.) to Mr. Domville's Amt., 1857.

OLIVIER, Mr.
Duval, Ulric, Postmr., complaints against (Ques.) 1250.
Brodie's, P.O., establishment of (Ques.) 1250.

Ont. & Pacif. Junct. Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 27 (*Mr. Williams*).
1°*, 140; 2°*, 208; Com. of W. and reported*, 798; 3°*, 798; Senate Amts. agreed to, 1290. (42 *Vic.*, c. 58.)

Ontario, Boundaries of.
M. for Arbitrators' Reps. (*Mr. Dawson*) 50.
Arbitration, cost of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 67.
Confirmation of decision, Ques. (*Mr. Mills*) 157.

Ontario Building Societies B. No. 79 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).
1°*, 1213; 2°*, 1287; 3°*, 1805. (42 *Vic.* c. 49.)

Ontario Common School Fund.
Payment of Award, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 1756.

Ontario, Divorce in (Mr. Hooper's B.)
See "Divorce."

Ontario Exhibition, Expenditure for.
Supply,—discussion in, 1848.

Ontario Female Reformatory B. No. 76 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
1°*, 1080; 2°*, Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1296. (42 *Vic.*, c. 43.)

Ontario Indians, Expenditure for.
Supply,—discussion in, 1684.

Ottawa Loan & Investment Co. Incorp. Act Amt. & change of name of Co. B. No. 78 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).
1°*, 1123; 2°*, 1141; Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1540. (42 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

Ontario Maritime Court.
Rules of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 503; M. withdn., 505.
Work performed by, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 663.

Ontario Maritime Court Act Amt. B. No. 73 (*Mr. McCuaig*).
1°*, 1026; 2°*, 1804; Com. of W. and reported, 1804; 3°*, 1805. (42 *Vic.*, c. 40.)

Ontario Maritime Court Act Repeal B. No. 34 (*Mr. McCuaig*).
1°*, 221; order for 2°, 684; dischgd. and B. withdn., 688.

Ontario, Public Works in.
Supply,—discussion in: Buildings, 1662, 1836, 1861; Harbours, &c., 1664.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

Speech from the Throne, 4.
ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE, QUESTIONS OF.

ORDER:—
Vote of mover of previous Ques. challenged as necessarily negative (Mr. Anglen); discussion, difference of Canadian practice defined (Mr. Speaker) 408.
Reports and Returns, Ms. for, without due reasons being given, objected to (Mr. Tupper and others) 492-4, 1265; Confidential Reports, production of, objected to (Mr. Mackenzie) 350.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, ETC.—*Con.*

Reports, Engineers, communication of, *confidentially*, to Leader of Opposition, offered by Min. of P. W.; objected to (*Messrs. Holton and Macdougall*); Report tabled, 1080-83.

Precedence of Tariff Debate, on private day, without formal notice of M., objected to (*Mr. Mackenzie*); objection sustained (*Mr. Speaker*) 650.

Precedence of Govt. business, Ms. for (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 738, 1290, 1533, 1668, 1841, 1885.

Allusions to proceedings of P. A. Com., still incomplete and not reported, objected to (*Mr. Oliver*); objection sustained by *Mr. Speaker*, 839.

Censure, in debate, upon the action of the Sovereign, or of Her Representative, a breach of Order; pointed out by *Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*, in remarks on Que. Constitutional Question, 934.

Cabinet Proceedings. On Res. for Cor. respecting dismissals, &c. (*Mr. Ross, W. Middx.*) the *Premier* declined to bring down anything of a Cabinet nature, 491. Upon the *Premier's* statement (p. 944) that, certain advice having been offered, H. E. had referred the case to England, *Messrs. Mackenzie & Holton* pressed for copy of the O. C. and more precise information; the *Premier* declined, it being a matter not of "Council," but of the Cabinet, 1026.

Com. of W. (Marine Telegraphs B.) order into being read, and *Mr. Holton* suggesting reference of B. to *Ry. Com.*, instead, *Mr. McCarthy* objected that the H. had already ordered itself into Com. of W. *Mr. Speaker* ruled the propriety of Amt. or discharge of that order if desired, 1572.—See also "PROCED." on this B.

Amt., for absolute Repeal, to M. for 2° of a B. for provisional Repeal (of Insolvency Laws) ruled in order by *Mr. Speaker*, 1610.

Amts., in Com. of W., to *Mr. Béchard's* B. for absolute Repeal of Insolvency Laws, objected to (English practice being quoted) as virtually destroying the B., which had passed 2°; ruled (*Mr. Chairman*) the *Amts.* not irrelevant to the B., 1769-75.

Objection to progress of a B. (the B. not being printed in French) over-ruled by *Mr. Speaker*, being raised too late, 1620.

Petition for dismissal of Judge Polette, Three Rivers, ruled out of order, 1755.

M. for Res., implying Want of Confidence. *Mr. Holton* objected to such being allowed to "stand"; but *Mr. Speaker* said it came within an agreement of the House, 1762.

Allusion to previous Debate objected to; and checked by *Mr. Speaker*, 1824.

Language, unparliamentary, 1938.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, ETC.—*Con.*

Strangers ordered to withdraw from the floor, 1940.—See "PRIVILEGE" for this case.

Speaking to a proposed M. without notice; objection taken (*Mr. Holton*).

Mr. Speaker decided that it must be taken when Ques. on the M. is put, 1984.

M. to adj. H., as a conclusion to Remarks (*Mr. Costigan*) objected to, 1985; *M. for Cor.*, without notice, objected to, and over-ruled by *Mr. Speaker*, 1986.

PRIVILEGE:—

Taking seat on telegraphic cert. of Returning Officer, objected to, and not allowed, 42.

Explanations respecting reports in *Le Canadien* (*Mr. Huntington*) 488; in *Courrier du Canada*, 613.

Explanation, respecting *Mr. Patterson's* personal charges in Tariff Debate (*Mr. Rykert*) 808, 818.

Explanation respecting report in Toronto *Globe* (*Mr. Doull*) 1250.

Explanation of Remarks in Debate on R. Cardinal's dismissal (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) 1373.

Explanations, continuing those made in Tariff Debate respecting Queen's, N.B., Election Protest, 1451-3 (*Mr. King and others*) 1454-6.

Explanations, Confederation Campaign in N.B. (*Mr. Tilley and others*) 1304, 1317, 1456-9.

Explanation, on statement in London *Advertiser*, as to vote (*Mr. Coughlin*) 1754.

Explanation, on statement in Chignecto *Post*, as to Reciprocity Treaty expenses (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 1754.

Explanation, on statements respecting Selkirk Election (*Mr. Smith*) 1805.

Stranger, conduct of, in insulting a Member of House, 1940. Charge formulated and offender summoned to Bar, 1943, 1980. Discussion as to *Proced.* in such cases, 1980. Report, writ not servable, 2044; Remarks (*Mr. McLennan and others*) 2044.

PROCEDURE:—

Private B., Selkirk Ry. (*Mr. Rykert*). Introduction opposed (*Mr. Schultz*) length of notice in *Gazette* being insufficient. The Com. on Standing Orders having passed the B., that decision concurred in and B. 1°, 71-3.

Private B., affecting Crown rights (Intercol. Ry., *Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland*) introduction opposed (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 138; B. withdn., 139; introduction allowed, 156.

B. to authorise payment of deposit to John Stewart, Kingston, not introduced as *Private B.*, objected to (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 139; decided against (*Mr. Speaker*) and withdn., 140.

Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elections.—Reference to, of Petition respecting South Grenville Election (M. of *Mr. McCarthy* for Address; Amt., *Mr. Holton*) 237.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, ETC.—*Con.*

B. respecting N. Sydney Harbour, overruled by *Mr. Speaker*, not being based on Res.; B. withdn., 649.

B., Northern Ry. Act Amt.; *Mr. Mackenzie*, objecting to its principle, opposed 1°. On discussion, decided that the principle might be discussed in Ry. Com.; B. 1°, 739-40.

B., Quec. Geographical Society Incorp. On 1°, *Mr. Casgrain* objected that the Legislation should have been obtained from Provincial Parlt., which had full powers, 741. On 2°, *Mr. Anglin* and others raised same objection; but the *Premier* maintained that the B., though local in name, was general in nature, 825.

Private Bs., Suggestion (*Mr. Cartwright*) of a legal examiner for, as in England, 826.

B., Yarmouth Dyking Co. Incorp. (*Mr. Killam*). Ques. of:—1st, Jurisdiction of Dominion and Provincial Legislatures in such matters; 2nd, Incorporation of one individual as a Co. B. withdn., 921-4.

B., Protest of Inland Bills of Exchange, N.S. (*Mr. Doull*). Ques. of:—1st, Jurisdiction of Dominion Parlt.; 2nd, Proper procedure. B. referred to Banking Com., 924-7.

B., Contagious Diseases, Animals (*Mr. Pope*). In Com., *Mr. Mills* urged that such legislation was vested in Local Parlt. B. reported, 1247-9.

Memorial from Free Trade Association of England. Ques. as to propriety of its reception (*Mr. Speaker*) discussed; tabled, 1412. Ruled, its reception irregular, 1453.

B., Supreme Ct., abolition of (*Mr. Keeler*). On "hoist" Amt. to 2° being lost, Opposition claimed their right (quoting English authorities) to oppose Bills at any stage, and held that members voting for 2° on div. committed themselves to general principle of B. The Govt. claimed that B. should go to 2°, and have its merits then discussed, 1376-9. See also page 1586 for a similar point.

B., Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal (*Mr. McCarthy*). Reference to Ry. Com. recommended by *Mr. Mackenzie*; ruled not necessary, unless desired by mover of B. Referred to Com. of W., 1285. Again objected, by *Mr. Holton*, that the B. affected private rights, and should be referred to Ry. Com. for examination; also, by *Mr. Anglin*, that Govt. should assume responsibility for such a measure. But B. was passed in Com. of W. and by H., 1572-5. See also *Q. of Ord.* on this B.

B., Defendants' costs in Crown suits (*Mr. MacDonnell*). The *Premier* objected that the B. affected Prerogative, and declined to obtain Assent; B. withdn., 1578-81.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, ETC.—*Con.*

B., Militia Acts Amt. Discussion on constitutional powers of Dominion Parlt. respecting employment of Militia in case of riots, 1697-1702.

Fees, remission of, on Moira R. Timber Tolls B., it not being considered a Private B. Ques. as to propriety thereof (*Mr. Holton*) 1982.

Ordinance Lands, N. S. & N. B., B. No. 102 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1°, 1628; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669. (42 *Vic.*, c. 33)

ORTON, Mr.

Introduction, 407.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 872-4; Res. 11, on 2° (Wheat) on *Mr. Houde's* Amt., 1357; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1526.

Election Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2° and *Mr. Arkell's* Amt. for "hoist," 929. Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2°, 1382.

Memorial, Free Trade Association, Eng., on Q. of Ord., 1453.

Insolvency Laws Repeal [B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2° and *Mr. Béchard's* Amt., 1619.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights and Measures) 1719.

Ottawa Agricult. Ins. Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 48 (*Mr. Rochester*).

1°, 338; B. withdn., 1453.

Ottawa and Montreal Mails.

Twice daily, Ques. (*Mr. Christie*) 826.

Ottawa Drill Shed. See "Militia."*Ottawa Exhibition.* See "Ontario."*Ottawa, Public Buildings.*

Western Block Extension, M. for Ret. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 920.

Supply,—discussion in, 1661, 1836, 1861.

Ottawa R. Bridge (*Mr. Holton's B.*)
See "Q. M. O. & O. Ry."*Ottawa River, use of Drag-nets.*

Intention of forbidding, Ques. (*Mr. Monge-nais*) 74.

OUIMET, Mr.

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 97-8.

Quebec Constitutional Question: on M. for Res. (*Previous Ques. m.*) 282; carried (Y. 136, N. 51) 407; on Q. of Ord. as to affirmation vote, 408; on *Premier's* statement of H. E.'s action (*Remarks*) 981; on 3° of Supply B., 2025, 2032-3.

Dual Representn. Abolition Act Repeal (B. 62, 1°) 649.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 986; Res. 11, on 2° (Books, &c.) 1344.

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 51 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1299.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on M. for 2°, 1576.

Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on 2°, 1593.

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Pembina Branch C.P.R. Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. No. 60 (*Mr. Tupper*).

1° 611; 2°, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3°, 1702. (42 *Vic.*, c. 13.)

Canadian Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. No. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*).

Res. m., 1888 (Res., 1895); Resumed Debate, 1944; H. in Com. of W., 1960; Res. reported, 1° and 2°, 1965; conc. in Res. 1 m., 1965; Amt., to re-com. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1970; neg. (*Y.* 37, *N.* 115) 1978. On Res. 12, Amt., route (*Mr. Mackenzie*) neg., same div., 1979. Res. 13 and 14 agreed to, on a div., 1979. B. 1°, 2° and 3°, 1980. (42 *Vic.*, c. 14).

Expenditure on, to 1st Jan., 1879.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Carterright*) 47.

Route of.

Ms. for Rets., &c., (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 50; (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 57.

Pembina Branch, Conveyance on.

Arrangements, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 74.

Esquimalt & Nanaimo Line.

M. for Reps. of Surveys (*Mr. Dewdney*) 87. Rails, removal to Frazer River, Ret. refd. to P. A. Com. (*Mr. Bunster*) 837.

Engineers' Report.

Publication of, Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 222.

Pembina and other Branches.

Expenditure on, M. for Rets. (Mr. Haggart) 235.

British Columbia, Special Tariff for.

Ad interim, Ques. (Mr. DeCosmos) 491.

Section "B," Contract for.

Signature, Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 547.

Sections "A" and "B," Tenders and Contracts.

Submitted (*Mr. Tupper*) 611.

Tenders, all, and Engineers' Reports.

Ques and Remarks (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 824, 943.

Statement (*Mr. Tupper*) Remarks (*Mr. Mackenzie and others*) 1080.

Reserve Lands in B.C.

Rights of settlers, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 827.

Prince Arthur's Landing.

Propd. Ry. connection, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Plumb*) 831.

Harbour, Lands and Buildings, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Plumb*) 834.

Vessel clearances, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Plumb*) 835.

Kaministiquia, the

Dredging and Harbour capabilities, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Plumb*) 831.

Vessel clearances, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Plumb*) 835.

Route, West of Selkirk.

Reports upon, Ques. (*Mr. Macdougall*) 1551.

Supply,—discussion in: Can. Central Extension, subsidized, 1645; Georg. Bay Br., 1648; B. C., expenditure, carried on div., 1992; Surveys, 1649; Line W. of Red R., 1749; Wallace's claim, 1876, 1883, carried (*Y.* 114, *N.* 37) 1884.

Route, in Manitoba.

Remarks upon (*Messrs. Smith and Ryan*) 2038-e.

Paisley, N. Bruce, Mail Service.

Extension to, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 223.

*Palace Cars (Mr. Bergeron's B.) See "Railway."**Paris Exposition, Canadian expenses.*

Names of Staff, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 658.

Paris Exposition, Medals.

For N. S. exhibitors, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 490.

Parliament, 4th, Session 1st, 1879, 42 Victoria.

Meeting, 1; Opening, 4; Prorogation, 2048. Commons. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS." See also "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

*Parliament (Bs. respecting). See "Dual Representation," "Elections," and "Independence of Parliament."**Parliament, time of meeting.*

Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 651.

PATERSON, Mr. (South Brant).

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 193. Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap. (*Q. of Ord.*) 597-9.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 804. Personal, on Mr. Rykert's statements, 820. Res. 2. (Drawbacks), on 2°, 1329. Res. 11, on 2°—(Corn) 1349; (Wheat flour) 1361; (Carriages, &c.) 1419; (Cheese) 1423; (Coal) 1434; (Copper rivets, &c.) 1437; (Earthenware) 1442; (Pig iron) 1449; (Screws, iron) 1466; Res. 12, Free List, on 2°—(Wool) 1522.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchar*) on 2°, 1622.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1991.

PATTERSON, Mr. (Essex).

Civil Service Examinations (*M. for Ret.*) 113. *Tariff*—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 642.

Ont. Maritime Ct., working of (*M. for Ret.*) 663.

Canada and Detroit Bridge Co. B. 101 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on 2°, 1587.

Patteson, Mr., Postmaster, Toronto.

Salary of, Ques. (*Mr. Hay*) 111; Appointment of, M. for O.C. and Cor., 130.

Peck, Thomas G., Nanaimo.

Customs officer, salary, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Bunster*) 667.

*Pembina Branch Ry. See "PACIFIC RAILWAY."***Penitentiaries Act, 1875, Amt. B. No. 51** (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1°, 409; 2°, 1298; Com. of W. and reported*, 1533. (42 *Vic.*, c. 42.)

Penitentiaries, Questions respecting.

Supply,—discussion in, 1536, 1540, 1832.

Penny and Halfpenny Coins.

Withdrawal of, Ques. (*Mr. Bolduc*) 223.

Pensions.—See "Militia" and "SUPPLY."

PERREAULT, Mr.

Introduced, 73.

St. Simon, Wharf for (*Ques.*) 490.Petite Rivière, Breakwater for (*Ques.*) 490.Bay St. Paul, wharf, completion, (*Ques.*) 490.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 585.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1637.*Petite Rivière, Breakwater.*Construction, *Ques.* (*Mr. Perreault*) 490.**Petroleum, Inspection and Storage of, B. No. 104** (*Mr. Baby*).Res. in Com. of W., 1696; reported, and B. 1^o*, 1697; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1805. (42 *Vic.*, c. 18.)**Petroleum, Inspection and Storage of, Act Amt. B. No. 117** (*Mr. Baby*).1^o, 2^o and 3^o*, 1980. (42 *Vic.*, c. 19.)*Philadelphia Exhibition.* See "Centennial."*Piché, Mr., (Clerk Asst.), retirement of.*Report (*Mr. Speaker*) 5; discussion on M. for Pap., 29; gratuity, discussion in *Supply*, 1873.**PICKARD, Mr.***Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat Flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1414.*Pictou & Truro Ry. (Mr. Tupper's B.)*

See "Truro."

Pictou Harbour Act Amt. B. No. 90(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)Res. in Com. of W., amd*, 1503; 1^o*, 1503; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1669. (42 *Vic.*, c. 29.)**Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 91** (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)Res. in Com. of W., 1503; 2^o*, Com. of W. and reported*, 1669; 3^o*, 1702. (42 *Vic.*, c. 25.)*Pilots' Fund, Control of.*M. for Pilots' Pet. (*Mr. Valin*) 675.*Plague, Precautions against.*Enforcement, M. for Address (*Mr. Charlton*) 55.*Pleuro-pneumonia (Mr. Pope's B.)* See "Contagious Diseases."**PLUMB, Mr.**

Introduced, 618.

Mitchell & Co., supplies by, &c., on M. for Rets., 659.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 734; on Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1141; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Wheat flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1367; (Furniture) 1443-4-5; (Pig Iron) 1448; (Screws, iron) 1466; (Tobacco) 1509. B. No. 93, on 2^o, 1826.Prince Arthur's Landing, Pacific, Ry. Connection (*M. for Pap.*) 831.Kaministiquia Harbour, Terminus (*M. for Pap.*) 831, 833-4.Prince Arthur's Landing, Harbour, Buildings, &c. (*M. for Pap.*) 834.**PLUMB, Mr.—Con.**Prince Arthur's Landing, Vessels' clearances (*M. for Pap.*) 835.Kaministiquia Harbour, Vessels' clearances (*M. for Ret.*) 835.Ventilation of Chamber (*M. for Com.*) 858; (*withdn.*) 859.Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (*Mr. Killam*) on M. into Com., 921.Election Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 929.Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1247.Usury Prohibition B. 35 (*Mr. Méthot*) on 2^o, 1584.Canada & Detroit Bridge Co. B. 101 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on 2^o, 1586.*Supply*—Estimates: Pensions (Veterans) 1629-30; Militia (Drill Instruction) 1634; Pub. Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1652-4; Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1670. Conc.: (*Mr. Piché's gratuity*) 1873-4.*Glendon*, purchase of (*M. for Pcp.*) 1757.Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase of, B. 119 (*Mr. Tupper*) Res. on Conc., 1997.Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) on Senate Amts., 2037.*Point Clair and Ste. Genevieve Mails.*Contract, cancellation, *Ques.* (*Mr. Huntington*) 489.*Polette, Judge, Three Rivers.*Pet. for dismissal of; reception m. (*Mr. Méthot*); ruled out of order (*Mr. Speaker*) 1755.*Police, Canada (Mr. McDonald's B.)*

See "Canada Police."

Police, N. W. (Sir John A. Macdonald's B.)

See "Mounted Police."

Pool-Selling (Mr. Robertson's B.)

See "Betting."

POPE, Mr. (Compton).

Plague, precautions, on M. for Address, 55, 57.

Agriculture Dept., Report (*Presented*) 71.*Newfield*, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 162.Contagious Diseases, Animals, Prevention (B. 37, 1^o*) 221; order for 2^o dischg'd. (*B. withdn.*) 562; (*B. 55, Res. in Com. of W. and 1^o*) 506-7; re-com. (*Amt.*) 1293.

Moore, S. J., claims for losses, on M. for Pap., 241.

Paris Exhibition, delay of medals (*Ans.*, by *Mr. Tupper*) 490.Grosse Isle Sheds, rebuilding (*Ans.*, by *Mr. Tupper*) 547.*Courrier du Canada*, on Mr. Huntington's statement, 616.Grosse Isle, settlement of (*Ans.*) 651.Census & Statistics (B. 67, *Com. of W. and 1^o*) 742; in Com. of W., 1233-4-5.*Tariff*—W. & M., Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1523.*Supply*—Estimates: Immigration, 1544-5; Quarantine (Cattle) 1548-9; Immigration (Mennonites) 1549.

POPE, Mr. (Queen's, P.E.I.).

- Marine & Fisheries Report (*Presented*) 41.
 Race Rocks, B.C., Fog Bell (*Ans.*, by *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 67.
 Isle Blanche, floating light (*Ans.*) 71.
 Mill-waste in navigable streams (*Ans.*) 74.
 Ottawa R., drag-nets, prohibition (*Ans.*) 74.
 Bic Seignior, fishing rights (*Ans.*) 111.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141, 149, 152-3.
 Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 229.
 Fishery Award, P. E. I. claims, on M. for Cor., 243, 251.
 Shelburne, Fog whistle for (*Ans.*, by *Mr. Tupper*) 489.
 Fishery Award, N. S. claims (*Ans.*, by *Mr. Tilley*) 491.
 Miramichi Marine Hospital, State of, on M. for Pap., 498.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 590-1.
 Jolicœur and Hurst, Grosse Isle, dismissal (*Ans.*) 563.
 Salmon Hatchery for B. C. (*Ans.*) 652.
 Fishery Award, Maritime Prov. claims, on M. for Cor., 659.
 Mitchell & Co., supplies by, &c., on M. for Pap., 660-2.
 Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 668-9.
 Riv. du Loup Pier, light for (*Ans.*) 826.
 Barnaby R., N.B., salmon fry for (*Ans.*) 826.
 Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1163-4.
 St. John R., fish-breeding estab. for (*Ans.*) 1250.
 Tonnage Dues (*B. 80, Res. in Com. of W. and 1°*) 1287.
 Trade Marks (*B. 82, Res. in Com. of W.*) 1292.
 Cape Beale, B. C., light-keeper, appointment of, on M. for Cor., 1405.
 Newfoundland, duties levied by, on M. for Cor., 1411.
 Montreal Harbr. Commrs. Acts Amt. (*B. 88, Res. in Com.*) 1501.
 North Sydney Harbour (*B. 89, Res. in Com.*) 1502-3.
 Pictou Harbour (*B. 90, Res. in Com. Amt.*) 1503.
 Pilotage Act Amt. (*B. 91, Res. in Com.*) 1503.
 Seamens' Act Amt. (*B. 92, Res. in Com.*) 1503.
 Supply—Estimates: Ocean & River Service (Dom. Steamers) 1669, 1672; (Mail Subsidies, Campbellton and Gaspé) 1673-4; Lighthouses, &c. (Construction) 1675-6; Fisheries (Salaries, overseers) 1676; (Breeding) 1678.
 Traverse, Navigation improvement (*Ans.*) 1755.
Glendon, purchase of, on M. for Pap., 1759-60.
 Masters and Mates' Certs. Act Extension (*B. 112, Res. in Com. and 1° and 2°*) 1799-80.
- Port Elgin, Harbour Improvement.**
 Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 1551.
- Port Elgin, Mail Service.**
 Extension to, Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 223.

- Port Hood, Harbour Improvement.**
 Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. MacDonnell*) 490.
- Port Huron, reporting of Vessels at.**
 On entering L. Michigan, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Kilvert*) 663.
- Port Stanley Harbour.**
 Revenue and expenditure, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Casey*) 655.
- "Post," Chignecto, Statement in.**
 Of expenses, correction (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 1754.
- Postmasters, pay of.**
 Intention to increase, Ques. (*Mr. Drew*) 112; P.M.G.'s Rep. referred to P. A. Com., 827.
- Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 39 (Mr. Langevin)**
 1°*, 222; 2°*, Com. of W. and reported and 3°*, 1249. (42 *Vic.*, c. 20).
- Post Office Department, changes in.**
 Messrs. LeSueur and Forsyth, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Huntington*) 236.
- Post Office Department, charge against.**
 Private letter on file, improper use of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Keeler*) 495; M. postpd., 496; M. renewed, 547; agreed to, 549.
- Post Office, Expenditure.**
 Supply,—discussion in, 1861.
- Post Office Regulations.**
 Letters, uncalled for, Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 75.
 Lord's Day Observance, Res. (*Mr. Christie*) 75; Amt. (*Mr. Langevin*) 79; agreed to, 84.
 Letters, registered, Ques. (*Mr. Little*) 112.
 Postmasters' salaries, scale of, Ques. (*Mr. Drew*) 112.
 Newspaper postage, abolition of, Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 547.
- Prescott Controverted Election.**
 Judge's Report, 107.
- Presqu'Isle Bay, Channel into.**
 Dredging, Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 904.
- Presqu'Isle, Government Lands.**
 Surveys and propd. sales, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 829.
 Trespassers, prosecutions of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 829.
- Presqu'Isle, Lighthouse.**
 Construction of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 919.
- Presqu'Isle, Lighthouse keeper.**
 Simpson, dismissal of, &c., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Keeler*) 663.
- Prevention of Crime Act (Mr. McDonald's B.)** See "Crime."
- Prince Arthur's Landing.** See "PACIFIC RY."
- Prince Edward and Brighton Mail route.**
 Reason of change, Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 547.
- Prince Edward Island, Civil Service.**
 Dismissals, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Muttart*) 838.

- Prince Edward Island, Claims of.*
Fishery Award, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 74; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Yeo*) 241, M. withdn., 251; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 658; Ques. (*Mr. Bain, for Mr. Yeo*) 1756; Remarks, in Supply (*Mr. Muttart*) 1838.
- Prince Edward Island, County Court Judges, salaries for, B. No. 110** (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
Res. in Com. of W., 1793; reported and B. 1^o, 1795; 2^o, 1795; 3^o*, 1806. (42 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- Prince Edward Island Ferry.*
Georgetown to Pictou, Ques. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's*) 1756.
- Prince Edward Island, Mail Contract to.*
M. for Pap. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's*) 137.
- Prince Edward Island Ry.*
Branch to Cape Traverse, Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 1550.
- Princess Alice, Death of.*
Mess, from Sen., 48; Address concurred in, 59; Mess., H. M.'s reply, 1397.
- Printing Committee.*
Appointment (*Mr. Stephenson*) 59.
- Privilege, Ques. of.* See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
- Procedure, Ques. of.* See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
- Promissory Notes (Mr. Baby's B.)* See "Bills of Exchange."
- Promotions.* See "Civil Service" and "HOUSE" for general questions; and the names or places referred to for special cases.
- PROLOGATION OF PARLIAMENT.**
Communication from H. E., 2048.
H. E.'s Speech, 2048.
- Protest of Bills (Mr. Doull's B.)* See "Bills of Exchange."
- Provincial Legislatures (Mr. Ouimet's B.)* See "Dual Representation."
- Public Accounts.*
Referred to Com. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 70.
- Public Buildings.* See "SUPPLY."
- Public Lands (Bs. respecting).* See "Dominion" and "Ordnance"; see also (*for Mr. Mills's Real Property B.*) "N. W. Territories."
- Public Service (Mr. Casey's B.)* See "Civil Service."
- Public Works, 1873-78.*
M. for Ret. of Tenders, &c. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 125.
- Public Works, Arbitrators' Awards.*
Appeals from, legislation, Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northd.*) 66.
- Public Works Dept., Division of, &c., B. No. 66** (*Mr. Tupper*).
Res. in Com. of W., agreed to *, 741; 1^o*, 741; 2^o*, 1241; Com. of W., 1241; reported, 1246; 3^o*, 1293, (42 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- Public Works, Railways, Canals, &c.*
Expenditure, 1873-79, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bergin*) 236. See also "SUPPLY."
- Purdy, Capt., Steamer "Newfield."*
Dismissal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 141; adjd. debate, 157; carried, 164.
- Quarantine Precautions.*
Against Plague, M. for Address (*Mr. Charlton*) 55; M. withdn., 57.
- Quartz Mining Machinery, B.C.*
Securities for duty on, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Thompson, Cariboo*) 655.
- Quebec and Grosse Isle Transport.*
Contract, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 67.
- Quebec, Assignees.* See "Assignees."
- Quebec Building Societies Liquidation B. No. 113** (*Mr. Desjardins*).
1^o and 2^o*, 1800; Com. of W. and reported and 3^o*, 1865, (42 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- Quebec, City, Walls.*
Improvement of, Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 60; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Vallée*) 67.
- Quebec Fire Ass. Co. Stock, reduction, B. No. 14** (*Mr. Langevin*).
1^o*, 88; 2^o*, 111; Senate Amts. agreed to*, 798. (42 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- Quebec Geographical Society Incorp. B. No. 65** (*Mr. Fortin*).
1^o, 740; 2^o, 825; 3^o*, 1141. (42 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- Quebec Harbour Works.*
Tenders, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 188.
Supply,—discussion in, 1661.
- Quebec, Judges' Salaries.*
Increase of, Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 562.
- Quebec, Military Properties.*
Transfer from Govt., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Strange*) 664.
- Q. M. O. & O. Ry. Bridge over Ottawa River B. No. 45** (*Mr. Holton*).
1^o*, 338; 3^o*, 1141. (42 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- Quebec, Province, Constitutional Question.*
M. for Pap, respecting (*Mr. Mousseau*) 49.
Ques. as to communication with Lt.-Gov. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 294.
Res. condemning Lt.-Gov.'s action, M. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 251, 270; previous Ques. m. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 282; resumed Debate, 294, 312, 339; carried (*Y. 136, N. 51*) 407; main Ques. carried on same division, 409.
Statement, H. E.'s action, case referred to Home Govt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 944.
Remarks thereon (*Mr. Ouimet and others*) 981.
Ques. and Remarks (*Mr. Mackenzie and others*) 1026.
Contradiction of Globe report (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1100.
Res. condemning reference of case to Eng-land (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1762; M. postpd., 1763.
Remarks on conduct of Ministers (*Mr. Holton*) 1830.

- Quebec Constitutional Question—Con.*
Debate, on conc. in Res. W. & M. (*Mr. Mackenzie and others*) 2001: on 3^o of Supply Bill, 2011.
- Quebec, Province, Judges' salaries.*
Increase of, Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 562.
- Quebec, Public Works in.*
Supply,—discussion in: Buildings, 1662; Harbours, &c., 1661-6.
- Quebec, Weights (Mr. Casgrain's B.)*
See "French Weight."
- Queen's, N.B., Election Protest.*
Personal explanations, continuing those in Tariff Debate, 1451-3 (*Mr. King and others*) 1454-6.
- Race Rocks, B.U.*
Fog-horn or bell for, Ques. (*Mr. Dewdney*) 67.
- Rails, British Columbia.*
Removal to Frazer R., M. for Pap. (*Mr. Bunster*) 27.
- Rails, Iron, old, disposal of.*
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Girouard. Jacques Cartier*) 837.
- Rails, Steel, removal of.*
Nanaimo to Frazer R., Ret. referred to P. A. Com. (*Mr. Bunster*) 837.
- Railway Act, 1868, Amt. respecting Bridges, B. No. 59** (*Mr. Tupper*).
1^o, 611; order for 2^o dischgd. and B. withdn., 1587.
- Railway Acts Consolid. B. No. 98** (*Mr. Tupper*).
1^o*, 1550; 2^o, 1702; Com. of W., 1705, 1711; reported, 1715; 3^o on a div., 1716. (42 Vic., c. 9).
- Railway Palace and Sleeping Cars B. No. 96** (*Mr. Bergeron*).
1^o*, 1533.
- Railway Reserve Lands, B.C.*
Rights of settlers, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 827.
- Railways, Accidents, and Employés on.*
M. for Rets., 1878 (*Mr. Fleming*) 129.
- Railways, Expenditure on, 1873-79.*
Details of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Beryin*) 236.
- Railways, in Dominion.*
Loans to, before Confederation, M. for Pet. (*Mr. Vallée*) 63.
- Railways, Minister of (Mr. Tupper's B.)*
See "Public Works."
- Railways, the various.* See under their names.
- Rebate of Duties.*
1874-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jones*) 65.
On Tin, B.C., Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 73.
On goods exported, 1877-8, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 1763.
- Receiver-General, Office of (Mr. Tupper's B.)* See "Public Works."
- Reciprocity and Free Trade Association, Eng.*
Memorial from, Ques. of its reception (*Mr. Speaker*) 1412; ruled, reception irregular, 1453.
- Red River, Lands on.*
Reservation of, M. for O.C. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 232.
- Red River Rebellion, R. McKenzie.*
Property destroyed, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 105.
- Red River Road, J. L. Audy's claim.*
In Com. of Supply,—carried on div., 1885.
- Red River, Timber Leases.*
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 189.
- Reformatory, Female, Ont. (Mr. McDonald's B.)* See "Ontario."
- Refunds, Inland Revenue.*
1873-78, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hesson*) 665; 1867-73, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Trow*) 920.
- Registered Letters, Regulations.*
Intention to alter, Ques. (*Mr. Little*) 112.
- Registration of American Vessels.*
In Canada, M. for Pets. (*Mr. Valin*) 180.
- Removals.* See "Civil Service" and "House" for general questions, and the names or places referred to for special cases.
- Reporting of Debates, Official.* See "Debates."
- Representation, Dual (Mr. Ouimet's B.)*
See "Dual Repn."
- Revenue, Receipts.*
Recent, Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 54, 119; on Malt, Liquor, Tobacco (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 185.
- Richard, Mr., Brandy Pots.*
Lighthouse Keeper, resignation of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 844.
- RICHEY, Mr.**
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 155.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 228.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 582.
Tarif—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1131.
Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Mail Subsidies, Campbellton & Gaspé) 1674.
- Rideau Canal, Damages caused by.*
Claims, 1872-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McRory*) 838.
- Riel, Mr. Louis.*
Pardon, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 42, 66.
- Rimouski, Carriage of Electors.*
On Intercol By., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 84.
- Rimouski, Harbour of Refuge.*
M. for all Pap. respecting (*Mr. Landry*) 653.
- Rimouski, Intercol. Ry. Employés.*
Names, pay, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 107.

Rimouski, Statute Labour in.
Remittance, during elections, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 67.

"*Rimouski*," Steamer, *Capt. Lavoie.*
Removal, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 563; M. for Orders, 920; Resumed debate, 1581; M. agreed to, 1582.

Rimouski, Wharf Improvements.
Intention to make, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 112; M. for Engr.'s Rep., 125.

Rimouski, Wood Contracts in.
For I. C. R., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 658.

Rimouski, Works at Matane and R. Blanche.
During Election, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 113; Amt. (*Mr. Fiset*) 114.

RINFRET, Mr.
Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 360.
Leclerc, Victor, Mail Contract, removal (*Ques.*) 1250.

Rivers, Act against throwing Mill-waste.
Intentions of repealing, Ques. (*Mr. Mongenais*) 74.

Rivière à la Graisse.
Survey, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Mongenais*) 74.

Rivière du Loup Branch, G. T. R.
M. for Cor. with G. T. R. Co. (*Mr. Fiset*) 47; Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 73.
(*Mr. Tupper's B.*) See "INTERCOL. RAILWAY."

Rivière du Loup Pier.
Work, &c., 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 84.

Rivière du Loup Wharf.
Light for, Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 826.

Roads, Construction Companies.
Bill, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 42.

ROBERTSON, Mr. (Hamilton).
Canada Life Ass. Co. Act Amt. (B 7, 1^o*) 71; (2^o) 108.
Burlington Bay Canal Piers, repair (*Ques.*) 74.
Hamilton, Public Buildings, purchase (*Ques.*) 74.
P. O. Regns., returning letters (*Ques.*) 75.
Weights & Measures Act (*M. for O. C.s*) 88.
Hamilton, appointments in, (*M. for Ret.*) 112.
Sarah E. Bryant, Amer. tug; seizure (*M. for Ret.*) 119, 120.
Emigrants, Hamilton, aid to (*M. for Ret.*) 124.
Toronto Postmastership, on M. for O. C., 133.
Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 197.
Pool-selling Act Amt., (B. 38, 1^o*) 222; (*M. into Com. of W.*) 845-6.
Manitoba, settlement of, arrangements (*M. for O. C., &c.*) 496.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 556.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 618, 632. Res. 11, on 2^o—(Screws, iron) 1460-1.
Election Act Amt, B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) 927.
Insolvency Laws Repeat B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) on M. for 2^o, 1426; in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1773-8.

ROBERTSON, Mr. (Hamilton)—*Con.*
Insolvency Act Amt. B. (*M. to introduce*) 1885; (*m. withdn.*) 1886.
Welland Canal Solicitors, payments to (*M. for Ret.*) 1763.
Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald) in Com., 1802.
Weights & Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in Com., 1847.

ROBERTSON, Mr. (Shelburne).
Shelburne Harbour Light (*Ques.*) 48.
Jordan Bay Breakwater (*M. for Ret.*) 54.
Intercol. Ry., Halifax Terminus (*Ques.*) 66.
C. Sable Id., Customs District (*M. for Pap.*) 70.
Halifax as Winter Port (*M. for Cor.*) 70.
Intercol. Ry., Receipts and expenses (*Ms. for Rets.*) 124; Freight on, 124.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 227.
Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims, on M. for Cor., 242.
Shelburne, Fog-whistle for (*Ques.*) 489.
Govt. Rys., Coal shipments (*Ques.*) 489; and sales to officials (*Ms. for Paps.*) 654.
Paris Exhibition, Medals for N. S. contributors (*Ques.*) 490.
Fishery Award, N. S. claims (*Ques.*) 490.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 580.
Fishery Award, appropriation (*M. for Cor.*) 658.
Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 668.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 766; Res. 11, on 2^o and Mr. Houde's Amt. (*Amt. m.*)
Cornmeal free, 1354.
Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 922.
Newfoundland, duties levied by, on M. for Cor., 1411.
Supply—Estimates: Lighthouses, &c. (Maintenance) 1675; (Construction) 1675; Fisheries (Overseers, &c) 1676; (Breeding) 1679.
Ry. Acts Consolid., B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1714.

Robertson, Wm., Dorchester Penitentiary.
Dismissal, M. for Pap. (*Sr A. J. Smith*) 492.

ROBINSON, Mr.
Toronto, Civil Serv. appts, 1873-78 (*M. for Ret.*) 47.
Private Bills, time, extension (*moved*) 71, 126, 221, 562.
Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1^o, 72.
War with Russia, volunteers for, on M. for Ret., 665.
Northern Ry. Act Amt, B. 64 (Mr. White) on 1^o, 739; on 2^o, 1393.
Tariff—W. & M. Res. 11, on 2^o—(Coal) 1434-5; (Pig iron) 1450.
Supply—Estimates: Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, etc., Ont.) 1664.

ROBITAILLE, Mr.
Mackerel, seining for, on M. for Cor., 227.
Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 572.
Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 670.

- ROBILTAILE, Mr.—Con.**
 L'Assomption R., deepening (*M. for Cor., for Mr. Hurteau*) 671.
 Metapedia, disposal of Ry. buildings (*M. for Ret.*) 828.
- Rocher Bay, Pier, erection.**
 Intention, Ques. (*Mr. Rogers*) 546.
- ROCHESTER, Mr.**
 Welland Canal, Mr. McMahon, on *M. for Ret.*, 62.
 U. S. Canals, navigation of (*M. for Cor., for Mr. Currier*) 185.
 Ottawa Agricult. Ins. Co. Act Amt. (*B.* 48, 1^o) 338; (*B. withdn.*) 1453.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1104; *Res. 11*, on 2^o—(India-rubber goods) 1446; (*Shovels, tools, &c.*) 1481-2.
Supply—*Estimates: Immigration*, 1544.
- ROGERS, Mr.**
 Albert Ry., postal car for (*Ques.*) 489.
 Rocher Bay, pier, erection of (*Ques.*) 546.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1111.
- Rondeau, Harbour of Refuge.**
 Improvements, *M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Stephenson*) 675.
- ROSS, Mr. (Dundas).**
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 211.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2^o: Personal (*Mr. Rykert*) 819. On *Ques.*, 896.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on *M. for 2^o* and *Mr. Béchard's Amt.*, 1621.
Supply—*Estimates: Public Works, Cap.* (Canals, Welland) 1654; *Collection of Revenues (Weights and Meas.)* 1724.
 Conc.: (*Post-office registration system*) 1864.
- ROSS, Mr. (West Middlesex).**
 Debates, official reporting (*M. for Tenders*) 27; on *M. to ratify cont.*, 89.
 Lord's Day Observance, on *Res. for*, 82.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 210.
 Civil Service superannuations, 1873-78 (*M. for Ret.*) 496.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2^o, 631; *Res. 11*, on 2^o—(*Agricul. Implemts.*) 1338; (*Books, &c.*) 1341; (*Book-binders' materials*) 1345; (*Furniture*) 1444; (*Printing presses*) 1475.
 Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 932; *personal explanation*, 938.
Supply—*Estimates: Legislation (Commons, Deputy Clk.)* 1541; (*Sess. Clks., &c.*) 1543; *Militia (Drill Instruction)* 1638; (*Ammunition and Stores*) 1642; *Collection of Revenue (Customs)* 1693.
 Suppl. *Estimates, 1878-79: Legislation (Report of Debates)* 1832.
 Conc.: (*Post-office—electric pen circulars*) 1865; (*Library catalogue*) 1875-6.
- ROULEAU, Mr.**
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 552; on *Q. of Ord.*, 553.
- Royal Instructions.** See "Governor-General."
- Roy, Vidal, St. Fabien.**
 Postmaster, removal of, *M. for Cor.* (*Mr. Fiset*) 1398.
- RYAN, Mr. (Marquette).**
 Manitoba, Colonisation Roads (*Ques.*) 157.
 Manitoba Land Patents (*M. for Ret.*) 185.
 Mounted Police, Conts. for Supplies (*M. for Ret.*) 497.
Supply—*Estimates: Indians (N.W.)* 1690.
 Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (*Mr. Tilley*) on *Res.*, 1785; on 2^o, 1786.
 Indian Act Amt. B. 94 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on *Senate Amts.*, 2004.
 Pacific Ry. Route in Manitoba, on *Mr. Smith's Remarks*, 2035.
- RYAN, Mr. (Montreal Centre).**
 Gazette Co. Incorporation (*B.* 23, 1^o) 126.
 Average adjusters, appointment of (*Ques.*) 491.
 Carriers' responsibilities, legislation on (*Ques.*) 491.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 558.
Supply—*Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction)* 1636-7; *Geological Survey*, 1682; *Collection of Revenue (Customs)* 1691-3.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1987.
- RYKERT, Mr.**
 Smith (Welland Canal) dismissal (*M. for Ret.*) 46.
 McMahon (Welland Canal) conduct of (*M. for Ret.*) 60.
 Ft. Frances Lock, expenses (*M. for Ret.*) 70.
 Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. (*B.* 9, 1^o); 71, 72; (*withdn.*) 1213.
 Insolvency Laws, on *M. for Sel. Com.*, 207-8.
 Seamen's Act, 1873, extension to Inland Waters (*B.* 33, 1^o) 221.
 Quebec Constitutional Question, on *M. for Res.*, 317.
 Maritime Ct., Ont., working of (*M. for Ret.*) 503; (*M. withdn.*) 505.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on *M. for Pap.*, 587.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2^o, 782. On *Mr. Paterson's speech, personal*, 808-18-20.
 Controvd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 2^o, 847.
 Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2^o and *Q. of Proced.*, 1381; (*Q. of Ord.*) 1390.
 Independence of Parlt. Act Amt. (*B.* 86, 1^o) 1453.
Supply—*Estimates: Collection of Revenues (Pub. Works, Maintenance, Canals)* 1727-8.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) in *Com.*, on *Mr. Girouard's Amts.*, 1775.
 Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1987.
- Ryland, Mr., Claim of.**
M. for Pap. (*Mr. Coursol*) postpd., 550; agreed to, 652.

RYMAL, Mr.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 202.
Tariff—W. & M. Res, on 2°—personal (Mr. Rykert) 808-19; Res. 11, on 2° (Corn) 1351.

Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1248.

Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Tupper) on Res. in Com., 1965.

Sabbath Observance in Public Depts.

Res. (Mr. Christie) 75; Amt. (Mr. Langevin) 79; agreed to, 84.

Saraway Indians.

Vaccination of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Cimon) 241.

Salaries. See "Civil Service." "HOUSE," &c., for general questions, and the names or places referred to for special cases.

Salmon Fishery. See "Fisheries."**"Sarah E. Bryant," Wrecking Tug.**

American, seizure of, M. for Ret. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) 119; Resumed debate, 680; M. agreed to, 684.

Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 6 (Mr. Schultz).

1°, 71; 2°, 107; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1706. (42 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

Saugeen River, Lighthouse for.

M. for Cor. respecting (Mr. Gillies) 836.

SCHULTZ, Mr.

Saskatchewan Colonisation Ry. Co. (B. G. 10°) 71; on 2°, 108.

Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. B. 9 (Mr. Rykert) on 1°, 71, 73.

Mounted Police B. 13 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com. of W., 126.

Mounted Police, recruiting for (Ques.) 222.

Rifles, importation into N. W. (Ques.) 489.

Mounted Police, supplies (Ques.) 651.

Telegraph, Selkirk & Battleford (M. for Comt, etc.) 830.

Sitting Bull's nationality (Ques.) 1756.

SCRIVER, Mr.

Lord's Day Observance, on Res. for, 80.

Montreal & Champlain Junction Ry. Act Amt. (B. 20 1°) 107.

Chinese in B. C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1263.

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Agricuilt. Implemts.) 1335; (Books, &c.) 1344; (Butter) 1417; Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1519.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors) 1633.

Fees, on remission of, Moira R. Toll B., 1983.

Seamen's Act, 1878, Extension to Inland Waters Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. Eykert).

1°, 221.

Seamen's Act Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. Pope, Queen's P.E.I.).

Res. in Com. of W., 1503; 1°, 1504; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1669. (42 *Vic.*, c. 27).

Seining in Gulf of St. Lawrence.

M. for Cor. (Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.) 224.

Select Standing Committees.

M. for, 5; Com. for Lists, 25; Report, 47; Conc., 59; additions, 338, 546.

Selkirk and Battleford Telegraph.

Contracts, &c., M. for Pap. (Mr. Schultz) 830.

Selkirk & S. Saskatchewan Ry. Co. In-corp. B. No. 9 (Mr. Rykert).

1°, 71; 2°, 109; B. withdn., 1213.

Selkirk Election.

Recount, M. for Cor. (Mr. Cameron, N. Vict.) 1764.

Personal explanation (Mr. Smith, Selkirk) 1805.

Sessional Clerks.

Supply,—discussion in, 1542, 1855.

SEAW, Mr.

Contd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. McCarthy) on 2°, 175.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 559 63.

Tariff—W. & M. Res, on 2°, 770.

Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (Mr. Tupper) in Com., 1712-15.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenues (Pub. Works, Maintenance—Canals) 1726.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1777, 1872.

Sheboygan. See "Duncan City."**Shelburne County, Customs Districts.**

C. Sable Isld., M. for Pets. (Mr. Robertson) 70.

Shelburne, Fog-whistle for.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 489; Ques. in Supply, 1675.

Shelburne Harbour Light, re-building of.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Robertson) 48; Ques. in Supply, 1675.

Sherwood, Wm. H., Lighthouse-keeper.

Presqu'Isle, appointment of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Keeler) 663.

Shippegan Gully, N. B., Breakwater.

Supply,—discussion in, 1666.

Ship-masters and Mates (Mr. Pope's B.)

See "Mastors and Mates."

Shipping of Seamen (Mr. Pope's B.) See "Seamen's Act."**Simpson, George B., Lighthouse-keeper.**

Presqu'Isle, dismissal of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Keeler) 663.

Sitting Bull's Nationality.

Statement in St. Paul Press, Ques. (Mr. Dubuc, for Mr. Schultz) 1756.

SKINNER, Mr.

Kingston, Ordnance Lands, disposal of (Ques.) 1397.

Beet Sugar, Excise duty on (Ques.) 1397.

SKINNER, Mr.—Con.
Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2° (Agricult. Implemts.) 1335; (*Ques.*) Beet sugar, excise duty on, 1397.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Drill Instruction) 1639.

Sleeping Cars (Mr. Bergeron's B.) See "Railway."

Smith, John B., Welland Canal.
 Dismissal, M. for Ret. (Mr. Rykert) 46.

SMITH, Mr. (Selkirk).
Supply—Estimates: Indians (N.W.) 1689-90; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1693.
 Manitoba Additional Grant B. 108 (Mr. Tilley) on Res., 1785.
 Selkirk Election (*Personal explan.*) 1805.
 Pacific Ry. route in Manitoba (*Remarks*) 2035.

SMITH, Sir ALBERT J.
 Clark, W. R., payments to (*M. for Pap.*) 113.
 Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 123.
Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor, 142-4-5, 150, 153.
 Mackerel, Seining for, on M. for Cor., 226.
 Robertson, Wm., dismissal of (*M. for Pap.*) 492-5.
 Miramichi Marine Hospital, state of, on M. for Pap., 498.
Ella G. McLean, purchase of (*M. for Pap.*) 505.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 557, 573, 575, 591.
 Mitchell & Co., Supplies by, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 659-62.
 Presqu'Isle, Govt. lands, survey of, and lawsuits, on Ms. for Ret., 830.
 Presqu'Isle, Lighthouse site, on M. for Pap., 919.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1190; M. to adj. Debate, neg., 1201; Res. amd., on 2°, 1214; on Mr. Tilley's sp., (*comments*) 1228, 1231-2, 1311-15; Res. 4 (Tea and Coffee, differential) on 2°, 1333; Res. 11, on 2° (Sugars) 1499.
 Tonnage Dues B. 80 (Mr. Pope) on Res. in Com. of W., 1288.
 Cape Beale, B.C., Light-keeper, appointment of, on M. for Pap., 1404-5.
 N. Sydney Harbour B. 89 (Mr. Pope) on Res. in Com., 1502.
 Seamen's Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Pope) on Res. in Com., 1503.
 Truro and Pictou Ry. Transfer B. 58 (Mr. Tupper) on 3°, 1505-7.
 B.C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (Mr. McDonald) on Res. in Com., 1534.
 Supreme Ct. Acts Amt. B. 74 (Mr. McDonald) on 2°, 1590; on 3°, 1804.
Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1669-70; Lighthouses, &c. (construction) 1676.
Chignecto Post, statement in (*Correction*) 1754-5.
Glendon, purchase of, on M. for Pap., 1758, 1760-1.

SMITH, Sir ALBERT J.—Con.
 N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1787.
 Anticosti, &c., Telegraph Subsidy B. 111 (Mr. Tupper) on 1°, 1796-7.
 Ont. Maritime Ct. Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. McDonald) in Com., 1805.

SNOWBALL, Mr.
 Miramichi Marine Hospital, state of (*M. for Pap.*) 498.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 561.
 Lobster-cans, Amer. duty, on M. for Cor., 670.
 Barnaby R., Salmon fry for (*Ques.*) 826.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 945; Res., amd., on 2°, 1315-16; Res. 7 (Appraisers) on 2°, 1332; Res. 11, on 2° (Earthenware) 1443; (Shovels, tools, &c.) 1481; (Stone, building) 1485.
Supply—Estimates: Lighthouses (Salaries, Keepers) 1675; Fisheries (Breeding) 1676.

Société Permanente de Construction d'Iberville B. No. 63 (*Mr. Mousseau*).
 1°, 738; 2°, 825; Com. of W., reported and 3°, 1885. (42 *Vic.*, c. 76.)

Souris, P.E.I.
 Breakwater, construction, M. for Tend. (*Mr. Muttart*) 69.
 Railway extension, M. for Tend. (*Mr. Muttart*) 69.

Southampton, Mail Service.
 Extension to, Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 223.

South Grenville Election. See "Grenville, S.R."

Sovereign F. and M. Ass. Co. (Mr. Mackenzie's B.) See "Isolated Risk Co."

SPEAKER, Mr. (Mr. Blanchet).
 Election as Speaker, 3.
 Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Rep., 3.
 Speech from Throne, Rep., 4.
 Librarian's Rep., 5.
 Appointment of Clerks Assistant, 5.
 Account current of House, presented, 6.
 Messages from His Excellency, 41, 42, 88, 251, 1397, 1627, 1628, 1784, 1796, 1840, 1982.
 East Elgin Election, Judge's Rep., 41.
 North York Election, Judge's Rep., 58.
 Charlevoix, Mr. Perreault's election, Rep., 73.
 Prescott Election, Judge's Rep., 107.
 Niagara Election, Judge's Rep., 610.
 Mr. Coughlin's vote on Usury B. (*Remarks*) 1754.
 Bellechasse Election, Judge's Rep., 1784.
 Stranger's misconduct. See under "Rulings."

RULINGS:—
 B., John Stewart, Deposit, irregular, 140.
 Vote, mover of previous Ques., not necessarily negative, 408.
 Policy of Local Govts., irrelevant matter, 553.
 Repeated and irrelevant speaking checked, 597-9, 1874.

SPEAKER, Mr. (Mr. Blanchet)—Con.

B. N. Sydney Harbour, irregular, 649.
Tariff Debate, precedence of, by Agreement, 650.

Previous Debate, allusions to, and irrelevancy checked, 660-1, 1824.

Right of reply, 662.

Speaking twice on M. allowed, leave having been granted, 833.

Reference to evidence before sitting Com., irregular, 839.

M. having no seconder, further speaking to it checked, 1079.

Privilege, explanation, limits of digression defined, 1251.

B. (Marine Telegraphs) referred to Com. of W., unless mover requests reference to a Sel. Com., 1285, 1572.

Memorial (Free Trade Association, Eng.) rejected, not being in form of a Pet., 1412, 1454.

Latitude in Tariff debate, permitted, 1451.
Amt., *absolute*, to B. for *conditional* Repeal of Insolvent Act, in order, 1610.

B. not printed in French, objection to its progress, taken too late, 1620.

Pet. against Judge Polette, out of order, 1755.

M. for Res. against Govt. action (Mr. Mousseau) allowed to stand, 1762.

Language, unparliamentary (Pacific Ry. Debate) 1938.

On M. to adj. H., latitude in personalities permitted, 1941.

Stranger ordered to withdraw, 1940; on Proceed., 1980; Report, Writ not servable, 2044; Remarks, apology offered, 2046.

M., objection to, must be taken when Ques. is put to House, 1984-6.

W. & M., conc. to be taken *to-morrow*, 2003.

See also "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

Speaker's Salary, till successor appointed.
Supply,—discussion in, 1541.

Speech from the Throne, 4.

For the Address, &c, see "Address."

Speedy Trials Acts Amt. B. No. 75

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou).

1^o, 1080; 2^o, 1294; Com. of W., reported and 3^o*, 1533. (42 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

Spettigue, J. J., London.

Insp. of Weights & Meas., suspension, M. for Cor. (Mr. Macmillan) 240.

Spirits, manufacture and consumption.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Burpee. St. John) 185.

Spring Hill Station. See "INTERCOL. RY."**SPEAKER, Mr.**

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 99.

American Vessels, Registration of, on M. for Pap., 184.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com., 219.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 589.

SPOURLE, Mr.—Con.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o. 625; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Corn) 1349; (Stone, building) 1483; Res. 12, Free List, on 2^o (Wool) 1516.

Ministers' Salaries, Members' Indemnities, on M. for Ret., 841.

Ventilation of Chamber, on M. for Com., 859.

Supply—Estimates: Collection of Revenue (Weights & Meas.) 1719.

Standard Weights and Measures.

Cost of, M. for Ret. (Mr. Oliver) 65.

Stark, E. O., Spring Hill Station.

Dismissal of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Domville) 918.

Stationery, Members', quality of.

Printing Com. to Report, M. (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 1213.

Statutory Holidays (Mr. Domville's B.)

See "Holidays."

STEPHENSON, Mr.

Printing, Joint Com. (*moved*) 59.

Ont. Boundary Arbitration, cost (*M. for Ret.*) 67.

Tug, American, seizure, on M. for Ret., 121.

Paris, Canadian exhibit (*M. for Ret.*) 658.

Green Island Leases (*M. for Pap., for Mr. McCarthy*) 674.

Yarwood, C. St. G., superannuation of (*M. for Pap., for Mr. Bunting*) 675.

Rondeau Harbour, Repairs (*M. for Ret.*) 675.

Mounted Police, expenditure for (*M. for Ret.*) 837.

Centennial Commission, expenses, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 837.

Legal services for Govt., payments, &c. (*M. for Ret.*) 838.

Oak contracts for Canals (*M. for Ret.*) 838.

Wrecking and Coasting (*M. for Cor., by Mr. Bunting*) 1405.

Supply—Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Legislation (Report of Debates) 1833.

Stewart, John, Deposit B. (Mr. McCarthy)

Introduc. m., 139; over-ruled and withd., 140.

Stock-broking Regulations B. No. 61

(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier).

1^o*, 612; 2^o*, 1285.

STRANGE, Mr.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 629; Res. 11, on 2^o (Paintings, &c.) 1473.

Military Properties, transfer (*M. for Pap.*) 664.

Election Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) on 2^o, 927.

Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors) 1634.

Stratford, Dynamite explosion.

Remarks (Mr. Hesson and others) 1800.

Stratford, Public Buildings.

Erection of, Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 222.

Sugar, Beet-Root, Excise duty on.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Skinner) 1397.

Superannuation Act, working of.

M. for Sel. Com. (Sir John A. Macdonald)
741.

Superannuations of Officials. See "Civil Service" and "Hours," for general questions, and the names or places referred to for special cases.

SUPPLY.

Resolution, 25.

ESTIMATES:—

Message, 251; referred to Com. of Supply*, 251.

*Charges of Management**, 293; Res. 2^o and agreed to*, 409.

*Civil Government**, 1536, 1855.

*Administration of Justice**, 1536.

*Police**, 1536.

Penitentiaries:

Kingston, 1536.

St. Vincent de Paul, 1536.

St. John*, 1540.

Halifax*, 1540.

Manitoba, 1540.

British Columbia, 1540.

Legislation:

Senate—

Salaries*, 1541.

Hansard*, 1541.

Commons—

Salaries, Clerk's Estimate, 1541.

Committees and Sess. Clks., 1542, 1855.

Contingencies*, 1543.

Debates, publishing*, 1543.

Salaries, &c., Sergt. at Arms' Est.*, 1543.

Miscellaneous*, 1543.

*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics**, 1543.

Immigration and Quarantine:

General, 1544.

Mennonites, 1549.

Pensions:

J. Bright and Mrs. Antrobus*, 1550.

New Militia Pensions—

Nominal List (Vote 67)*, 1550.

Compensation in lieu of land*, 1550.

Veterans of 1812, 1628.

Militia:

Ordinary—

Salaries, Milt. Branch and Dist. Staff*, 1631.

Salaries, Brigade Majors, 1630.

Allowances for Drill Instru., 1634.

Ammunition, clothing and Milt. stores, 1642.

Armouries and care of arms*, 1642.

Drill and Training, Pay and Expenses, 1642.

Contingencies (Bands, &c.) 1642.

Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges*, 1643.

Extraordinary—

Military properties, care of*, 1643.

Royal Military College*, 1643.

Military Schools and Drill in Colleges, 1643.

"A" and "B" Batteries*, 1643.

Rideau Hall Guard*, 1643.

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Special—

Ordnance and improved fire-arms*, 1643.

Public Works and Buildings, chargeable to Capital.

Railways:

Intercolonial—

To deep water, St. John, 1643; on Conc., 1856.

Nut-locks, 1643; on Conc., 1858; carried (Y. 111, N. 42) 1860.

Pacific—

Canada Central Extension, 1645.

Georgian Bay Branch, 1648.

Fort William to English R., 1648.

English R. to Eagle R.*, 1648.

English River to Keewatin*, 1648.

Keewatin to Selkirk*, 1648.

Engine House at Selkirk*, 1648.

Pembina Branch*, 1648.

Station House and Water Supply*, 1648.

British Columbia, 1648; on Conc., agreed to on a division, 1992.

Telegraph lines and roadway*, 1648.

Surveys, 1648.

Canals:

Lachine, 1649.

Cornwall, 1649.

St. Lawrence, 1649.

Welland, 1649.

St. Anne's Lock and Canal*, 1661.

Carillon Lock and Canal*, 1661.

Grenville*, 1661.

Culbute*, 1661.

St. Peter's*, 1661.

Miscellaneous*, 1661.

Public Buildings and grounds, Ottawa, 1661.

Public Works and Buildings, chargeable to Income.

Improvement of Navigable Rivers, 1661.

Public Buildings:

Ontario, 1662; on Conc. (Ottawa Drill Shed) 1861.

Quebec, 1662.

New Brunswick, 1663.

Nova Scotia*, 1664.

N. W. Territories*, 1664.

British Columbia*, 1664.

Public Buildings, generally*, 1664.

Penitentiaries*, 1661.

Rents, Repairs, &c.*, 1664.

Harbours and Breakwaters:

Ontario, 1664.

Quebec, 1666.

New Brunswick, 1666.

Nova Scotia, 1667.

Prince Edward Island*, 1667.

Slides and Booms*, 1667.

Dredging*, 1668.

Miscellaneous (including Telegraphs) 1668.

Ocean and River Service:

Dominion Steamers, 1669.

Mail Subsidies—

Halifax, Yarmouth & St. John, 1673.

Other subsidies*, 1673.

Campbellton, N.B., and Gaspé, 1673.

SUPPLY—*Con.*

- Masters and Mates, examination 1875.
 Life boats, &c.* 1875.
 Wrecks, investigations*, 1875.
 Shipping, registration*, 1875.
 Montreal Water Police*, 1875.
 Quebec River Police*, 1875.
 Navigable Rivers, obstructions*, 1875.
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
 Salaries, &c., of Light-keepers, 1875.
 Maintenance and Repairs, 1875.
 Lighthouses, &c., construction, 1875.
Fisheries:
 Salaries, &c., Fishery Overseers, 1876.
 Fish-breeding, 1876.
*Scientific Institutions—Observatories**, 1830.
*Marine Hosps. & Distressed Seamen**, 1830.
*Steamboat Inspection**, 1830.
*Inspection of Insurance Companies**, 1831.
Geological Survey, 1831.
Indians:
 Ontario and Quebec, 1834.
 Nova Scotia*, 1834.
 New Brunswick*, 1834.
 P. E. Island*, 1834.
 British Columbia, 1834.
 Manitoba and the N. W., 1839 99.
*North-West Mounted Police**, 1839.
Miscellaneous:
*Canada Gazette**, 1839.
 Miscellaneous Printing*, 1839.
 Unforeseen Expenses*, 1839.
 Commutation of Duties*, 1839.
 N. W. Territories, Government*, 1839.
 Kewatin, Government*, 1839.
 Liquor Traffic Act, expenses*, 1839.
Collection of Revenues:
 Customs, 1839.
 Excise*, 1839.
 Culling Timber, 1839.
 Weights & Measures and Gas—
 Salaries, Dep. Insprs. W. & M., 1839.
 Salaries, Gas Inspectors*, 1839.
 Rent, Fuel, &c.* 1839.
 Inspection of Staples*, 1839.
 Adulteration of Food*, 1839.
 Pub. Works., Maintenance and Repairs—
 Salaries, &c., Canal Officers*, 1839.
 Collection Slide & Boom dues*, 1839.
 Repairs, &c., Canals, 1839.
 " Harbs. & Slides*, 1839.
 Intercol. Ry., 1839; on Conc., 1865.
 P. E. I. Ry., 1839.
 Telegraph lines, B. C.*, 1839.
 " " P. E. I., 1839.
 Agent, &c., B. C.*, 1839.
 Post-office*, 1839; on Conc., 1861.
 Dominion Lands*, 1839.
 Minor Revenues*, 1839.
 SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-79:—
Message, 1879.
Charges of Management, 1831.
*Civil Government**, 1831.
*Police**, 1831.
Penitentiaries:
 Manitoba, 1832.
 British Columbia*, 1832.
Legislation:
 Witnesses and Reporters, 1878*, 1832.
 Debates, publication, 1878, 1832.

SUPPLY—*Con.*

- Library, Catalogue, 1832; on Conc., 1875.
 Gratuity, Mr. Piché, 1832; on Conc., 1873.
*Arts, Agriculture and Statistics**, 1832.
*Immigration and Quarantine**, 1832.
*Pensions**, 1832.
*Militia**, 1832.
Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Capital:
 Railways, 1832.—On conc. (Mr. Wallace's claim) 1876, 1883; carried (Y. 114, N. 37) 1884.—On conc. (Boggs' & Murray's claim) 1884; carried on a div., 1885.
 Canals*, 1832.
 Public Buildings, Ottawa, 1832.
Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Income:
 Public Buildings*, 1832.
 Penitentiaries*, 1832.
 Rents, Repairs, &c.* 1832.
 Harbours and Breakwaters—
 Ontario*, 1832.
 Nova Scotia, 1832.
 Improvement of navigable Rivers*, 1832.
 Red River Road*, 1832; on Conc. (Arrears of Wages, D. L. Audy) carried on a div., 1885.
 Arbitrations and Awards*, 1832.
 Slides and Booms*, 1832.
Ocean and River Service, 1832.
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
 St. Paul Island, 1837.
Fisheries:
 Salaries, additional overseers, 1837.
 Fish-breeding establishments, 1837.
*Steamboat Inspection**, 1832.
*Indians**, 1832; on Conc., item, houses for farming instructors. withdn., 1835.
*N. W. Mounted Police**, 1832.
Miscellaneous:
 Four items*, 1832.
 Testimonial to M. Delfosso, 1832.
 One item*, 1832.
 Trade Mission to France and Spain, 1839.
 Two items*, 1839.
Collection of Revenues:
 Customs, 1839.
 Excise*, 1840.
 Public Works*, 1840.
 Post Office*, 1840.
Unprovided Items, 1877-78*, 1840.
 SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1879-80:—
Message, 1840.
Arts, Agriculture & Statistics:
 Ontario Exhibition, 1848.
Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Capital:
 Pacif. Ry., W. of Red R., 1849.
*Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Income**, 1852;
Ocean and River Service:
 Steamer subsidy, Canada and Brazil, 1852.
 Three items*, 1854.
*Fisheries**, 1854.

SUPPLY—Con.

Indians:

Ontario and Quebec, 1854.
Manitoba and N. W.*, 1854.

Collection of Revenues:

Customs (Experts, &c.) 1854.
Other services*, 1855.

FURTHER SUPPL. ESTIMATES, 1879-80:—

Intercol. Ry.:

Riv. du Loup Br., purchase, &c.*, 1982;
Conc.*, 2001.

Collection of Revenue:

Intercol. Ry., working R. du Loup Line*,
1982; Conc.*, 2001.

CONCURRENCE, 1856, 1883, 2001.—(See also
the respective items, in Estimates above,
where discussion occurred on Concur-
rence).

Supply B. No. 118 (*Mr. Tilley*).

Res. in Com. of W. & M., agreed to and re-
ported*, 2001; B. 1° and 2°, 2011; 3°
m., 2011, debate; 3°, 2035. (42 *Vic., c. 1.*)

Supreme Court Act, Amt.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn, W.*
Northd.) 66.

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. No. 74 (*Mr.*
McDonald, Pictou).

1°, 1080; 2°, 1587; Com. of W., 1801;
Amd. and reported, 1803; 3° m., 1803,
postpd., 1804; 3°, 1806; Senate Amts.
propd., 2036; Amt., respecting appeals
(*Mr. McDonald*) agreed to, 2043. (42
Vic., c. 39.)

Supreme Court Act Repeal B. No. 84 (*Mr.*
Keeler).

1°, 1373; 2° m. for to-morrow, 1875; 3
months' "hoist" m. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) neg.
(*Y. 44, N. 120*) 1375; debate on pro-
cedure, 1376-91.

Supreme Court Judges (*Mr. McDonald's*
Bs. See "B.C." and "N.E.")

Supreme Court, the Judges Taschereau.

Appointments of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Landry*)
505.

Supreme Court, Work and Expense of.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bolduc*) 496.

Sydney Harbour (*Bs. of Messrs. McDon-*
ald and Pope.) See "North Sydney."

St. Anaclet, Post-office.

Location of, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 904.

St. Anne de Sorel, Piers.

Construction, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Massue*)
106.

St. Anne's (*J. Cartier*) Lighthouse
Keeper.

Deschamps, discharge of, M. for Pap. (*Mr.*
Girouard) 675.

St. Anne's Lock.

Widening, intention, Ques. (*Mr. Girouard,*
Jacques Cartier) 141.

St. Boniface, Emigrant Shed.

Erection of, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 111.

St. Donat, Postmaster.

Lévesque, complaint, M. for Pap. (*Mr.*
Fiset) 70.

St. Fabien, Mail Contract.

Taken from J. Danjou, Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*)
111; M. for Cor., 232.

St. Fabien, Postmaster.

Roy, removal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*)
1398.

St. Flavie, Engine-house Supt.

Bourdeau, removal of, M. for Cor. (*Mr.*
Fiset) 1398; M. withdn., 1398.

St. Francis River, Dredging.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Gill*) 74.

St. François Xavier, Breakwater.

Construction, Ques. (*Mr. Perreault*) 490.

St. Genève and Point Clair Mails.

Contract, cancellation, Ques. (*Mr. Hunting-*
ton) 489.

St. John, Deep Water extension.

Supply,—discussion in, 1643, 1856.

St. John, Negro Point Breakwater.

Repair, Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 222; Supply,
statement in, 1666.

St. John Penitentiary.

Uses of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Weldon*) 239-40.
Warden, investigation, M. for Rep. (*Mr.*
Donville) 492; for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St.*
John) 667.

St. John Post-office, Clerk in.

Waterley, dismissal, damages, Ques.) *Mr.*
Donville) 1249.

St. John, Public Buildings at.

Supply,—discussion in, 1663.

St. John River, Bridges across.

Woodstock and Andover, M. for Pap. (*Mr.*
Connell) 653. Also see "Addenda," Vol. i.

St. John River, Fish-breeding in.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. King*) 1250.

St. Johns Infantry Co., Drill of.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tellier*) 505.

St. Joseph's Island, Land Sales.

To 1st July, 1867, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*)
1763.

St. Lawrence Canals.

Oak supply for, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Stephenson*)
839.
Supply,—discussion in, 1649, 1726.

St. Lawrence Harbours, provisioning.

M. for Cont. (*Mr. Valin*) 70.

St. Lawrence, Islands in.

M. for Leases in 1878 (*Mr. McCarthy*) 674.

St. Lawrence, Lighthouses.

Oil supply, M. for Conts., &c. (*Mr. Méthol*)
836.

St. Lawrence, Surveys (*Montmagny, &c.*)

M. for Eng's Reps. (*Mr. Landry*) 62.

St. Nicholas, Postmaster.

Duval, complaint against, Ques. (*Mr. Olivier*) 1250.

St. Paul & Pacific Ry. Co., arrangements with.

For conveyance to Manitoba, Ques. (*Mr. Dubuc*) 74.

St. Simon Station. See "INTERCOL. RY."*St. Simon, Wharf.*

Construction, Ques. (*Mr. Perreault*) 490.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.

Employés, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 497.
Supply,—discussion in, 1536.

TARIFF, THE.

Ques., Tobacco, Canadian, excise duty (*Mr. Mongenais*) 74.

H. resolved into Com. of W. & M., 409.

Speech of Finance Minister, 409; Debate, 430.

Res. agreed to and reported, 475.

Res., 2° m. (*Mr. Tilley*) 507; Resumed Debate, 618, 629; Ques. as to precedence of Debate, 649; Resumed Debate, 688, 705; Ques. as to Newfld. fish (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 743; Resumed Debate, 743, 782, 798. No. of copies of Tariff, complaint (*Mr. Casgrain*) 824. Resumed Debate, 859, 944, 986, 1003, 1028.

Amt., condemning Govt. scheme (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1079; Debate, 1084, 1101, 1123, 1141; M. to adj. Debate (*Sir A. J. Smith*) neg. on a Div., 1201; Amt. neg. (*Y. 53, N. 36*) 1201.

Ques. on the M. to agree to Res. (*Mr. Tilley*); Amt., H. m. into Com. of W. & M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1201; carried, 1202. Com. of W. & M., Res. (amended) agreed to, H. resumed and Res. reported, 1202.

Res. (amended) 2° m. (*Mr. Tilley*) 1214; explanation (personal) of vote (*Mr. Doull*) 1250; Resumed Debate, 1300.

Res. 1 (p. 1202) Bottles, packages, &c., 2° and agreed to*, 1324. Lard, packages containing, Ques. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 1510.

Res. 2 (p. 1202) Foreign drawbacks (sugars, &c.) 1324; agreed to, 1329.

Res. 3 (1202) Reciprocal reductions, equal to those of U.S., agreed to*, 1329.

Res. 4 (p. 1203) Tea and Coffee, differential, 1329, agreed to, 1331; renewed discussion, 1332-4.

Res. 5 (p. 1203) Refunds for breakages, &c., agreed to*, 1331.

Res. 6 (p. 1203) Transportation charges, agreed to*, 1331.

Res. 7 (p. 1203) Appraisers, 1331; agreed to, 1332.

Res. 8 (p. 1203) Reduction in values, agreed to*, 1332.

Res. 9 (p. 1203) Reciprocal reductions with France and Spain, agreed to*, 1332.

Res. 10 (p. 1203) Repeal of former Acts, agreed to*, 1332.

Res. 11 (p. 1203) Duties. Debate on items: Acids, 1334; Agricult. Impts., 1334; Ale, etc., bottled, 1339; Animals, living, 1339; Artificial flowers, 1339; Babbit metal,

TARIFF, THE—Con.

1339; Books, etc., 1340; Brit. copyrights, 1344; Books through post, 1345; Blank books, 1345; Bookbinders' materials, 1345; Billiard tables, 1346; Brass, 1346; Bread-stuffs, (Barley) 1346; (Indian corn) 1347; (Wheat) 1352.

Amt., on Item—Wheat 15c. per bushel; to go into Com. of W. for permissive clause, relaxation of duty by O. C. (*Mr. Houde*) 1352; Amt. withdn., 1355, 1359.

Amt., to place wheat on Free List (*Mr. Fiset*) neg. (*Y. 61, N. 109*) 1353.

Amt., wheat, coal and pig iron tree (*Mr. Charlton*) neg. (*Y. 53, N. 116*) 1354.

Amt., cornmeal free (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) neg. (*Y. 57, N. 112*) 1354.

Amt., on Item—Wheat flour 50c. per barrel, 1359—to place flour on Free List (*Mr. Vallée*) 1362; Debate resumed, 1412; neg. (*Y. 61, N. 121*) 1415.

Ques., Beet-root sugar, Excise duty on (*Mr. Skinner*) 1397.

Remarks, French copies of Tariff (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1405.

Items: Brooms, 1416; Butter, 1416; Candles, parafine, 1417; Carriages, &c., 1417; Cement, 1420; Cheese, 1421; Clocks 1426; Coal, 1426; Copper, 1437; Cotton (Sheetings, &c.) 1437; (Jeans, &c.) 1439; Earthenware, 1440; Fruits, 1443; Furniture, 1443; Gunpowder, 1446; India rubber, 1446; Pig iron, 1447.

Amt., on Item—Pig iron \$2 per ton—pig iron free, &c. (*Mr. Bourassa*) neg. on a div., 1447; Discussion continued, 1447-50.

Item: Tin plates, 1450.

Personal discussions (*Mr. Domville and others*) 1451; (*Messrs. Anglin and Tilley*) 1304, 1317, 1456.

Items: Iron, manufactures of, 1459; Oil cloth, 1470; Opium, 1470; Organs, 1472; Paintings, &c., 1472; Paper hangings, 1473; Paper, calendered, 1473; Plants, 1474; Plaster of Paris, 1474; Printing presses, 1474; Quinine, 1476; Salt, 1476; Spirits, &c. (Wines) 1478; Steel manufactures (Shovels, tools, &c.) 1481; Stone, building, 1483; Sugars, 1485; Tobacco, manufactured, 1508; Vegetables, 1510; Wool, unmanufactured, free, 1510, agreed to, 1531.

Res. 12 (p. 1210) Free List.—On Item: Steel in ingots, &c., till 1st Jan., 1881, Debate; Res. agreed to, 1531.

Res. 13 (p. 1213) Newfoundland Fish and Animals free, agreed to*, 1531.

Res. 14 (p. 1213) Excise duty on Spirits, 1531, agreed to, 1533.

Res. 15 (p. 1213) Excise duty on Malt, agreed to*, 1533.

Res. 16 (p. 1213) Drawback on Malt Liquors, present stock, agreed to*, 1533.

Res. 17 (p. 1213) Excise duty on Tobacco, agreed to*, 1533.

Res. 18 (p. 1213) Tariff to take effect Mch. 15, agreed to*, 1533.

Customs and Excise B. No. 93 (*Mr. Tilley*.) 1° 1533; order for 2°, 1806, debate; 3° agreed to on a div., 1830. (42 *Vie.*, c. 15.)

TARIFF—*Com.*

Ques., publication of H. E.'s despatches (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1628, 1669, 1729.
 Message, copy of H. E.'s despatch, 1784.

Taschereau, the Judges.

Appointments of, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Landry*) 505.

TASSÉ, Mr.

The Address (*seconded*) 14.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 962.
 Sir Geo. Cartier, monument to (*Ques.*) 1250.
Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1670.
Glendon, purchase of, on M. for Pap., 1762.
 Supreme Ct. Act Amt. B 74 (*Mr. McDonald*) in Com., 1801.

Telegraphs, Dominion (*Mr. Kirkpatrick's B.*) See "Dominion Telegraph."

Telegraphs, Marine (*Mr. McCarthy's B.*) See "Marine Telegraph."

Telegraph, Anticosti, &c. (*Mr. Tupper's B.*) See "Anticosti."

Telegraph, U. S. Cable Co. (*Mr. McCarthy's B.*) See "U. S."

Telegraphs, Expenditure for.
Supply,—discussion in, 1668.

TELLIER, Mr.

Mercier, P. A. and E. H., absence from duty (*M. for Ret.*) 105-6.
 Tobacco, Canadian, seizures, 1874-78 (*M. for Ret.*) 505.
 Militia, No. 1 Co., 21st Batt., Drill of, &c., (*M. for Ret.*) 505.

Temperance Act, 1878, intent of, B. No. 70 (*Mr. McCuaig*).

1°, 904; 2°, 1285; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1575. (42 *Vis.*, c. 50.)

Territories, N. W., Lands (*Mr. Mills's B.*) See "N. W. Territories."

THOMPSON, Mr. (Cariboo).

Lord's Day observance, on Res. for, 80.
 Quartz-mining Machinery, B. C., duty on (*M. for Pap.*) 655-7.
 Election Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2°, 927.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2°, 1058.
 Chinese in B. C., on M. for Sel. Com., 1261.
 B. C. Supreme Ct. Judges B. 97 (*Mr. McDonald*) on M. into Com. of W., 1290; in Com., 1534.

THOMPSON, Mr. (Haldimand).

Camps of Mily. Instruction (*Ques.*) 112.
 War with Russia, volunteers for, on M. for Ret., 666.
 Welland Canal, supplies for (*M. for Ret.*) 673.
Supply—Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors) 1631; (Drill Instruction) 1636-7, 1641; (Ammunition and Stores) 1642.
 Mr. Coughlin's vote on Usury B. (*Remarks*) 1754.

TILLEY, Mr.

Election of Speaker (*M. seconded*) 2.
 Public Accounts, *presented*, 26.
 Estimates, Message, 251; referred to Com. of Supply*, 251; Suppl. Est., 1878-9, Mess., 1796; Suppl. Est., 1879-80, Mess., 1840.
Budget Speech, 409; comments in reply to Mr. Cartwright, 437, 446-8-9; Ques. on Res., 473; Passing *en bloc*, on Q. of Proceed., 474; Res. agreed to and reported, 475.
Tariff—W. & M. Res. (2° m.), 507-9; Comments on Mr. Charlton's speech, 529; on Mr. Oliver's, 704-10; on Ques., 712-13; on Mr. Cartwright's sp., 732; on Mr. Killam's, 737-8, 1163. Respecting duty on Newfdld. fish (*Ans.*) 743. On Mr. Cameron's sp., 745; on Mr. Weldon's, 797; on Mr. Mills's, 892; on Mr. Snowball's, 948; on Mr. Guthrie's, 999, 1006; on Mr. Casgrain's, 1179-80. W. & M. Res., *amd.* (2° m.) 1214; on Sir A. J. Smith's sp., 1214-16, 1222-6. (*Personal explan.*) 1227, 1232, 1309-10. On Ques., 1300; on Mr. Cartwright's sp., 1323. Res. 1, Packages, lard (*Ans.*) 1510. Res. 2, Drawbacks, on 2°, 1324-5-7. Res. 4, Tea and Coffee, differential duty, 1329-30, 1333. Res. 7, Appraisers, 1331-2. Res. 11, on 2° (Acids) 1334; (Agricult. Implemts.) 1334-5; (Ale) 1339; (Animals) 1339; (Artificial flowers) 1339; (Babbit metal) 1339; (Books, &c.) 1340-1-2-4-5; (Book-binders' material) 1345; (Billiard tables) 1346; (Brass) 1346; (Barley) 1346-7; (Corn) 1347-8; (Wheat flour) 1359-60. Respecting Beet-sugar Excise duty (*Ans.*) 1397. (Brooms, &c.) 1416; (Butter) 1416-17; (Candles, parafine) 1417; (Carriages, &c.) 1418-20; (Cement) 1420; (Cheese) 1422-3-6; (Clocks) 1426; (Coal) 1426; (Copper rivets, &c.) 1437; (Cotton sheetings, &c.) 1437-8; (Cotton jeans, &c.) 1439; (Earthenware) 1440-41; (Fruits) 1443; (Furniture) 1444-5; (Gunpowder) 1446; (India-rubber goods) 1446; (Tin plates) 1450. (*Personal explanation*) 1456-8. (Screws, iron) 1459-63; (Oil-cloth) 1470; (Opium) 1470; (Organs) 1472; (Paintings, &c.) 1472-3; (Paper, calendered) 1473-4; (Plants) 1474; (Plaster of Paris) 1474; (Printing presses) 1475; (Quinine) 1476; (Salt) 1477-8; (Wines) 1479-80; (Stone, building) 1483; (Sugars) 1486-7-8-9; (Tobacco) 1509; (Vegetables) 1510. Res. 1, Packages containing lard, 1510. Res. 12, Free List, on 2° (Wool) 1510, 1529; (Steel in bars, &c., till 1881) 1531. Res. 14 Excise duty, Spirits, on 2°, 1532. B. No. 93 (1° m.) 1533; on 2°, 1812; on Mr. Mackenzie's speech, 1816-17; on Mr. Holton's, 1823. H. E.'s despatches (*Ans.*) 1628, 1669. Copy of H. E.'s despatch (*Mess.*) 1784. W. & M. Res. (*General*) in Com., 2001; (*Conc. m.*) 2001.
 Eastn. Extension Ry., N. B. claims (*Ans.*) 547.
 Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 600-4.
 Civil Service B. 8 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2°, 1273.
 Newfoundland, duties levied by, on M. for Cor., 1411.

- TILLEY, Mr.—Con.**
Supply—Estimates: Legislation (Dep. Clk.) 1541; Militia (Pensions) 1630; Ocean Service (Mail Subsidies,—Campbellton and Gaspé) 1674-5.
 Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Charges of Management (Seigniorial Tenure Comn.) 1831; Miscellaneous (Trade Mission to France) 1839.
 Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Arts, &c. (Ont. Exhibition) 1848; Collection of Revenue (Customs, Experts) 1854-5.
 Usury Prohibition B. 35 (Mr. Méthot) on 2°, 1584.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on 2°, 1578.
 Govt. Life Ins. (*Res., withdn.*) 1669.
 Ont. School Fund, payment (*Ans.*) 1756.
 Manitoba, Additional Grant (B. 108, *Res. in Com., 1° and 2°*) 1784-6.
 Esquimalt Dock (*Res., withdn.*) 1787.
 N. B. Supreme Ct. Judge B. 109 (Mr. McDonald) on Res., 1792.
 Consolidated Bank (B. 114, 1°*) 1805.
 Fees, remission of, Moira R. Toll B. (*Remarks*) 1983.
 Riv. du Loup Br., G. T. R., purchase of, B. 119 (Mr. Tupper) on 2°, 2001.
- Timber Tolls, Belleville (Mr. McCuaig's B.)* See "Belleville."
- Tin, Rebate on, B. C.*
 Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 73.
- Tobacco, Canadian.*
 Duties, intention, Ques. (Mr. Mongenais) 74.
 Revenue from, 1873-79, M. for Ret. (Mr. Vallee) 119.
- Tobacco, Manufacture, Exportation, &c.*
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Burpee, St. John) 185.
- Tobacco, Seizures, Montreal.*
 1874-78, M. for Rep. (Mr. Tellier) 505.
- Tonnage Dues B. No. 80 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.).**
 Res. in Com. of W., 1287; reported and B. 1°, 1288; Com. of W. and reported, and 3°, 1535. (42 *Vic., c. 24.*)
- Toronto, Civil Service Appointments.*
 M. for Ret., 1873-78 (Mr. Robinson) 47.
- Toronto Harbour, Dredging.*
 Supply,—Ques. (Mr. Robinson) 1664.
- Toronto, Military Properties.*
 Transfer from Govt., M. for Pap. (Mr. Strange) 664.
- Toronto Postmastership.*
 Mr. Patteson's salary, Ques. (Mr. Hay) 111; Appointment, M. for O. C. and Cor., 130. Accounts and salary, 1874-78, M. for Pap. (Mr. Macmillan) 1757.
- Toronto Savings Bank, Selling Powers, B. No. 26 (Mr. Cameron, North Victoria).**
 1°, 140; 2°, 825; Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1470. (42 *Vic., c. 55.*)
- Tracadie Harbour, Dredging of.*
 Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Mésac) 223.
- Tracadie, Lazaretto, support of.*
 Claim of N. B. Govt., on Mr. Burpee's M. for Cor. (Mr. Anghin) 1401.
- Trade Marks and Designs B. No. 82 (Mr. Pope, Compton).**
 Res. in Com. of W., 1292; reported and B. 1°, 1293; 2°, Com. of W. and reported and 3°, 1594. (42 *Vic., c. 22.*)
- Traverse, Navigation of.*
 Improvement of, Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 1755.
- Trent River Navigation Works.*
 Transfer to Ont. Govt., M. for Pap. (Mr. Keeler) 104.
 Address, refd. to Sel. Com. (Mr. Keeler) 904, 1025.
- Trials, Speedy (Mr. McDonald's B.)* See "Speedy Trials."
- Trinity House, Montreal (Mr. Pope's B.)*
 See "Montreal."
- TROW, Mr.**
 Pacific Ry., Sec. "B," Cont. (*Ques.*) 547.
 Newspaper postage, abolition (*Ques.*) 547.
 Cardinal, Régis, disml. of, on M. for Pap., 585.
 Inland Revenue refunds (*M. for Ret.*) 920.
Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2° and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1113; Res. 11, on 2°—(Books, &c.) 1342; (Corn) 1350.
 Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Tupper) on Res. in Com., 1960.
- Tug, Wrecking.* See "Sarah E. Bryant."
- Truro and Pictou Ry. Transfer Act Amt., B. No. 58 (Mr. Tupper).**
 1°, 610; 2°, 1238; Com. of W. and reported*, 1241; 3° m., 1504; Amt., to refer back to Com. of W. (Mr. Brecken) 1505; neg. on a div., 1508; 3°, 1508. (42 *Vic., c. 12.*)
- Truro and Pictou Ry.*
 Transfer of, M. for Pap. (Mr. Doull) 1763.
- TUPPER, Mr.**
 Public Works, Report (*presented*) 26.
 Pacific Railway Tenders (*Ans.*) 26, 824.
 Carillon Dam, completion (*Ans.*) 42; on M. for Ret., 45.
 G. T. R., Riv. du Loup Branch, on M. for Cor., 47; (*Ans.*) 73.
 Railways and Canals, certain expenditure, on M. for Ret., 47.
 Chambly Canal, widening (*Ans.*) 48.
 Shelburne Harbour Light (*Ans.*) 48.
 Intercol. Ry. Dismissals, on M. for Pap., 57.
 " Halifax Terminus (*Ans.*) 66.
 " Acts, Amt. (*Ans.*) 66.
 Arbitrators' Awards, Appeal (*Ans.*) 66.
 Windsor Branch Ry. (*Ans.*) 73.
 St. Francis and Yamaska Rrs., (*Ans.*) 74.
 Burlington Bay Canal Piers, (*Ans.*) 74.
 Rivière à la Graisse, Survey (*Ans.*) 74.
 Manitoba, Transportation to, arrangements (*Ans.*) 75.
 Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 94-6.
 Manitoba, Emigrant Sheds (*Ans.*) 111.
 Rimouski Wharf Improvement (*Ans., by Mr. Langevin*) 112.
 Toronto Postmastership, on M., for O. C., 131.

TUPPER, Mr.—*Con.*

- Intercol. Ry., Halifax City Ry., on proposed Bill (Mr. Cockburn) 138.
- Intercol. Ry., Ste. Flavie Land Claims (*Ans.*) 491.
- Public servants, money due from, recovery (*Ans.*) 140.
- Beauharnois Canal, enlargement (*Ans.*) 141.
- St. Anne's Lock, widening (*Ans.*) 141.
- Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 141, 144, 145.
- Negro Point Breakwater, Repair (*Ans.*) 222.
- Pacific Ry., bringing down reports (*Ans.*) 222.
- Stratford, Govt. Offices, erection (*Ans.*) 222.
- North River, Dredging of (*Ans.*) 223.
- Woodward's Cove, N. B., appropriation for (*Ans.*) 223.
- Tracadie Harbour, dredging of (*Ans.*) 223.
- Public Works Conts. (1873-79) on M. for Pap., 236.
- Tarif*—Budget, on the, 454; comments in reply to Mr. Mackenzie, 469-70, 508-9. W. & M., Res. 11, on 2°—(Coal) 1427; (Pig iron) 1448. On Mr. Tilley's personal explan., 1458. (Stone, building) 1484; (Sugars) 1490-1. H. E.'s despatches (*Remarks*) 1729.
- Shelburne, fog whistle for (*Ans.*) 489.
- Coal on Govt. Rys., shipment at false rates, (*Ans.*) 490; do., and sales to Govt. officials, on M. for Ret., 654.
- Petite Rivière, Breakwater for (*Ans.*) 490.
- St. Simon, Wharf for (*Ans.*) 490.
- Port Hood, Harbour improvement (*Ans.*) 490.
- Paris Exhibition, delay of medals (*Ans.*) 490.
- Bay St. Paul Wharf, completion (*Ans.*) 490.
- Dorchester Penitentiary, Robertson, dismissal, on M. for Pap., 492-5.
- Miramichi Marine Hospital, state of, on M. for Pap., 498.
- Harbours, Canadian, expenditure on, &c., on M. for Ret., 499, 502.
- Rocher Bay Pier, erection (*Ans.*) 546.
- Grosse Isle Sheds, rebuilding (*Ans.*, for Mr. Pope) 547.
- Pacific Ry., Sect. "B" cont. (*Ans.*) 547.
- Ryland, Mr., claim of, on M. for Pap., on Q. of Proceed., 550.
- Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 551, 605; (*Q. of Ord.*) 598.
- Judges' Salaries, Quebec (*Ans.*, for Mr. McDonald) 563.
- Lavoie, Capt., dismissal of (*Ans.*) 563; on M. for orders to, 920, 1581-2.
- L'Assomption R., deepening of (*Ans.*) 563.
- Truro and Pictou Ry. Act Amt. (*B.* 58, 1°) 610; on 2°, 1238-41; on 3°, 1504-7-8.
- Railway Act, 1868, Amt. (*B.* 59, 1°) 610; withdn., 1587.
- Pacific Ry. Act Amt. (*B.* 60, 1°) 611.
- Pacific Ry., Conts. A. and B. (*submitted*) 611; (*Remarks*) 944.
- Eastern Extension Ry., coal rolling stock for (*Ans.*) 652.
- New Westminster, P.O., construction (*Ans.*) 652.
- Woodstock, Bridge at, on M. for Pap., 653-4.
- Port Stanley Revenue and Expenditure, on M. for Pap., 655.

TUPPER, Mr.—*Con.*

- B. C. Ry. Reserves, squatters' rights (*Ans.*) 827.
- Arisaig Pier, improvement (*Ans.*) 827.
- Metapedia, disposal of Ry. buildings, on M. for Ret., 829.
- Ventilation of Chamber, on M. for Com., 858.
- Presqu'Isle Bay, dredging of (*Ans.*) 904.
- Murray Canal, construction of (*Ans.*) 904.
- Intercol. Ry., Murray & Co's. claims, on M. for Pap., 917.
- Intercol. Ry., Stark, reml, on M. for Pap., 919.
- Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 921.
- Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Casey) on 2°, 941-2.
- Pacific Ry. Conts., Engrs.' reports offered confidentially to Leader of Opp., 1080; all reports will be tabled (*Remarks*) 1083.
- Census and Statistics B. 67 (Mr. Pope) in Com. of W., 1234.
- Receiver-Genl. and Min. of P. W. (*B.* 66, 1°) 741; in Com. of W., 1241-2.
- Cheticamp Harbour, dredging of (*Ans.*) 1249.
- McNair's Cove Pier, repair (*Ans.*) 1249.
- Washademoak R., dredging (*Ans.*) 1250.
- Vancouver I., Canal for east side (*Ans.*) 1250.
- Intercol. Ry., Bouchard, disml., on M. for Pap., reasons for such Ms. (*Remarks*) 1256.
- Ont. and Pacif. Junct. Ry. B. 27 (Mr. Williams) on Senate Amts., 1290.
- Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (Mr. Keeler) on 2° and Q. of Proceed., 1377.
- Northern Ry. Act Amt. B. 64 (Mr. White) on 2°, 1395.
- Campbell's Cove, P.E.I., Breakwater for (*Ans.*) 1397.
- Kootenay R., clearing of (*Ans.*) 1397.
- Intercol. Ry., Bourdeau, disml. of, on M. for Pap., 1398.
- B. C. Penitentiary, construction of, on M. for Pap., 1409.
- Montreal Harbour Dues B. 88 (Mr. Pope) on Res. in Com., 1502.
- Supply*—Estimates: Legislation (Commons, Dep. Clk.) 1542; Pub. Works, Cap. (Intercol., to Deep Water, St. John) 1643; (Nut-locks) 1643-4; (St. John, Passenger Station) 1645; (Pacific Ry) 1645-6-8-9; (Georgian Bay Br.) 1648; (Canals, Lachine) 1649; (Cornwall) 1649; (Welland) 1650-2-3-4-5-7-8; (Buildings, Ottawa, snow-shovelling) 1661; Pub. Works, Inc. (Navigable Rivers, Quebec Harbour) 1662; (Pub. Buildings, Ont.) 1662; (Que.) 1663; (N.B.) 1663; (Harbours, &c., Ont.) 1664-5-6; (Que.) 1666; (N.B.) 1666; (N.S.) 1667; Miscellaneous (Telegraph Subsidies) 1668; Collection of Revenues (Customs, Salaries, &c.) 1691; (Weights & Meas., Salaries) 1719, 1722; (Maintenance, Canals, Welland) 1726-7-8. (*Remarks*) Kamouraska and Paspébiac Mail Service, 1729.
- Suppl. Estimates, 1878-79: Pub. Wks., Cap. (Intercol. Ry., Murray's claim) 1833-5; Pub. Works, Inc. (Harbours, &c., Oak Point, N.S.) 1836.
- Suppl. Estimates, 1879-80: Pub. Wks., Cap. (Pacific Ry., W. of Red E.) 1849, 1850-1.

TUPPER, Mr.—*Con.*

Conc.: (Intercol. Ry., to Deep Water, St. John) 1857-8-9; (Nut-locks) 1859-60; (Ottawa Drill Shed) 1861; (Intercol. Ry.) 1865-6-7-9, 1870-2-3; (Mr. Piché's gratuity) 1873; (Pacific Ry., Wallace's claim) 1877.

Bayfield, N.S., Breakwater (*Ans.*) 1550.
C. Tormentine, Govt. Br. Ry. (*Ans.*) 1550-1.
Port Elgin Harb. Improvemt. (*Ans.*) 1551.
Pacific Ry. Route W. of Selkirk (*Ans.*) 1551.
Canada and Detroit Bridge Co. B. 101 (Mr. Kilvert) 1586.

Ry. Acts Consolid. (*B.* 98, 1^o) 1550; on 2^o, 1703-4-5-6; in Com., 1711-12-13-14-15; on 3^o, 1716.

W. & A. and W. C. Rys., settlement (*Ans.*) 1756.

Public Lands Acts Consolid. (*B.* 107, 1^o) 1765.

Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3^o and Mr. Holton's Amt., for "hoist," 1766.

Anticosti, &c., Telegraph Subsidy (*B.* 111, 1^o and 2^o) 1796.

Dynamite explosion, Stratford (*Remarks*) 1800.

Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. (*B.* 116); Res. propd., 1886; on Res., 1895, 1909, 1916-18, 1954; in Com., 1960-4; on conc., Res. 1, 1965, 1974-6-8; Res. 12, 1979; B. 1^o, 2^o and 3^o, 1979.

Riv. du Loup Br., G.T.R., purchase (*B.* 119) Res., in Com., 1982; Res., on conc., 1992-6.

Quebec Constitutional Question: in Debate, on 3^o of Supply B., 2002.

Twenty-first Battalion, No. 1 Company.

Drill of, 1873-74, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tellier*) 505.

Union Ass. Co. of Canada, B. No. 36 (*Mr. Kilvert*).

1^o, 221; 2^o, 312.

U. S. Direct Cable Co., extension of powers to Canada, B. No. 47 (*Mr. McCarthy*).

1^o, 338; B. withdn., 1696.

United States Vessels, &c. See "American."

Usury, Prohibition of (*Mr. Méthot's B.*) See "Interest."

VALIN, Mr.

St. Lawrence, Harbours, provisioning (*M. for Conts.*) 70.

Grosse Isle, Pub. Works (*M. for Conts.*) 70.

American Vessels, Registration of (*M. for Pap.*) 180.

Northern Light (*M. for Ret., respecting*) 235; agreed to, 684.

Cardinal, Régis, disml. of, on M. for Pap., 572.

Pilots' Fund, managemt. (*M. for Pet.*) 675.

Official Assignees, Que., proceedings of (*M. for Ret.*) 919.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 994. Res. 11, on 2^o—(Wheat-flour) on Mr. Vallée's Amt., 1362; (Coal) 1433; (Wines) 1480; (Sugars) 1488.

VALIN, Mr.—*Con.*

Statutory Holidays B. 57 (Mr. Domville) on M. for 3^o and Mr. Brooks's Amt., 1768.

Supply—Estimates: Ocean Service (Dom. Steamers) 1670.

VALLÉE, Mr.

Intercol. Ry., dismissals, &c., on M. for Pap. (*Amt.*) 57.

Quebec Walls, improvement (*Quec.*) 60; (*M. for Ret.*) 67.

Railways, Loans to (*M. for Ret.*) 63.

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify cont., 100.

Bic, Seigniori, Fishing rights (*Quec.*) 111; (*M. for Pap.*) 137.

Rimouski, works at Matane, &c., on M. for Ret., 115.

Tobacco, Canadian, 1873-79 (*M. for Ret.*) 119.

Insolvency Laws, on M. for Sel. Com. (*Amt. propd.*) 217; (*withdn.*) 219.

Lady Head, loss of, &c. (*Ms. for Ret.*) 549.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 563, 565.

Courrier du Canada, on Mr. Huntington's statement, 613.

Hemlock Bark, export duty (*Quec.*) 651.

Rails, old, disposal of (*M. for Ret.*) 837.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. B. 46 (Mr. Killam) on M. into Com., 922.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on Premier's statements, 985.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o and Mr. Mackenzie's Amt., 1101; Res. 11, on 2^o (Wheat flour) (*Amt., free*) 1362.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 15 (Mr. Béchard) on 2^o and Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1779.

Vallée, Stanislas, Montmagny.

Postmaster, dismissal of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Landry*) 835.

Vancouver Island. See "Brit. Columbia."

Ventilation of Chamber.

Remarks (*Mr. Charlton and others*) 858.

Vessels, American, Registration.

In Canada, M. for Pets. (*Mr. Valin*) 180.

Veterans, of 1812 & 1837. See "Militia."

Volunteers for War Service, recently.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Bunster) 665.

WADE, Mr.

Windsor Branch and W. & A. Rys. (*M. for Ret. respecting*) 844.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 951.

WALLACE, Mr. (South Norfolk).

Tariff—W. & M., Res. 11, on 2^o—(Cheese) 1421; (Shovels, Tools, &c.) 1482.

National Currency (*Res. propd.*) 1550.

Blake, Vice-Chancellor, conduct of (*Remarks*) 1991.

Wallace's Claim. See "Pacific Ry."

Washademoak River, Dredging of.

Completion, *Quéc.* (*Mr. King*) 1250.

Washington Treaty. See the respective subjects thereof.

Waterley, D. H., St. John P. O.

Clerk, dismissal of, damages, Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 1249.

WAYS AND MEANS.

M. into Com. and Budget Speech (*Mr. Tilley*) 409; Debate, 430; Res. agreed to and reported, 475.

For further proceedings in House and in Com., see "TARIFF" and "Supply Bill."

Weatherbe, Judge, Appointment of.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Doull*) 842.

Weeds Destruction Companies.

Bill, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 46.

Weight, French (Mr. Casgrain's B.) See "French Weight."

Weights and Measures.

Standard, cost of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 65.

Inspectors, intentions of Govt., Ques. (*Mr. Merner*) 71.

Act, working of, M. for Pap. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 88.

Supply—discussion in, 1718.

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 87 (*Mr. Baby*).

Res. in Com. of W., 1501; 1^o, 1501; 2^o, 1841; Com. of W., 1841; reported, 1848; 3^o, 1848. (42 *Vic.*, c. 16.)

WELDON, Mr.

Newfield, Capt. Purdy's dismissal, on M. for Cor., 157.

Negro Pt. Breakwater, intention (*Ques.*) 222.

St. John Penitentiary, Provincial claims (*M. for Cor.*) 239; M. amd. and agreed to, 240.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 599, 600.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 795-8; on Mr. Domville's speech, 801. On Mr. Tilley's personal explan., 1459.

Supreme Ct. Act Repeal B. 84 (*Mr. Keeler*) on 2^o, 1383.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1613.

Welland Canal.

Smith, John B., dismissal, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 46.

Enlargement, expenditure, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cartwright*) 47.

McMahon, James A., conduct of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rykert*) 60.

Employés' names, &c., M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCallum*) 104.

Land damages, Haldimand and Monck, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCallum*) 106.

Damages, caused and paid, 1878, M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCallum*) 179.

Supplies purchased, 1873-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunting*) 185; 1871-78 (*Mr. Thompson, Haldimand*) 673.

Damages by schooner *Louise*, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McCallum*) 830.

Oak supply for, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 838.

Supply,—discussion in, 1649, 1726.

Solicitors, payments to, 1877-79, M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 1708.

Welland, Marsh Lands in.

Govt. claims, M. for Cor. (*Mr. McCallum*) 672.

Welland Ry. Co. Debentures conversion, &c., B. No. 12 (*Mr. Drew*).

1^o, 88; 2^o, 111; Com. of W. and reported, 629; 3^o, 650. (42 *Vic.*, c. 60).

Western Block, Ottawa, Extension.

Expense of, M. for Ret. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 920.

Western Counties Ry.

Settlement with W. & A. Ry., Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 73; (*Mr. Longley*) 1756. Windsor Br., earnings of, claims, etc., M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wade*) 844.

West Indies, Steamer, subsidy to.

Supply,—discussion in, 1853.

Westminster, B. C., Post-office.

Erection of, Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 652.

WHITE, Mr. (Cardwell).

Debates, Reporting, on M. to ratify Cont., 100.

Pub. Works Conts., recent (*M. for Ret.*) 125.

Quebec Harbour Works and Graving Dock (*M. for Ret.*) 188.

Quebec Constitutional Question, on M. for Res., 294.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 577-8.

Northern Ry. Act Amt. (B. 64, 1^o) 738; (*withdn.*) 1730.

Trent E. Navigation Works, on M. for Com., 910.

Western Building, Ottawa, expenditure on (*M. for Ret.*) 920.

Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 932-9.

Tariff—W. & M. Res., on 2^o, 1028, 1068; Res. 4, Tea and Coffee, differential, on 2^o, 1330; Res. 11, on 2^o—(Books, &c.) 1343; (*Carriages*) 1419. On Mr. Domville's personal explan., 1455.

Marine Telegraphs Act Repeal B. 44 (*Mr. Carthy*) on 2^o, 1281-2.

Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o and Mr. Béchard's Amt., 1615; B. 15 (*Mr. Béchard*) in Com., on Mr. Girouard's Amts., 1778.

Supply—Estimates: Public Works, Cap. (Canals, Welland) 1659-60.

Ry. Acts consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2^o, 1714.

Pacific Ry. Act, 1874, Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Tupper*) on propd. Res., 1934; personal remarks, 1939.

WHITE, Mr. (East Hastings).

Introduction, 293.

Controv'd. Elections Act Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for reference to Com., 853.

Elections Act Amt. B. 19 (*Mr. Casey*) on 2^o, 928.

Tariff—Res. 11, on 2^o—(Agricuilt. Implem-ents.) 1338; (Cheese) 1422-4.

Supply—Estimates: Public Works, Inc. (Buildings, Ques.) 1662-8.

WHITE, Mr. (North Renfrew).

- Carillon Dam (*M. for Ret.*) 45.
 Trent R. Navigation Works, on *M. for Com.*, 910.
Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2°, 952.
 Contagious Diseases, Animals, B. 55 (*Mr. Pope*) 1248.
 Insolvency Laws Repeal B. 85 (*Mr. Colby*) on *M. for 2°* and *M. Béchard's Amt.*, 1611.
 Ry. Acts Consolid. B. 98 (*Mr. Tupper*) on 2°, 1705.
Supply—*Estimates: Collection of Revenues (Excise, Culling)* 1716-17-18.
 Statutory Holidays B. 57 (*Mr. Domville*) in *Com.*, 1766; on *M. for 3°* and *Mr. Brooks's Amt.*, 1767.
 Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (*Mr. Baby*) in *Com.*, 1847.

Wilkins, Judge, Resignation of.

M. for Cor. (Mr. Doull) 842.

WILLIAMS, Mr.

- Ont. and Pacif. Junct. Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 27, 1°*)* 140.
 Appointments, &c., 1873 and 1878 (*M. for Cabinet Cor.*) 491.
Supply—*Estimates: Militia (Brigade Majors)* 1633.

Windsor and Annapolis Ry.

Earnings of, claims, &c., M. for Ret. (Mr. Wade) 844. See also "Western Counties Ry."

Woodstock, N.B., Bridge at.

M. for Pap. (Mr. Connell) 653.

Woodstock, N.B., Mail Service.

Postal Car for, Ques. (Mr. Connell) 652.

Woodward's Cove, Grand Manan.

Re-vote, intention, Ques. (Mr. Gillmor.) 223.

Wrecking, Amer., in Canadian Waters.

M. for Cor., since 1874 (Mr. Stephenson) 1405.

Wrecking Tug, American.

Seizure of, M. for Ret. (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) 119; *Resumed Debate, 680; M. agreed to, 684.*

WRIGHT, Mr.

Weights and Meas. Laws Consolid. B. 87 (Mr. Baby) in *Com.*, 1848.

Yamaska River, Dredging, &c.

Intention of Govt., Ques. (Mr. Gill) 74.
M. for Pap. respecting (Mr. Massue) 106.

Yarmouth Dyking Co. Incorp. B. No. 46

(*Mr. Killam*).
 1°, 338; *M. into Com. of W.*, 921; *order dischgd. and B. withdn.*, 924.

Yarwood, C. St. G., Chippewa.

Landing waiter, superannuation, M. for Pap. (Mr. Bunting) 675.

YEO, Mr.

Cascumpec Harbour, improvement, M. for Reps. (seconded) 87.

Fishery Award, P.E.I. claims (Ques.) 74; (*M. for Cor.*) 241, 247; (*M. withdn.*) 251; (*Ques.*) 1756.

Cardinal, Régis, dismissal of, on M. for Pap., 586.

Tariff—*W. & M. Res.*, on 2° and *Mr. Mackenzie's Amt.*, 1171.

Capes Tormentine and Traverse, Branch Bys. (Ques.) 1550.

York, North R., Election.

Judge's Report, 58.